THE DEPARTMENT OF STATE
BULLETIN

Volume LXXV • No. 1932 • July 5, 1976

THE OFFICIAL WEEKLY RECORD OF UNITED STATES FOREIGN POLICY

For index see inside back cover

THE DEPARTMENT OF STATE BULLETIN

VOL. LXXV, No. 1932
July 5, 1976

The Department of State BULLETIN *a weekly publication issued by th Office of Media Services, Bureau o Public Affairs, provides the public an interested agencies of the governmer with information on developments i the field of U.S. foreign relations an on the work of the Department an the Foreign Service.*

The BULLETIN *includes selecte press releases on foreign policy, issue by the White House and the Depar ment, and statements, addresse and news conferences of the Preside and the Secretary of State and oth officers of the Department, as well special articles on various phases international affairs and the functio of the Department. Information included concerning treaties and inte national agreements to which t United States is or may become party and on treaties of general inte national interest.*

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

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.

Note: Contents of this publication are not copyrighted and items contained herein may be reprinted. Citation of the DEPARTMENT OF STATE BULLETIN as the source will be appreciated. The BULLETIN is indexed in the Readers' Guide to Periodical Literature.

Secretary Kissinger Attends OAS General Assembly at Santiago

The sixth regular General Assembly of the Organization of American States met at Santiago, Chile, June 4–18. Secretary Kissinger headed the U.S. delegation June 7–9. Following are statements made before the Assembly by Secretary Kissinger on June 8 and 9 and his statement circulated by the U.S. delegation on June 11, together with the text of a joint report presented to the Assembly by the United States and Panama on June 9.

STATEMENT BY SECRETARY KISSINGER, JUNE 8, ON HUMAN RIGHTS

Press release 293 dated June 8

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

without freedom is sterile; nationalism without a consciousness of human community—which means a shared concern for human rights—refines instruments of oppression.

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

The Human Rights Challenge in the Americas

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

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

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

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

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

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

The rights of man have been authoritatively identified both in the U.N.'s Universal Declaration of Human Rights and in the OAS's American Declaration of the Rights and Duties of Man. There will, of course,

always be differences of view as to the precise extent of the obligations of government. But there are standards below which no government can fall without offending fundamental values, such as genocide, officially tolerated torture, mass imprisonment or murder, or the comprehensive denial of basic rights to racial, religious, political, or ethnic groups. Any government engaging in such practices must face adverse international judgment.

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

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

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

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

Reports of the Human Rights Commission

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Necessity for Concern and Concrete Action

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

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

Let us then turn to the great task before us. All we do in the world—in our search

or peace, for greater political cooperation, or a fair and flourishing economic system—s meaningful only if linked to the defense of he fundamental freedoms which permit the ullest expression of mankind's creativity. No nations of the globe have a greater re-ponsibility. No nations can make a greater ontribution to the future. Let us look deeply within ourselves to find the essence of our uman condition. And let us carry forward he great enterprise of liberty for which this emisphere has been—and will again be—the onored symbol everywhere.

TATEMENT BY SECRETARY KISSINGER, JUNE 9, ON COOPERATION FOR DEVELOPMENT

ress release 296 dated June 9

For two centuries, the peoples of this emisphere have been forging a record of ooperation and accomplishment of which we an be proud. It is a record which gives good ause for the confidence we bring to the asks we face today. But of greater impor-ance is the truly special relationship we have chieved. The ties of friendship, mutual re-ard, and high respect that we have forged ere set this hemisphere apart. The bond etween the American republics is un-natched in the world today in both depth nd potential.

First, we have maintained the awareness hat our destinies are linked—a recognition f the reality that we are bound by more han geography and common historical ex-erience. We are as diverse as any associa-ion of nations, yet this special relationship s known to us all, almost instinctively.

Second, ours is a hemisphere of peace. In o other region of the world has interna-ional conflict been so rare, or peaceful and ffective cooperation so natural to the fabric f our relationships.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

It is for this reason that we support the suggestions which have been made for a Special Assembly of the OAS to be devoted to hemispheric cooperation for development.

Such an Assembly should deal with concrete problems capable of practical solutions. To this end, the United States proposes that a preparatory meeting of experts be held in advance of the Special Assembly.

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

—First, to give special attention to the economic concerns of Latin America in every area in which our executive branch possesses the power of discretionary decision.

—Second, to undertake detailed consultations with Latin Amerian nations to coordinate our positions on all economic issues of concern to the hemisphere prior to the consideration of those issues in major international forums.

—Third, to consider special arrangements in the hemisphere in economic areas of particular concern to Latin America, such as the transfer and development of technology.

—In addition, we will put forth every effort to bring about the amendment of the U.S. Trade Act to eliminate the automatic exclusion of Ecuador and Venezuela from the generalized system of preferences.

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

—More stable and beneficial conditions for the production and marketing of primary commodities upon which the economic aspirations of so many countries in Latin America rely;

—Expansion of the trade opportunities and capabilities that are an essential part of the development strategies of all countries in the hemisphere; and

—Improved arrangements for the development, acquisition, and utilization of higher technology to speed the modernization of the hemisphere.

Let me address each of these issues in turn.

Commodities

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

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

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

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

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

secure the contribution of commodities to development in this hemisphere.

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

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

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

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

Trade

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

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

—The need to provide opportunities for developing countries to expand and diversify exports of manufactured and semiprocessed goods;

—The need to promote the hemisphere's trade position through the multilateral trade negotiations at Geneva; and

—The need for effective regional and subregional economic integration.

Let me turn to each of these three points.

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

The preferences system contained in the U.S. Trade Act has been in effect since January. It gives Latin American countries duty-free entry on more than 1 billion dollars'

worth of their exports to the United States. Even more important, it provides vast opportunities for Latin America to diversify into new product areas in its exports to the United States.

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

—He will make every effort to add to the preferences system products that are of direct interest to Latin America.

—The executive branch will bend every effort to accommodate the export interests of Latin America in all matters in which we have statutory discretion. President Ford's recent choice of adjustment assistance rather than import restrictions in response to the petition of the U.S. footwear industry clearly demonstrates the commitment of the U.S. Government to a liberal trade policy and the use of the Trade Act to expand trade in the hemisphere.

—The President will direct the U.S. Department of Commerce to respond positively to requests from your governments for assistance in the development of export promotion programs. The Department of Commerce will make available technical advice on promotion techniques and personnel training to help develop new markets for Latin American exports worldwide.

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

—The United States will seek agreement at Geneva that the code on countervailing duties and subsidies now being negotiated should contain special rules to permit developing countries to assist their exports under agreed criteria for an appropriate time linked to specific development objectives.

—The United States next month will propose that the safeguards code under negotiation in Geneva grant special treatment to developing countries that are minor suppliers or new entrants in a developed-country market during the period that safeguards are in effect.

—The United States will send a trade policy team to Latin America shortly to identify ways to promote increased hemisphere trade through the Geneva negotiations; we are prepared to intensify consultations in Geneva and Washington with Latin American delegations to explore both general issues and positions for specific meetings.

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

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

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

opportunities for Latin American products in Europe and Japan and throughout Latin America itself.

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

Technology

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

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

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

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

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

Open a technology exchange service for Latin America to provide information on U.S. laws and regulations relating to technology flows and to sources of public and private technology;

Explore cooperative ventures in which small and medium-sized U.S. firms would provide practical technologies to individual Latin American firms, along with the management expertise needed to select, adapt, and exploit those technologies; and

Expand and strengthen Latin America's access to the National Technical Information Service and other facilities of the technology information network of the U.S. Government, which covers 90 percent of the technical information that flows from the $20 billion worth of research that the U.S. Government sponsors annually.

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

First, that we establish a consultative group under the OAS to address and provide recommendations on information problems that Latin America faces in acquiring technology.

Second, that the OAS, in line with the UNCTAD IV consensus, establish a regional center on technology. The center would facilitate cooperative research and development activities, drawing on both public

and private sources. It could stimulate exchanges of qualified technical personnel. And it could begin to attack the problem of incentives to the thousands of technologically trained Latin Americans now living abroad to return to and serve with their own countries. In the view of the United States, such a center should be a cooperative enterprise requiring commitment and contributions in funds, technological resources, and personnel from all of the countries that take part. To get us underway, I propose that we convene a group of experts to examine the need, feasibility, characteristics, and role of an inter-American technology center and report to us before the next OAS General Assembly.

The Importance of Cooperative Development

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

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

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

SECRETARY KISSINGER'S STATEMENT ON REFORM OF THE OAS [1]

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

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

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

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

This hemisphere is unique; there is no other grouping like it in the world. We have indeed a special relationship. The fundamental purpose of the OAS must be to continue to nurture and strengthen our fundamental, shared values. We must have an organization that reflects our permanent and

[1] Circulated by the U.S. delegation and released on June 11 (text from press release 302).

irrevocable engagement to work together and maintain our continent as a hemisphere of peace, cooperation, and development.

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

It was to that end that the member states agreed three years ago to an effort to reform, restructure, and modernize the OAS. The results of that effort are disappointing. A proposed new draft of the Charter of the OAS has emerged from the Permanent Council. I regret to say that it is one that our government could neither sign nor recommend that our Senate ratify. It includes prescriptive and hortatory statements of general principle which are as poorly defined as they are ominous. No effort is made in the new charter draft to come to grips with the need to modernize or improve the structure of the organization. We believe the real shortcomings of the OAS have yet to be adequately addressed.

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

A. As to structure,

The United States would like to advance four points as possible guidelines for the future effort, in the interest of modernization of the organization.

1. The purposes of the organization should be stated simply and clearly in the new charter.

Those purposes should be:

—The promotion of cooperation for development;

—The maintenance of the peace and security of our region; and

—The preservation of our common tradition of respect for human dignity and the rights of the individual.

2. The structure of the organization serving these goals should be flexible.

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

3. The governance of the organization should be in the hands of the Ministers.

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

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

The General Assembly, as the central pillar of the inter-American system, might well be convened more frequently, perhaps twice a year, with special additional sessions to consider our common concerns, particularly

the great challenges of cooperation for development. As contacts at the ministerial level intensify, the need for an elaborate structure of councils will disappear. Our encounters at the General Assembly will offer sufficient opportunities to set organizational policy.

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

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

B. As to membership,

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

C. As to financing,

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

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

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

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

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

JOINT U.S.-PANAMA REPORT [2]

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

We are negotiating because both countries feel th need to build a new relationship which gives ful regard to the aspirations of the Panamanian people

[2] Presented to the General Assembly on June 9 b the Governments of the Republic of Panama an the United States (text from press release 295).

[3] For text, see BULLETIN of Apr. 27, 1964, p. 65

the interests of both nations and the principles and objectives of the Charter of the UN. And we are negotiating in deference to the unanimous views of our sister republics in the Western Hemisphere.

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

The negotiating process has confirmed the dedication of both parties to the eight principles agreed on by their authorized representatives on February 7, 1974.[4] The two countries reported to this Assembly last year that significant progress had been made in this process of balancing the interests of both parties in accordance with the eight principles. We are pleased to report that during the past year the parties have made further significant progress on the highly complex issues before them.

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

The Republic of Panama and the United States are anxious to complete these negotiations as soon as possible and recognize that the other nations represented in this Assembly share that desire. But we have recognized that the complexity of the issues remaining before us requires the most careful and painstaking negotiating efforts if we are to achieve a treaty which is truly just and equitable—a treaty which will balance the respective interests of both countries and those of the other nations of the Hemisphere and the world in such a way as to definitely eliminate the potential for causes of conflict in the future. It is in this sense that both Governments are in agreement with the concept expressed by General Torrijos [Brig. Gen. Omar Torrijos, Head of Government of Panama] that we are not simply seeking any new treaty—we are seeking a treaty that will fully meet our common goals in the future and be seen by our sister republics as reflecting a new era of cooperation in the Americas. The United States and the Republic of Panama reiterate their commitment to continue their most serious efforts to achieve such a treaty as promptly as possible.

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

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

[4] For text of a joint statement initialed at Panama on Feb. 7, 1974, by Secretary Kissinger and Panamanian Foreign Minister Juan Antonio Tack, see BULLETIN of Feb. 25, 1974, p. 184.

Letters of Credence

Bolivia

The newly appointed Ambassador of the Republic of Bolivia, Alberto Crespo Gutierrez, presented his credentials to President Ford on May 21.[1]

Czechoslovakia

The newly appointed Ambassador of the Czechoslovak Socialist Republic, Jaromir Johanes, presented his credentials to President Ford on May 21.[1]

Yemen Arab Republic

The newly appointed Ambassador of the Yemen Arab Republic, Yahya M. al-Mutawakkil, presented his credentials to President Ford on May 21.[1]

[1] For texts of the Ambassador's remarks and the President's reply, see Department of State press release dated May 21.

Secretary Kissinger Visits Four Latin American Countries

Secretary Kissinger visited the Dominican Republic June 6; Bolivia June 7; Chile June 7–9, where he headed the U.S. delegation to the sixth regular OAS General Assembly at Santiago; and Mexico June 10–13. Following are remarks and news conferences by Secretary Kissinger, together with the texts of joint communiques issued in Bolivia and Mexico.[1]

ARRIVAL STATEMENT, SANTO DOMINGO, DOMINICAN REPUBLIC, JUNE 6

Press release 285 dated June 6

Mr. Foreign Minister: It is a great honor for me to begin my second trip within this hemisphere within four months with our friends in the Dominican Republic.

President Ford has sent me on this journey to underline the special ties which the United States feels with its sister republics in the Western Hemisphere, the importance we attach to the dialogue that is growing up between us, and our conviction that if we here in the Western Hemisphere cannot solve the problems between developed and developing nations, it is very difficult to solve them in the world at large.

We are tied together by a similar history, by a long tradition of cooperation, and by the conviction that in this hemisphere, above all others, human dignity and human rights must always be respected.

All these subjects will be discussed at the forthcoming session of the General Assembly, which my colleague your Foreign Minister and I are planning to attend. But I am here to say also that in a world in which nonalignment is respected and in which we are prepared to cooperate with nonaligned nations, we nevertheless greatly value and appreciate those nations that have always been our friends.

We were greatly impressed and moved by the remarks of your distinguished President on February 27 in his Independence Day message when he said:

> In an era in which a certain strident nationalism and certain pseudo anti-imperialist poses are fashionable, we are not ashamed of our friendship with the United States. We have identified with the destiny of that great nation.

We reciprocate this feeling, and it is to strengthen that friendship between our two peoples and to deepen our relationship that I have come here. I look forward to my talks with your leaders, and I thank you for the very gracious reception that Mrs. Kissinger and I have received.

TOAST BY SECRETARY KISSINGER, SANTO DOMINGO, JUNE 6[2]

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

A great chronicler of Columbus' voyages the late Samuel Eliot Morison, pointed out that the most remarkable aspect of Colum-

[1] Other press releases relating to Secretary Kissinger's trip are 286 of June 6, 290 and 292 of June 7, 297 of June 11, 298 of June 10, and 304 of June 12.

[2] Given at a luncheon hosted by President Joaquín Balaguer on June 6 (text from press release 287)

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

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

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

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

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

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

Today, the evolution of the hemisphere and the world impels us to expand the range of our concerns beyond the traditional agenda of security and peace. It is fortunate that our relationship is so deep that it can comfortably accommodate the broad range of human preoccupations.

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

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

—Take special cognizance of the distinctive requirements of the more industrialized economies of Latin America and of the region as a whole, in the context of our efforts to help shape a more equitable international order;

—Assist directly the neediest nations in

the hemisphere afflicted by poverty and natural disaster;

—Support Latin American regional and subregional efforts to organize for cooperation and integration;

—Negotiate on the basis of parity and dignity our specific differences with each and every state, to solve problems before they become conflicts;

—Enforce our commitment to collective security and to maintain regional integrity against attempts to undermine solidarity, threaten independence, or export violence; and

—Work to modernize the inter-American system to respond to the needs of our times and give direction to our common action.

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

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

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

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

Trade

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

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

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

—Make clear our determination to administer our Trade Act in ways constantly

more favorable to Latin America's exports;

—Announce our willingness to explore with Latin America ways in which, through our own trade policies, we can offer incentives for more liberal trade and greater integration in Latin America;

—State our willingness next month, at the multilateral trade negotiations in Geneva, to consider special safeguards treatment for certain developing countries and, in other ways, to press the trade interests of Latin America at the Geneva conference;

—Explore several means of expanding Western Hemisphere commodity production and exports; and

—Propose a new inter-American consultative mechanism on trade so that the inter-American system shall enjoy, for the first time, an open, continuing forum for dialogue on this the most significant economic relationship of the nations of this hemisphere.

Technology

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

At the General Assembly this time, I shall:

—Announce measures to expand Latin America's access to our own National Technical Information Service;

—Detail an increased U.S. assistance program for the coming year for the development of indigenous technology capability within Latin America;

—Announce that we are opening a technology exchange service for Latin America to service requests for information about public and privately owned technology in the United States;

—Indicate that we are prepared to mount a pilot program of practical technology exchanges between private Latin American and U.S. companies; and

—In general, elaborate for Latin America the technology initiatives which I suggested in Nairobi recently and those which were approved in the technology resolution at UNCTAD IV.

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

Human Rights

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

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

During this trip I shall stress that the struggle for human dignity is central both to national development and to international cooperation, and I shall propose a strength-

ened role for the Inter-American Human Rights Commission.

Our Inter-American System

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Ladies and gentlemen, I ask you to join

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

NEWS CONFERENCE, SANTO DOMINGO, JUNE 6

Press release 288 dated June 6

Q. There is one basic question: What is the real purpose of your visit to the Dominican Republic?

Secretary Kissinger: As I indicated at the airport, this is my second visit to Latin America in four months, and I am trying to see as many countries of the Western Hemisphere as I can during this year to create a basis for a new relationship between the United States and the countries of the Western Hemisphere.

I am using the occasion of the General Assembly in Santiago to stop here to exchange views with an old friend of the United States, a country that plays a central role in the Caribbean area and whose problems are characteristic of many of the smaller countries of this region. This is the basic purpose of my visit in Santo Domingo.

The larger purpose is to establish a relationship between the United States and its Western Hemisphere neighbors, to contribute to the dialogue between the developed and the developing nations, and to help construct in this hemisphere a model of what the relationship in the world at large can be over a period of time.

In any case, it is a pleasure for me to visit a country with which we have no bilateral problems and from which we don't want anything and also to have the opportunity to visit a capital which has shown great friendship.

Q. Mr. Secretary, today you stated that the matter of human rights is a matter that is vital for continued cooperation in the region. Does this mean that the United States will not provide economic assistance to Chile in view of the demonstrated and systematic violations of human rights by the government of General Pinochet?

Secretary Kissinger: The United States has made clear and will make clear again in Santiago its commitment to human rights, and it will make some specific proposals on how to advance them in the Western Hemisphere. We are not here to discuss questions related to interruption of economic assistance or economic matters.

Q. Mr. Secretary, I wonder whether you could please explain the new role of the Dominican Republic within the context of this new policy that you have expressed in the area of the Latin American Continent and, very specifically, the role of this country in the Caribbean area. We have heard recently and there has been some evidence of efforts or trends to stop the establishment of blocs of producers of raw materials. On the other hand, we have heard of the role of an arms or ammunition factory that is being run by some Cuban exiles and there are rumors that the CIA has something to do with it. We would like to know what the role of this factory is in the Caribbean and with respect to Latin America and the area in general. There has been late news of arms shipments made to Chile and that this was a sale effected by the United States through the Dominican Republic. Could you comment?

Secretary Kissinger: I have never heard of any arms sales to Chile by way of the Dominican Republic, and that, in any case, would be against our laws. So I don't believe that this is possible. I have also never heard of an arms factory established by Cuban exiles, but there are many things under the sun that I haven't heard of, though it's very rare for me to admit it.

The role of the Dominican Republic can be, as it has been traditionally, one of moderation and cooperation. We are not attempting to stop the formation of producer blocs,

but the producers cannot complain if the consumers then also create organizations of their own. Our basic theme is not to tell other countries how to organize themselves. Our basic theme is that relations between producers and consumers cannot be settled by confrontation, everybody will suffer, but most of all the poorest countries. And this is why we have made, constantly, proposals to encourage a dialogue and to take into account the concerns of the developing countries and why we believe that in the last 15 months considerable progress in that direction has been made.

We have a long flight ahead of us, so if I could ask for only two more questions.

Q. What other fundamental or primary benefits are or could be offered to the Government of the Dominican Republic in the social and economic order in connection with your visit, Mr. Secretary?

Secretary Kissinger: I did not come here in order to make a commercial deal with the Dominican Republic. I came here to visit old friends, to discuss the general principles of hemispheric cooperation, and to deal with a few specific problems of direct import to our countries.

I believe that the benefits to the Dominican Republic will develop from the general program of hemispheric cooperation that we are trying to develop and our general readiness to deal with the special concerns of the Dominican Republic with an attitude of friendship. But you should not present this as if I had come here on a sort of commercial mission in which we asked something of the Dominican Republic and then paid a certain amount for it. This is not the sort of visit it was.

Q. Mr. Secretary, do you feel you're in a position to affirm and state that the United States will not repeat the type of activity that we were subjected to during the 1965 experience—that is to say that no new armed intervention will ever be carried out in our own territory—or do you feel that circumstances could lead to a repetition of such type of activity?

Secretary Kissinger: One of the celebrated candidates in the American political campaign has just announced that he has made a new discovery, which is never to answer a hypothetical question. I have so few opportunities to agree with him that I would like to record my agreement.

But to answer your hypothetical question—we are not looking for opportunities for military intervention. And we are trying to build a relationship of cooperation in this hemisphere.

May I use this occasion to thank the Dominican Government, its President, Foreign Minister, and all the people we have met for the extraordinarily warm reception that we have received here.

NEWS CONFERENCE, SANTA CRUZ, BOLIVIA, JUNE 7

Press release 291 dated June 7

Q. With whom did you confer last night and today, and what were the subjects?

Secretary Kissinger: Before I answer the question I want to take this opportunity to thank the Bolivian Government on behalf of my colleagues for the reception we have had here. I already had an opportunity to express my views at City Hall. I would like to repeat again how touched we all have been by the very friendly reception we have had here.

In answer to your question, last evening I had a very brief talk with the Foreign Minister. This morning I met for about two hours with the President, the Minister of Foreign Affairs, the Finance Minister, and two others of their associates, and I was accompanied by Under Secretary Maw, Assistant Secretary Rogers, and our Ambassador to Bolivia.

We reviewed the topics that are covered in the communique—that is, the progress of economic development; bilateral issues between the United States and Bolivia; and some substantial discussion on narcotics control, which is a matter of great concern for both our countries. Also, Secretary

Rogers met with the Minister of Finance last night to go into some more details on the economic subjects that were also discussed this morning.

Q. Mr. Secretary of State, two points I would like to ask you about, and they concern —they are matters of special concern to all Latin American countries. The first point refers to the landlocked nature of Bolivia and its desires to gain access to the sea. The second one refers to the matter of Panamanian desires to assert sovereignty over the canal area. I would like to ask you specifically what steps the United States is contemplating to find a solution to these two problems and, additionally, what type of support is the United States intending when you say that the United States does support Bolivia's desires to have access to the sea?

Secretary Kissinger: With respect to the issue of Panama, three American Presidents have been negotiating with Panama in order to see whether it is possible to reconcile the American interests of free and uninterrupted passage through the canal with Panamanian aspirations. We do this not only because of the concerns of the country of Panama but because of our convictions that all of the countries of the Western Hemisphere are watching these negotiations at this time for the new and equal relationship that we are attempting to establish with the countries of the Western Hemisphere.

We are negotiating seriously. So far no conclusions have been reached, but we are proceeding on a serious exploration to see whether the interests of both the United States and Panama and the concerns of all of the countries of the Western Hemisphere can find an expression that strengthens the ties of the Western Hemisphere and assures free access and passage through the canal. As you know, this has been the subject of considerable debate in the United States, but we believe that we are acting in the national interests and in the Western Hemisphere's interests, and we are proceeding with these negotiations.

As for the Bolivian access to the sea, you know better than I that this is a complicated problem involving Chile, Bolivia, and Peru that all three countries have to agree. It is our understanding that some preliminary understandings have been reached between Chile and Bolivia and are now being discussed with Peru.

The United States watches these negotiations with sympathy, and it hopes that a successful conclusion can be achieved, in the belief that this will help the tranquillity and cooperation in the Southern Cone. We will certainly express these views to all interested parties and to all other colleagues in Santiago.

Q. Mr. Secretary, of all of your diplomatic undertakings, which one would you consider the most positive in your pursuit of world peace, and could you tell us what are the most recent steps and most recent efforts undertaken by you in order to seek peace in the world?

Secretary Kissinger: I would not want to make a judgment between the various activities with respect to peace, because if the world is to become more peaceful several things have to be done simultaneously. The relationship between the industrial democracies has to be strengthened. The relationship between the industrialized countries and the developing countries has to grow into one of cooperation so that the world is not forever divided between those who are advanced and those who are struggling for progress. And finally, relations between ideological adversaries—between East and West—have to follow some rules of restraint. If we do not make progress in all of these areas simultaneously, then we have great difficulty speaking of an improvement of world peace.

In addition to the structural problems, there are specific areas such as the Middle East and now Africa, and I believe that it is—that America has an obligation to use its influence and its power to attempt to ease conflicts, to mediate rivalries, and to move these specific issues closer to a peaceful resolution.

Q. In Bolivia, Mr. Secretary, tin is a most important basic product, and the high cost of production of this mineral makes it of great significance to our country. Tin, therefore, and the world tin situation are of great significance. The Fifth International Tin Agreement established a voting system that provides a virtual veto right to the United States. Bolivia has announced its intention not to ratify such an agreement because of the manner in which it would affect its interests. This implies the right of the United States to veto the positions of some minor nations. Wouldn't this be, Mr. Secretary, in contradiction to some of the principles that you stated during the course of the Nairobi Conference?

Secretary Kissinger: The issue of commodities is one of the principal problems in the relations between the developed and the developing nations. The United States understands the concern of the producers of primary products and especially of countries that are dependent on—to a large extent—on the single commodities—commodity—to avoid excessive fluctuations in the price, and therefore, frankly, after some internal debate, we have agreed to join a number of commodity agreements. Some have already been concluded, and we have agreed to discuss others. We have signed [inaudible].

We do not consider that our voting percentage in fact constitutes a veto. And in any event, having joined the agreement, it would be our intention to realize its objective, which is to prevent extreme fluctuations of the prices and to enable the producers of the primary commodities to stabilize their income. I frankly am not aware of the fact that Bolivia has indicated that it would not ratify the agreement, and I would regret it if it were true, because one of the principal reasons for our joining the agreement is precisely to help countries like Bolivia. We ourselves are not tin producers.

Q. Mr. Secretary, I have read in a publication of the U.S. Information Service entitled "Latin America in a Changing World" and have noted that in all of your public statements during the course of your visits to Venezuela, Peru, Bolivia, Colombia, Costa Rica, you have made references to the matter of human rights and to the need for the observation of human rights in order to promote peace and encourage progress among the peoples of the world. How, Mr. Secretary, do you think that the United States can require —demand—of countries that do not respect such human rights, that they do so, as has been on occasion suggested by Democratic Senator Kennedy? And I suggest that this is not on my part an effort to interfere in the internal politics of another country.

Secretary Kissinger: Before I answer the last expression, may I thank everybody for the extreme courtesy with which the interview has been conducted—a method that I am considering introducing in the Department of State—and I hope that the American correspondents here have paid great attention to the politeness with which everything has been conducted here.

Now, to answer your question. I think the problem of human rights is not primarily a question of preserving the peace, because peace can also be preserved in the absence [inaudible]. The problem of human rights arises from the moral positions of the Western Hemisphere, in that all of the founding documents of all of our republics have called attention to the importance of human dignity and personal freedom. This is the hemisphere to which people came to escape oppression elsewhere, and we can only be true to our history and to the human imperatives of our time by implementing the demands for the respect for human dignity. I will make a statement on this subject at the meeting in Santiago, and I will indicate the U.S. position with respect to it and what methods we believe can be used for the time being to advance the cause of human rights in the Western Hemisphere. But I do believe that this hemisphere has a special obligation by virtue of its tradition and by virtue of its basic belief to promote the advancement of human rights.

U.S.-BOLIVIA JOINT COMMUNIQUE, JUNE 7[3]

His Excellency the Secretary of State of the United States of America, Dr. Henry A. Kissinger, at the invitation of the Government of Bolivia, visited the city of Santa Cruz de la Sierra on the 6th and 7th of June, 1976. During his visit, he was received by His Excellency the President of the Republic of Bolivia, General Hugo Banzer Suárez, with whom he held cordial conversations on matters of mutual interest to both countries.

After a friendly dialogue between the Secretary of State of the United States and His Excellency the Minister of Foreign Relations and Worship of the Republic of Bolivia, General Oscar Adriazola Valda, the following Communique was issued:

Both sides reaffirmed the close ties of friendship between their peoples and their governments, and expressed satisfaction at the high level of understanding and cooperation existing between the two nations.

In this spirit, His Excellency the President of the Republic of Bolivia, General Hugo Banzer Suárez, and the Minister of Foreign Relations and Worship, General Oscar Adriazola Valda, outlined for the Secretary of State of the United States the scope of the Bolivian proposal for peace, development, and integration in the Southern Cone, intended to resolve Bolivia's geographic isolation by providing sovereign access to the Pacific Ocean.

The Secretary of State manifested great interest in this important subject, and stated that the Government of the United States views with satisfaction the progress which has been achieved up to the present toward reaching a definite solution that will satisfy the interests of the concerned parties.

The Secretary of State also emphasized that a negotiated solution to this century-old problem would constitute a substantial contribution to the peace and development of the South American continent.

The Chancellor of the Republic of Bolivia informed the Secretary of State of the United States of America that he had studied with great interest the speech given by Dr. Kissinger during the general debate at UNCTAD IV which took place in Kenya, in which he made known important proposals with regard to raw materials, trade, and financing; and expressed his desire that these proposals achieve an effective application within the framework of the United Nations system of cooperation for development.

The Governments of Bolivia and the United States recognize the importance of international agreements on raw materials between producing countries and consuming countries. The United States has recognized for its part the importance of the income derived from exports of raw materials for countries in the process of development, such as Bolivia. The Foreign Minister and the Secretary of State agreed that the existing integration processes in Latin America should receive the necessary support since they constitute appropriate mechanisms for achieving inter-regional economic equilibrium, accelerating development and promoting joint activities for the achievement of harmonious and balanced progress.

The Foreign Minister and the Secretary of State agreed on the necessity to increase the efforts of both Governments to combat and eradicate the manufacture and traffic of dangerous substances. They also resolved to explore the means of encouraging the socio-economic development of the zones producing coca leaves so that such cultivation can be gradually reduced.

They agreed on emphasizing the need to augment substantially the capacity of developing countries, like Bolivia, to apply science and technology to their economic development programs. Likewise, they outlined the necessity to strengthen the mechanisms of cooperation in favor of the relatively less developed countries.

Both countries look forward to a prompt and successful conclusion of the Conference on the Law of the Sea on the basis of a consensus which satisfies the interests of the entire international community.

The Government of the United States reaffirms its willingness to consult with Bolivia with regard to its plans for sales of tin and other products from its strategic reserves and states that such sales will be made with due regard for protection against avoidable disruption of usual markets.

[3] Signed at Santa Cruz de la Sierra by President Banzer and Secretary Kissinger (text from press release 289).

REMARKS AT ECLA HEADQUARTERS, SANTIAGO, CHILE, JUNE 9

Press release 296A dated June 9

Mr. Secretary [Enrique V. Iglesias, Executive Secretary of ECLA, the U.N. Economic Commission for Latin America], I appreciate very much the complimentary remarks that you have made, and I would like you and your distinguished staff to know that while it is a meeting of the General Assembly of the Organization of American States that brings me to Santiago at this time, I value this opportunity to meet with

you and to visit this renowned fountainhead of ideas.

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

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

The problem of economic development is not primarily a technical issue. It is profoundly a political and moral issue. It is not possible to build a world community which is divided between the rich and the poor. If we are to live in a world of peace and justice, all nations must have a sense of participation, and all nations must have the consciousness that the world community either takes into account their concerns or at least listens to their concerns.

This is why we attach such extreme importance to the dialogue that is now taking place between the developed and developing nations; for regardless of technical solutions we find, the spirit we can help engender can contribute to a world of peace and to a sense of community. And this is why we are concerned when there are attitudes of confrontation or technical majorities, because it is the essense of an international structure that solutions cannot be imposed by one group on another but that a consensus must be established in which all share.

The nations of Latin America have a very special role to play in this process. They are among the most developed of the developing nations or among the least developed of the developed nations. They belong to the Organization of American States, and they are tied to us, a country which has a great concern with security and global equilibrium. But they are also a part of other groupings of the so-called Third World, and they can, therefore, in important respects act as a bridge between the views of the different groups that exist in the world today.

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

In Nairobi, we advocated a comprehensive plan for addressing major commodity issues and set forth additional proposals for dealing with technology and other requirements for development. Our proposal for the establishment of an International Resources Bank failed for reasons of an accidental majority. But I cannot scold every forum that I meet on this topic. I think we have made our point.

The more fundamental problem I would like to put to this distinguished group is how to relate these general proposals for global development, which are important, to the special requirements of the Western Hemisphere.

My colleagues and I are doing a great deal of thinking on how, in a global context of

development, we can at the same time reflect the special ties and the special values and the particular institutions that have grown up in this hemisphere—how we can avoid being caught between the extremes of dogmatic globalism and dogmatic regionalism. We favor regional integration of the Western Hemisphere or of the nations of Latin America, either in subregional groupings or in regional groupings; and we are going to give very serious study to how, within a global framework, we can spur the very special concerns for development of our old friends and associates in the hemisphere.

Today, at the meeting of the OAS General Assembly, I made some specific proposals of what can be done within the framework of existing legislation and within the discretion that our executive has, but I also pointed out that at the special session on development that has been proposed by several members at the General Assembly and that we assume will take place next spring, the United States will be prepared to address the more fundamental questions that I'm putting to my friends here: how to relate the global concerns for development with the regional concerns of the Western Hemisphere, because it would be wrong to waste the traditions of cooperation and the special relationships that have grown up in this hemisphere.

I am providing your Executive Secretary with a copy of the paper in which we made a series of comments and recommendations regarding cooperation for development, and I hope that ECLA will find that it can play a role with regard to some of the arrangements we suggested on vital issues; for example, on technology for development. We hope also that you will not feel yourself confined to the proposals that we have made and will feel free to offer your own suggestions. In looking at the record, the danger that you will feel yourself confined by our proposals is minimal.

The nations of this hemisphere are bound by historical and other special ties and interests. The United States consequently supported and has been interested in the work of ECLA since its founding in 1948. I would also like to reciprocate the very warm words of the Secretary General, whose dedication to the cause of peace we admire and whose indefatigable efforts in all areas of world problems we support.[4] I wish you and the Executive Secretary the very best as you carry on your important work, and I would like to thank you for this very warm reception I have had here.

NEWS CONFERENCE, MEXICO CITY, JUNE 11

Press release 300 dated June 11

Secretary Kissinger: Ladies and gentlemen, having read some of your commentaries, I know you have many questions. I would like, however, to take this opportunity to express again my very great joy to be in this country which I love so much and of which I have so many happy personal memories and with which we've been so closely tied officially. Especially I would like to express my appreciation to my good friend, your distinguished President, whose contribution to peace and progress and justice is well known around the world and from whose friendship and frank opinions we have all benefited greatly. And now I'll be glad to answer your questions.

Q. Mr. Secretary, what do you want to obtain from Mexico? Do you want Mexico to be subjected to you, or do you want its friendship? [*Laughter.*]

Secretary Kissinger: You have to remember America is a pragmatic people, and I know you are a heroic people, so I am not here to attempt anything so foolhardy as to attempt the subjugation of Mexico, and that has never succeeded. In all seriousness, the big international problem in the world today is that for the first time in history international relations have become global.

For the first time world peace has to be built on the basis of a community of nations

[4] Roberto Guyer, personal representative of U.N. Secretary General Kurt Waldheim, conveyed a message from the Secretary General.

that feel that they have a sense of participation and a sense of justice. That can only be done by the voluntary cooperation of other countries, and in this sense, Mexico and the United States—that have had a very complicated history and in which paternalism was not always asked—have a special opportunity to demonstrate how two great peoples can cooperate on the basis of equality. And if we do not cooperate on the basis of equality, we can achieve nothing.

Q. When you speak of the dictatorship of the majorities, could we apply the same concept to the majorities in the United States with reference to their own political life?

Secretary Kissinger: Of course, there is a difference between the domestic—the conduct of domestic affairs and the conduct of international affairs.

In domestic affairs in a democratic country, it has proved to be the most equitable system to let the majority determine the decisions of the people. This works especially in countries where the minority has an opportunity to become the majority. In countries where there is a permanent minority and a permanent majority along racial lines, it also has its problems. Internationally, when we have used the phrase "the dictatorship of the majority," we have applied it to situations in which a numerical grouping of countries composed of countries of very unequal status, whose total population might be very small, attempted to impose their will on a minority, without whose willing cooperation it is not possible to achieve anything.

I believe that in the problems of development especially, but in all international problems, the art of foreign policy is to obtain the willing cooperation of all those without whose cooperation progress is not possible. And if one is looking for parliamentary-type victories in a situation in which there is no ability to enforce those victories, one is working essentially for propaganda and not for substance. And therefore we have internationally expressed concern about unofficial majorities. On the other hand, we are prepared to work out cooperative solutions, and I believe in the international field one should proceed by consensus and not by imposition —either imposition by power or imposition by majority.

Q. Mr. Secretary, do you have information that Cuba is in fact withdrawing its troops from Angola, and if this is the case, does this inspire you to resume your efforts to improve relations with Cuba?

Secretary Kissinger: We have had information through the Swedish Prime Minister and other statements that were made to various other countries that Cuba intends to withdraw troops at a rather slow rate from Angola. We have not yet been able to achieve a conclusive confirmation, especially a confirmation of whether there is a net return or whether there is a rotation. So, at this point it would be premature for us to draw any conclusions.

We had, in principle, been prepared to explore the normalization of relations with Cuba as long as Cuba conducted its affairs as a national Latin American or Western Hemisphere state and not as a country exporting revolutionary activities. The introduction of large military organized contingents in Angola has created a very serious situation in our relationship with Cuba.

At this moment the withdrawal is of too small proportions to permit us to draw any conclusions. I would say that the precondition for any improvement in our relations with Cuba is the total withdrawal of all organized military units from Angola.

Q. I have two questions to ask of you, Mr. Secretary. You have made reference to the fact that the United States would never permit another situation like the situation of Angola; that is to say, that it would not permit the interference of Cuban troops in any country and also in countries of Latin America. How is it that the United States can determine what the internal policy of a country is to be and what it will permit and not permit internationally?

Secondly, I would like to refer to President Echeverria's visit in 1971 to the United

Nations, when he proposed the admittance into the United Nations of the People's Republic of China. At that time, the United States opposed the suggestion that was made by President Echeverria, and the United States said that the two Chinas should be admitted. At that point, President Echeverria responded that sovereignty is indivisible and that therefore there could only be one China. Now, with reference to all of this, I would like to know how you view President Echeverria at this particular point because of this reply and this stand. Is there any resentment on your part?

Secretary Kissinger: With respect to the first question, we do not assume the right to intervene in the domestic policies of other countries. For example, in Mozambique, the group that took over—got the government of Mozambique—is in its political views as different from our predominant views as the MPLA [Popular Movement for the Liberation of Angola] in Angola. Nevertheless we recognized it as soon as it came into office and have established improved relations with the Government of Mozambique. We are prepared and are making every effort to improve the relationship further.

The situation in Angola is not an internal affair. It is the massive introduction of at least 15,000 Cuban combat troops in a country thousands of miles away from Cuba, in a civil war situation. When I say we do not wish to see any more Angolas, I do not mean the internal struggles of Angola. I mean the introduction of outside military forces, supported by the Soviet Union, encouraged by the Soviet Union, and acting as surrogates for the Soviet Union. This is what the United States will oppose.

Now, with respect to President Echeverría, I think you must have seen from our greetings that we consider each other personal friends. I have very high regard for President Echeverría and great respect for the role that Mexico has played internationally. Of course, Mexico, being an independent sovereign country which is not governed by weakminded individuals, has its own views on a number of international problems. Those views do not always coincide with ours. When we differ, we intend to discuss our differences. Sometimes we succeed in eliminating the differences. But sometimes we do not.

In those cases, each country pursues its own policy. Nothing has happened so far, and nothing is likely to happen that I can foresee that will affect the basic friendship that exists between Mexico and the United States. We do not have resentment of President Echeverría. We have the highest regard for him, and I personally have great affection for him.

Q. Mr. Secretary, what can you tell us about negotiations regarding conditions in Mexican jails, conditions that Americans are held in? Are they going well, and what are those conditions?

Secretary Kissinger: The distinguished Foreign Minister of Mexico and his associates and my associates and I had, as you know, an extensive discussion yesterday evening on a large number of bilateral issues. The problem of prisoners was part of that discussion.

I think it is important to point out that in fact more Mexicans are held in American prisons than Americans in Mexican prisons. And we discussed how to alleviate the general situation of individuals being held in prison in a foreign country. The Mexican side presented a number of rather ingenious and interesting proposals which we would like to study carefully and on which we are going to begin, in the near future, intensive bilateral discussions.

I can say that the discussions yesterday were conducted in a very constructive spirit, with the recognition by each side of the sovereignty of the other, but also with an attitude of good will to settle what is a very complicated problem; and I am hopeful that we can make progress on this.

Q. Mr. Secretary of State, I would like to mention that during the third UNCTAD [U.N. Conference on Trade and Development], which took place in Santiago de Chile,

President Echeverria proposed a charter, the Charter of Economic Rights and Duties of States. This was in April 1972. Later on, in December 1974 and against the will and vote of the United States, this charter was approved by 120 countries within the United Nations. My question is the following: Do you not believe that an attitude such as this one taken by the United States is going to bring on the unpopularity of the United States within the United Nations?

Secretary Kissinger: Of course, we cannot finally make our foreign policy on the basis of popularity or unpopularity, any more than any other nation can. We have to follow our best judgment of what we consider to be in the national interest and in the world interest.

With respect to the proposal of President Echeverría for a charter, I was very attracted to the concept. And in two speeches at the U.N. General Assembly, I supported the concept that President Echeverría put forward, and so did the U.S. Government.

In the elaboration of the charter a number of provisions were included that we felt were simply not acceptable and were against some basic principles of our foreign policy and of our foreign economic policy. We would have been prepared, if it had been possible to arrange, to vote on different items in the charter, rather than for the charter as a whole. We had offered to vote on individual items, in which case we could have supported, I think, 98 percent of the charter and simply voted against the provisions with which we disagreed, if we had not been also forced to vote on the entire charter.

So it is a concept which we supported. There are three or four provisions in it with which we disagreed. The majority of the provisions we could have supported, and it was one of those issues where, I believe, with a different parliamentary management, we could have achieved a more satisfactory outcome. But I would like to say now that the United States did not oppose the concept of the charter, nor does it oppose the overwhelming majority of the provisions in the charter. And we, at the time that it was proposed, took an opportunity to commend President Echeverría for his initiating it.

Q. Mr. Secretary, is the United States concerned that Cuba is trying to expand its influence in the Caribbean, particularly by influencing the Governments of Jamaica and Guyana?

Secretary Kissinger: I would like to make a distinction between the diplomatic activities of a country and the military activities of Cuba—Cuban diplomatic activities and Cuban political efforts to gain influence in matters that are subject to our foreign policy. And we are sufficiently self-confident that we believe that we can sustain a political competition with a country like Cuba. Our concern is the military infiltration or the movement of military units by Cuba. This we would oppose. We have seen no evidence of the movement of organized Cuban military units within the Western Hemisphere. As for other Cuban influence, this is a matter that we will deal with in diplomatic channels.

Q. Mr. Secretary, could you give us your assessment of the implications of the entrance of other Arab armies into Lebanon with the Syrians? And, additionally, could you give us some feeling as to what you feel the implications are of a possible military defeat of the PLO [Palestine Liberation Organization] in Lebanon? Would it make renewed negotiations easier or more difficult?

Secretary Kissinger: The primary American interest in Lebanon is to bring an end to the fighting and to end the suffering of the Lebanese people that has gone on too long and that has exacted an enormous and exorbitant toll of human life.

At an earlier period, we endorsed the idea of an Arab force as one means of bringing about security. In this particular case, we do not know the composition of the force, nor do we know the attitude of the Syrian Gov

ernment toward the force. And we are attempting to clarify these issues and also the role that that force is going to play before we take a final position, but we would generally support efforts that have a promise to end the fighting.

As for the exact military situation—who is winning—the United States does not look at this problem from the point of view of what helps the negotiating process. We have no clear view of what the military situation is, since we are receiving very confused reports.

Our primary objective is to put an end to the fighting, to do it in a manner that respects the sovereignty and integrity of Lebanon, enables the Moslem and Christian communities to live side by side with each other; and our attitude toward specific measures will be governed by those principles.

Q. Mr. Secretary, I have two questions to ask. The first question is: What is your opinion in reference to the junta, a military Chilean junta? Does your presence in Chile signify in any way your support for the government of Augusto Pinochet? And my second question is the following: Do you foresee that the moment will come when the United States and Russia will come to a confrontation in any one of the countries outside the United States and Russia that are having a difficult time?

Secretary Kissinger: I visited Chile together with the Foreign Ministers of every other Western Hemisphere country except Mexico to attend the General Assembly of the Organization of American States, as I have every year since I became Secretary of State. While I was in Chile, I stated the basic position of the United States with respect to human rights throughout the Western Hemisphere and called attention to the fact that the constituent documents of every one of the American republics calls attention to the protection of the individual, as you would expect in a hemisphere to which millions fled from oppression. I had an opportunity to discuss our views with respect to Chile in that statement, and I had an opportunity to discuss the matter privately also with the Chilean Government.

At the same time, as Latin Americans you will understand that it is more in conformity with the dignity of my oath to enable them to make their decisions as Chilean decisions, and we have been told that there will be a constitutional act forthcoming that takes into greater account the concern for human rights that many countries in the Western Hemisphere have expressed. And we want to wait for this constitutional act before we express any judgment.

With respect to the relationship of the United States and the Soviet Union, we are ideological opponents. We confront each other politically and ideologically in various parts of the world. At the same time, we also possess nuclear weapons, and we have the capacity to destroy humanity. And therefore we have an obligation, unprecedented in history, to conduct our competition in a way that reduces and, in time, eliminates the dangers of nuclear war. It is therefore the basic policy of our government to use every opportunity to seek to bring about a world that is based on something more stable than a balance of terror and in which we strive for conditions of peace that depend on something other than a pure equilibrium of power. No responsible American leader can do anything else. And this is a political duty, and it is a moral duty that any American leader, of whatever party, will have.

[Secretary turns to next questioner.] I know she's been waiting to destroy me for 45 minutes. [Laughter.]

Q. I have two questions to ask. I want to know why it is that you consider that the participation of Cuba or the solidarity shown by Cuba in the Angola case is intervention and why you do not consider that the participation of the United States in the Chilean case is similar intervention. Aside from that, I want to point out that you signed the peace

agreements in Paris in the Viet-Nam case and that it was for this reason that you were awarded the Nobel Prize. The agreements have not been complied with. I would like to know whether you are ready to give back the prize until the agreements are complied with.

Secretary Kissinger: I knew that the question would not be entirely friendly when I recognized you.

The Cuban action in Angola was the introduction of massive organized military units into a civil war. The U.S. position was that all outside countries, including the United States, should stay out of that civil war and that the parties in that civil war should settle their disputes. And half of the countries of the Organization of African Unity agreed with our point of view.

With respect to the situation in Chile, it will be impossible ever to catch up with the mass of misleading information that has been put out in many quarters. Basically, what the United States attempted to do was to enable the democratic parties and newspapers of Chile to survive until the 1976 elections in the face of confiscatory taxation. And that was the principal thrust of the American effort in Chile.

With respect to the Viet-Nam Peace Agreement, I think there must be limits to hypocrisy. The only clause of the peace agreement that the Vietnamese are still talking about is the clause that speaks about the principle that the United States would assist North Vietnamese economic recovery. Every other clause of that agreement has been systematically, flagrantly, totally violated by the North Vietnamese. And I have never yet seen an international situation in which one government had the colossal nerve to insist that the one provision that still exists must be observed, when it has totally violated every other provision of the agreement.

And, therefore, if North Viet-Nam wants to talk to us, we have indicated a willingness to talk, especially after they have fulfilled the requirement of the Paris accord with respect to the missing-in-action. But it is absurd to insist that the one remaining clause of the Paris accord should be observed, when all others have been flagrantly violated by the Vietnamese.

TOAST BY SECRETARY KISSINGER, MEXICO CITY, JUNE 11 [5]

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

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

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

Tonight I want to discuss two great tasks which are deep and permanent concerns of our two nations; both bear the personal mark of President Echeverría:

—The global challenge of helping to construct a new and peaceful international order

[5] Given at a dinner hosted by Secretary Kissinger in honor of President Luis Echeverría Alvarez (text from press release 301A).

offering justice and prosperity to all peoples; and

—The state of the special, indeed unique, bond between the United States and Mexico.

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

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

Global Challenges: Peace, Prosperity, Justice

History has presented this generation with two great and unique challenges: the imperative of peace in the nuclear age and the need to give purpose to peace by helping to shape a new structure of international relations that speaks to the positive aspirations of all peoples.

Every nation has a stake in, and a responsibility for, the problem of global peace. Each has its special circumstances and its special role.

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

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

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

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

This is why we attach such importance to the dialogue now taking place between the developed and developing nations. For beyond the technical solutions we may reach, the spirit we help engender can contribute to a world of peace and to a sense of community. This is why we are disturbed by attitudes of confrontation and concerned by those who seek gains through technical majorities. It is the essence of an effective in-

ternational structure today in our interdependent world that solutions cannot be imposed by one group on another but that a consensus must be established in which all share. By continuing to grow in strength and international participation, Mexico, and indeed all the nations of Latin America, can in important respects act as a bridge between the different groups that exist in the world today.

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

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

Mexico's economic growth and progress have made it a vital force in international affairs. Mexico had a major influence on the course of the seventh U.N. special session and is an active participant in all international efforts to accelerate development through a fair and cooperative global economic system. Mexico's energetic promotion of the Charter of Economic Rights and Duties of States—which you yourself inspired, Mr. President—itself symbolizes the need for a new awareness that interdependence is not a slogan, but a reality.

And since the Revolution of 1910, Mexico has presented the international community with the example of a proudly independent nation committed to progress and social justice. Today Mexico's voice is heard and heeded in the leading councils of the world.

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

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

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

contribution to the course of development around the world.

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

And we have as well an obligation to the deeper sources of our common humanity. No peoples have been more dedicated to the cause of human dignity and liberty than ours. The struggle to secure the peace or to widen prosperity ultimately will have no meaning unless the peoples of the world can pursue their aspirations without fear, in societies which foster the fundamental rights of mankind.

At the General Assembly of the Organization of American States in Santiago earlier this week, I reaffirmed the unequivocal commitment of the United States to the American Declaration of the Rights and Duties of Man. The United States endorsed the reports presented there by the Inter-American Human Rights Commission, whose powers we proposed be broadened. We did so in the recognition that the precious heritage of our Western Hemisphere is the conviction that human beings are the subjects, not the objects, of public policy; that citizens must not be the mere instruments of the state.

The traditions of our two countries and our heritage as free American republics places upon us a special trust to defend and carry forward the principle that progress is sterile unless it enhances the areas of human freedom.

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

U.S.-Mexico Independence and Interdependence

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

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

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

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

Second, we have acted and are acting with mutual respect and great responsibility on issues of substantial economic interest, such as the desire of Mexican workers to seek employment in the United States and of Mexican exporters to sell in our country's

markets. After decades of relatively satisfactory accommodation to the question of undocumented workers, we now face a number of new issues requiring mutual study and heightened cooperation—and that must take into account the legitimate concerns both of the people of the United States and the human rights of Mexican citizens.

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

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

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

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

All these are issues of immediate and direct concern to our two nations. But they are also variations on the large themes of sovereignty, economic interest, and human concern that affect nations everywhere. Our struggles and our successes in dealing effectively and creatively with our own interdependence are relevant to the rest of the increasingly interdependent world in which we live.

In a period when mankind faces international problems which are not only complex but fraught with ultimate risks, it is unrealistic as well as unwise to expect easy solutions. What we can and must seek to bring about is an atmosphere—in bilateral, regional, and global relations—in which problems are addressed positively and constructively, in which divergent views are expressed openly and freely without wounding and sterile rhetoric, and in which the objective is an effort to solve problems prag-

matically, not aggravate them ideologically.

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

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

Mr. President, friends: A short distance from my office in the Department of State in Washington is a statue of Benito Juárez on which are engraved his words, "Respect for the rights of others is peace."

But Benito Juárez also knew that the mere absence of war is not enough. The relations of states today must have an economic and a moral dimension as well. In the hearts of men and women, peace means an abiding sense of security and freedom from external intimidation; it also means the hope of widening economic opportunity; and it means conditions which foster the growth of social justice for all. These are values and causes which Mexicans and Americans hold in common and hold dear and which you, Mr. President, have done so much to promote.

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

Viva Mexico.

U.S.-MEXICO JOINT COMMUNIQUE ISSUED AT MEXICO CITY, JUNE 11

Press release 303 dated June 11

The President of the United Mexican States, Luis Echeverría, and the Secretary of State of the United States, Henry A. Kissinger, met today to discuss a broad range of issues. The spirit of the talks was warm and friendly. Both agreed that relations between Mexico and the United States are being carried out in a climate of mutual respect and good neighborship and they emphasized the need to maintain these relations at the highest level, as befits two nations which share the same human and political values, and, especially, the same faith in independence and democracy.

The President and the Secretary discussed world issues which require the most urgent effort in international cooperation on the part of all nations. They were in agreement that the gap between the rich and poor countries is a danger to peace, as ominous as an unbridled arms race. On this subject, they said that it is essential to take steps to accelerate economic development based upon justice and equity.

The Secretary explained to the President several initiatives which he had put forth at the UNCTAD IV meeting in Nairobi and at the recent General Assembly of the Organization of American States, to further the economic development of the developing countries.

President Echeverría offered the Secretary his ideas on the scope of the Charter of Economic Rights and Duties of States, which, for Third World countries, constitutes the basis for a new international economic order, and one of the essential elements for world peace.

The Secretary of State recalled that the United States had given its support, from the very beginning, to the Charter's concept, in spite of the fact that it has not been able to give it its complete approval, due to the fact that some of its provisions are not compatible with basic principles of his country's foreign policy.

The President and the Secretary also touched upon other important matters in the field of bilateral relations between both countries, including the following:

(1) The illicit traffic in drugs between the two countries. The Secretary expressed his warm appreciation for the efforts and cooperation of Mexico in the battle to eradicate this activity. They examined, with concern, not only the demand for drugs in parts of the United States, but also the

financing of production, which is provided from various major urban centers in the United States.

(2) The question of American prisoners detained in Mexican jails—the majority of whom have been apprehended in the course of the permanent campaign which Mexico is carrying out against illegal drug traffic. Mexico has proposed several possible remedies to this problem, which take into account the plight of the considerable number of Mexicans detained in United States jails. The Secretary assured the President that the United States would study these proposals with care, and offered that representatives of the United States would meet soon with the appropriate Mexican authorities for further consideration of the Mexican initiatives.

(3) Trade relations between Mexico and the United States. The Secretary agreed that the United States would give early consideration to several suggestions by Mexico to improve the trade balance between the two countries, which is adverse to Mexico.

At the end of the talks, the President requested the Secretary to transmit to the President and the people of the United States, his warm congratulations on the occasion of the two hundredth anniversary of the Declaration of Independence, and expressed his best wishes for the continued progress and well-being of the people of the United States, on the basis of the same historic ideas which inspired the Founding Fathers two hundred years ago in their struggle for independence, democracy and liberty for all peoples.

The Secretary transmitted to the President the admiration of the American people for Mexico's own proud record in its commitment for social justice, progress and the rule of law.

Finally, the Secretary expressed his personal appreciation for the spirit of hospitality shown him by the Government of Mexico and its people.

Congressional Documents Relating to Foreign Policy

94th Congress, 1st and 2d Sessions

Allocation of Resources in the Soviet Union and China—1975. Hearings before the Subcommittee on Priorities and Economy in Government of the Joint Economic Committee. Executive sessions. June 18–July 21, 1975. Part 1. 177 pp.

Americans Missing in Southeast Asia. Hearings before the House Select Committee on Missing Persons in Southeast Asia. Part 1; September 23–October 23, 1975; 125 pp. Part 2; November 5–December 17, 1975; 312 pp.

United States-Soviet Union-China: The Great Power Triangle. Hearings before the Subcommittee on Future Foreign Policy Research and Development of the House Committee on International Relations. Part I. October 21, 1975–March 10, 1976. 149 pp.

Military Sales to Saudi Arabia—1975. Hearings before the Subcommittee on International Political and Military Affairs of the House Committee on International Relations. November 4–December 17, 1975. 42 pp.

International Security Assistance Act of 1976. Hearings before the House Committee on International Relations on H.R. 11963; November 6, 1975–February 19, 1976; 973 pp. Report of the committee, together with supplemental, additional, and dissenting views; H. Rept. 94–848; February 24, 1976; 113 pp.

United States-China Relations: The Process of Normalization of Relations. Hearings before the Special Subcommittee on Investigations of the House Committee on International Relations. November 18, 1975–February 2, 1976. 230 pp.

94th Congress, 2d Session

Foreign Investment and American Jobs. Hearings before the Subcommittee on International Economic Policy of the House Committee on International Relations. Part I. January 27–February 4, 1976. 91 pp.

Oversight Hearings on U.S. Foreign Trade Policy. Hearings before the Senate Committee on Finance. January 29–February 4, 1976. 513 pp.

State Department Authorization for Fiscal Year 1977. Hearings before the Subcommittee on International Operations of the House Committee on International Relations. February 9–24, 1976. 155 pp.

Managing International Disasters: Guatemala. Hearings and markup before the Subcommittee on International Resources, Food, and Energy of the House Committee on International Relations on H.R. 12046, to provide for relief and rehabilitation assistance to the victims of the earthquakes in Guatemala, and for other purposes; February 18–March 4, 1976; 97 pp. Report of the committee to accompany H.R. 12046; H. Rept. 94–891; March 11, 1976; 6 pp.

Waiver of Countervailing Duties on Swiss Emmenthaler and Gruyere Cheese. Communication from the Assistant Secretary of the Treasury (Enforcement, Operations, and Tariff Affairs). H. Doc. 94–379. February 23, 1976. 8 pp.

A New Panama Canal Treaty: A Latin America Imperative. Report of a study mission to Panama November 21–23, 1975, submitted to the House Committee on International Relations. February 24, 1976. 60 pp.

U.S. Information Agency Authorization Act, Fiscal Year 1976. Report of the House Committee on International Relations to accompany H.R. 11598. H. Rept. 94–849. February 25, 1976. 5 pp.

To Amend Further the Peace Corps Act. Hearing before the House Committee on International Relations; February 26, 1976; 52 pp. Report of the committee to accompany H.R. 12226; H. Rept. 94–874; March 4, 1976; 8 pp.

Ambassador Scranton Comments on World Health Assembly Action

Following is a statement by William W. Scranton, U.S. Representative to the United Nations, issued on May 21.

USUN press release 58 dated May 21

From time to time U.N. agencies make decisions which are of critical importance to the entire U.N. system. The recent decisions by the World Health Assembly in Geneva show how the politicization of U.N. agencies not only denigrates the agencies but is potentially ruinous to the United Nations as a whole.

The World Health Assembly refused to consider the report of three eminent physicians on the situation in the occupied territories as it related to the health care of the inhabitants. Israel permitted an investigation by the individual physicians, but not as a committee. The WHA now has gone on to demand that the committee as a whole visit the occupied territories—in other words, the same men should go back and see the same things, but this time as a trio. Perhaps the mode by which Israel chose to cooperate with the WHA was less than perfect. The key point is that Israel chose to cooperate. It met the WHA more than halfway.

How did the WHA respond to this effort at cooperation?

It responded by placing shortrun, irrelevant considerations ahead of health concerns. It refused to consider the report of the physicians it itself had designated. It adopted instead a highly political resolution which deals mostly with Israeli behavior in matters unrelated to health in occupied territories. The United Nations has appropriate bodies, such as the Security Council, for the handling of political issues, and the situation in the West Bank area is under active consideration in the Security Council at this time.

The absence of balance, the lack of perspective, and the introduction by the WHA of political issues irrelevant to the responsibilities of the WHA do no credit to the United Nations. Indeed, this is precisely the sort of politicized action which decreases respect for the U.N. system.

How long will there be any respect whatsoever for the United Nations if such politicization becomes pervasive in areas where it clearly does not belong, particularly in the health matters, one of humanity's greatest concerns? A person's, a people's, a nation's health is more important than all the extraneous politicizing in the world.

Clearly the WHA action is a gross political interference in matters of health care. This misuse of U.N. agencies must stop if the U.N. system is not to be dangerously eroded.

TREATY INFORMATION

U.S. and U.K. Reach Understanding on Acceptance of Air Charters

Department Announcement [1]

The United States and the United Kingdom concluded on April 28 a memorandum of understanding on passenger charter air services, under which each government will, with some exceptions, accept as charterworthy transatlantic charter traffic originating in the territory of the other and organized and operated in accordance with the other's charterworthiness criteria.

The understanding was brought into force by an exchange of diplomatic notes in London. The understanding is not an exchange of economic rights, but it is expected to provide stability in the U.S.-U.K. charter market and to facilitate the operation of charter flights, including the recently authorized one-stop inclusive tour charter, between both countries by the air carriers of both countries during 1976.

[1] Issued on May 12 (text from press release 245, which includes the text of the memorandum of understanding).

U.S. and Egypt Sign Agreement on Claims of U.S. Nationals

Press release 219 dated May 3

The Governments of the United States of America and of the Arab Republic of Egypt have, on May 1, signed an agreement ad referendum providing for the payment of a lump sum of $10 million in compensation of private claims of nationals of the United States. The agreement is subject to the further approval of the two governments and will enter into force upon an exchange of notes stating each government's final approval of the agreement.

Covered by this agreement is the claim of the American Mission in Egypt (United Presbyterian Church in the U.S.A.), which is being settled to its complete satisfaction.

This agreement marks another step in the continually improving relations between the two countries and will contribute to mutually beneficial economic relations. It should in particular assist in creating an atmosphere of confidence to attract American investment and technology in Egypt.

Current Actions

MULTILATERAL

Agriculture

International plant protection convention. Done at Rome December 6, 1951. Entered into force April 3, 1952; for the United States August 18, 1972. TIAS 7465.
Ratification deposited: Cuba, April 14. 1976.[1]

Coffee

International coffee agreement 1976, with annexes. Done at London December 3, 1975.[2]
Signatures: Cameroon, Haiti, June 3. 1976; El Salvador, June 4, 1976; Tanzania, Trinidad and Tobago, June 9, 1976.

Economic Cooperation

Agreement establishing a financial support fund of the Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development. Done at Paris April 9, 1975.[2]
Ratification deposited: Federal Republic of Germany, June 8, 1976.[3]

Energy

Memorandum of understanding concerning cooperative information exchange relating to the development of solar heating and cooling systems in buildings. Formulated at Odeillo, France, October 1–4, 1974. Entered into force July 1, 1975. TIAS 8202.
Signature: Jamaica, May 19, 1976.

Postal

Constitution of the Universal Postal Union, with final protocol. Done at Vienna July 10, 1964. Entered into force January 1, 1966. TIAS 5881.
Ratifications deposited: Colombia, May 11, 1976; Liberia, September 16, 1975.
Accession deposited: Papua New Guinea, May 4, 1976.

Additional protocol to the constitution of the Universal Postal Union with final protocol signed at Vienna July 10, 1964 (TIAS 5881). Signed at Tokyo November 14, 1969. Entered into force July 1, 1971, except for article V, which entered into force January 1, 1971. TIAS 7150.
Accession deposited: Papua New Guinea, May 4, 1976.

Second additional protocol to the constitution of the Universal Postal Union of July 10, 1964 (TIAS 5881, 7150), general regulations with final protocol and annex, and the universal postal convention with final protocol and detailed regulations. Done at Lausanne July 5, 1974. Entered into force January 1, 1976.
Accession deposited: Papua New Guinea (with reservations), May 4, 1976.
Ratifications deposited: Jordan, May 10, 1976; Swaziland, May 7, 1976.

Space

Convention on international liability for damage caused by space objects. Done at Washington, London, and Moscow March 29, 1972. Entered into force September 1, 1972; for the United States October 9, 1973. TIAS 7762.
Accession deposited: Sweden, June 15, 1976.[4]

Convention on registration of objects launched into outer space. Opened for signature at New York January 14, 1975.[2]
Signature: Sweden, June 9, 1976.
Ratification deposited: Sweden, June 9, 1976.

Tin

Fifth international tin agreement, with annexes. Done at Geneva June 21, 1975.[2]
Ratification deposited: Hungary, June 8. 1976.

---

[1] With reservation and declaration.
[2] Not in force.
[3] Applicable to Land Berlin.
[4] With declaration.

rade

rrangement regarding international trade in textiles, with annexes. Done at Geneva December 20, 1973. Entered into force January 1, 1974, except for article 2, paragraphs 2, 3, and 4, which entered into force April 1, 1974. TIAS 7840.

Acceptances deposited: Paraguay (ad referendum), May 17, 1976; Uruguay, May 11, 1976.

Ratification deposited: Guatemala, May 19, 1976.

Whaling

nternational whaling convention and schedule of whaling regulations. Done at Washington December 2, 1946. Entered into force November 10, 1948. TIAS 1849.

Notification of adherence: New Zealand, June 15, 1976.

rotocol to the international whaling convention of December 2, 1946 (TIAS 1849). Done at Washington November 19, 1956. Entered into force May 4, 1959. TIAS 4228.

Notification of adherence: New Zealand, June 15, 1976.

Wheat

rotocol modifying and further extending the wheat trade convention (part of the international wheat agreement) 1971 (TIAS 7144). 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. TIAS 8227.

Ratification deposited: Austria, June 15, 1976.

rotocol modifying and further extending the wheat trade convention (part of the international wheat agreement) 1971 (TIAS 7144, 8227). Done at Washington March 17, 1976. Entered into force June 19, 1976, with respect to certain provisions, and July 1, 1976, with respect to other provisions.

Ratifications deposited: Australia, June 11, 1976; Canada, Republic of Korea, June 16, 1976; Pakistan, June 17, 1976; Ecuador, June 18, 1976.

Accession deposited: Denmark, June 17, 1976.[5]

Declarations of provisional application deposited: Finland, June 11, 1976; Switzerland, June 15, 1976; Greece, Kenya, June 16, 1976; Belgium,[5] European Economic Community,[5] France,[5] Federal Republic of Germany,[5] Ireland,[5] Italy,[5] Luxembourg,[5] Netherlands,[5 6] Tunisia, United Kingdom,[5 7] United States,[4] June 17, 1976; Egypt, Japan,[5] Norway, June 18, 1976.

rotocol modifying and further extending the food aid convention (part of the international wheat agreement) 1971 (TIAS 7144, 8227). Done at Washington March 17, 1976. Entered into force June 19, 1976, with respect to certain provisions, and July 1, 1976, with respect to other provisions.

Ratifications deposited: Australia, June 11, 1976; Canada, June 16, 1976.

Declarations of provisional application deposited: Finland, June 11, 1976; Switzerland, June 15, 1976; Belgium, European Economic Community, France, Federal Republic of Germany, Ireland, Italy, Luxembourg, Netherlands,[6] United Kingdom, United States,[4] June 17, 1976; Japan,[5] June 18, 1976.

Accession deposited: Denmark, June 17, 1976.

BILATERAL

Bangladesh

Loan agreement relating to installation of a 50-megawatt hydrogenerating unit at Karnaphuli Power Station, Kaptai, with annex. Signed at Dacca May 28, 1976. Entered into force May 28, 1976.

Project agreement relating to support for the Population Control Program of Bangladesh, with annexes. Signed at Dacca May 31, 1976. Entered into force May 31, 1976.

Belgium

Procedures for mutual assistance in the administration of justice in connection with the Lockheed Aircraft Corporation matter. Signed at Washington May 21, 1976. Entered into force May 21, 1976.

Canada

Agreement relating to the construction, operation, and maintenance of a Loran-C station in the vicinity of Williams Lake, British Columbia, with annex. Effected by exchange of notes at Ottawa May 28 and June 3, 1976. Entered into force June 3, 1976.

Greece

Procedures for mutual assistance in the administration of justice in connection with the Lockheed Aircraft Corporation matter. Signed at Washington May 20, 1976. Entered into force May 20, 1976.

Indonesia

Agreement amending the agreement for sales of agricultural commodities of April 19, 1976. Effected by exchange of notes at Jakarta May 26 and 28, 1976. Entered into force May 28, 1976.

Ireland

Agreement relating to air passenger charter services. Effected by exchange of notes at Dublin May 11 and 28, 1976. Entered into force May 28, 1976.

---

[4] With declaration.

[5] With statement.

[6] For the Kingdom in Europe.

[7] Applicable to Dominica, Saint Christopher, Nevis and Anguilla, Saint Vincent, Belize, Bermuda, British Virgin Islands, Hong Kong, Montserrat, Saint Helena and Dependencies, Seychelles, and Tuvalu.

Panama

Agreement amending the loan agreement of May 6, 1969, as amended, relating to the Panama City water supply system. Signed at Panama June 2, 1976. Entered into force June 2, 1976.

Syria

Agreement amending the agreement for sales of agricultural commodities of April 20, 1976. Effected by exchange of notes at Damascus June 2 and 3, 1976. Entered into force June 3, 1976.

Tanzania

Agreement relating to the transfer of food grain to Tanzania to assist in alleviating the shortage caused by prolonged drought. Signed at Dar es Salaam April 13, 1976. Entered into force April 13, 1976.

Tunisia

Agreement for sales of agricultural commodities. Signed at Tunis June 7, 1976. Entered into force June 7, 1976.

PUBLICATIONS

Department Releases General Index for 1776-1949 Treaty Compilation

Press release 167 dated April 9

The Department of State released on April 9 the "General Index" to its series "Treaties and Other International Agreements of the United States of America 1776–1949," compiled under the direction of Charles I. Bevans, formerly Assistant Legal Adviser for Treaty Affairs.

The 119-page index is volume 13 of the series. The first four volumes in the Bevans series, released in 1969 and 1970, contain the texts of multilateral treaties and other international agreements entered into by the United States from 1776 to 1950. Volumes 5 through 12, released 1971 to 1974, contain bilateral agreements for that period, grouped alphabetically by country. Agreements concluded since 1949 are not included, because they are available in the annual statutory volumes "United States Treaties and Other International Agreements."

Copies of volumes 1 through 13 of the Bevans series are for sale by the Superintendent of Documents, U.S. Government Printing Office, Washington, D.C. 20402. Price (domestic postpaid): vol. 1, $8.50; vol. 2, $10.25; vol. 3, $11.75; vol. 4, $8.25; vol. 5, $9.75; vol. 6, $11.00; vol. 7, $11.00; vol. 8, $11.00; vol. 9, $11.00; vol. 10, $11.00; vol. 11, $14.35; vol. 12, $15.15; vol. 13, $4.60. Volume 13 is Department of State publication 8830 (Stock No. 044–0000–1326–6).

GPO Sales Publications

Publications may be ordered by catalog or stock number from the Superintendent of Documents, U.S. Government Printing Office, Washington, D.C. 20402. A 25-percent discount is made on orders for 100 or more copies of any one publication mailed to the same address. Remittances, payable to the Superintendent of Documents, must accompany orders. Prices shown below, which include domestic postage, are subject to change.

Background Notes: Short, factual summaries which describe the people, history, government, economy, and foreign relations of each country. Each contains a map, a list of principal government officials and U.S. diplomatic and consular officers, and a reading list. (A complete set of all Background Notes currently in stock—at least 140—$21.80; 1-year subscription service for approximately 77 updated or new Notes—$23.10; plastic binder—$1.50.) Single copies of those listed below are available at 35¢ each.

Bahamas	Cat. No.	S1.123:B14
	Pub. 8329	4 pp.
Netherlands	Cat. No.	S1.123:N3
	Pub. 7960	7 pp.
Norway	Cat. No.	S1.123:N8
	Pub. 8228	4 pp.
Upper Volta	Cat. No.	S1.123:UP6
	Pub. 8201	4 pp.
Zambia	Cat. No.	S1.123:Z
	Pub. 7841	6 pp.

World Military Expenditures and Arms Transfer 1965-1974. This report, the eighth in a series, pro vides worldwide statistical information on nationa military spending and armed forces, internationa transfers of arms, and other comparative data. Pub 84. U.S. Arms Control and Disarmament Agency 76 pp. $1.80. (Stock No. 002–000–00054–7).

Fisheries. Agreement with the Union of Soviet So cialist Republics extending the agreements of Febru ary 21, 1973, as extended. TIAS 8150. 5 pp. 50¢ (Cat. No. S9.10:8150).

Frequency Modulation Broadcasting. Agreement wit Mexico amending the agreement of November 9 1972. TIAS 8152. 5 pp. 50¢. (Cat. No. S9.10:8152).

Air Transport Services. Agreement with Malaysi amending the agreement of February 2, 1970. TIA 8157. 5 pp. 35¢. (Cat. No. S9.10:8157).

Trade Relations. Agreement with the Socialist Re public of Romania. TIAS 8159. 43 pp. 75¢. (Cat. No S9.10:8159).

Name Index

Checklist of Department of State Press Releases: June 14–20

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

No.	Date	Subject
†305	6/16	Kissinger: statement on murder of Ambassador to Lebanon Francis E. Meloy, Jr., Robert O. Waring, and Zohair Moghrabi.
†306	6/17	Kissinger: House Committee on International Relations.
*307	6/17	Robert V. Keeley sworn in as Ambassador to Mauritius (biographic data).
*308	6/18	John H. Reed sworn in as Ambassador to Sri Lanka (biographic data).
*309	6/18	William D. Rogers sworn in as Under Secretary for Economic Affairs (biographic data).
†310	6/19	Kissinger: remarks at services for Ambassador Meloy and Robert O. Waring, Andrews AFB.
†312	6/20	Kissinger: arrival, Paris.
†312A	6/20	Kissinger: departure, Andrews AFB.

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