

FOREIGN
RELATIONS
OF THE
UNITED
STATES

1969–1976

VOLUME
XXXVIII

Part 1

FOUNDATIONS
OF
FOREIGN
POLICY,
1973–1976



DEPARTMENT
OF
STATE

Washington



Foreign Relations of the United States, 1969–1976

Volume XXXVIII

Part 1

Foundations of Foreign Policy, 1973–1976

<i>Editors</i>	Kristin L. Ahlberg Alexander Wieland
<i>General Editor</i>	Edward C. Keefer

DEPARTMENT OF STATE
OFFICE OF THE HISTORIAN
BUREAU OF PUBLIC AFFAIRS

For sale by the Superintendent of Documents, U.S. Government Printing Office
Internet: bookstore.gpo.gov Phone: toll free (866) 512-1800; DC area (202) 512-1800
Fax: (202) 512-2250 Mail: Stop IDCC, Washington, DC 20402-0001

Preface

The *Foreign Relations of the United States* series presents the official documentary historical record of major foreign policy decisions and significant diplomatic activity of the United States Government. The Historian of the Department of State is charged with the responsibility for the preparation of the *Foreign Relations* series. The staff of the Office of the Historian, Bureau of Public Affairs, under the direction of the General Editor of the *Foreign Relations* series, plans, researches, compiles, and edits the volumes in the series. Secretary of State Frank B. Kellogg first promulgated official regulations codifying specific standards for the selection and editing of documents for the series on March 26, 1925. These regulations, with minor modifications, guided the series through 1991.

Public Law 102-138, the Foreign Relations Authorization Act, which was signed by President George H.W. Bush on October 28, 1991, established a new statutory charter for the preparation of the series. Section 198 of P.L. 102-138 added a new Title IV to the Department of State's Basic Authorities Act of 1956 (22 U.S.C. 4351, et seq.).

This statute requires that the *Foreign Relations* series be a thorough, accurate, and reliable record of major United States foreign policy decisions and significant United States diplomatic activity. The volumes of the series should include all records needed to provide comprehensive documentation of major foreign policy decisions and actions of the United States Government. The statute also confirms the editing principles established by Secretary Kellogg: the *Foreign Relations* series is guided by the principles of historical objectivity and accuracy; records should not be altered or deletions made without indicating in the published text that a deletion has been made; the published record should omit no facts that were of major importance in reaching a decision; and nothing should be omitted for the purposes of concealing a defect in policy. The statute also requires that the *Foreign Relations* series be published not more than 30 years after the events recorded.

Structure and Scope of the Foreign Relations Series

This volume is part of a subseries of volumes of the *Foreign Relations* series that documents the most important issues in the foreign policy of Presidents Richard M. Nixon and Gerald R. Ford. This specific volume documents the foundations of U.S. foreign policy, 1973-1976. Documentation on Nixon's first administration can be found in volume I, *Foundations of Foreign Policy, 1969-1972*.

*Focus of Research and Principles of Selection for Foreign Relations,
1969–1976, Volume XXXVIII, Part 1*

The purpose of this volume is to document the intellectual foundations of the foreign policy of the second Nixon and Ford administrations. The documentation explores the collective mindset of Nixon and Ford administration officials on foreign policy issues rather than documenting significant foreign policy decisions or diplomatic exchanges. The compilation takes as its canvas the entire record of the second Nixon and Ford administrations. Therefore, the documents selected are necessarily a sampling chosen to illustrate policy perspectives and themes, rather than a thorough record of a bilateral relationship or of a major issue. This volume draws upon the published record of speeches, press releases, press conferences and briefings, interviews, and testimony before Congressional committees to document policy positions and the assumptions of administration officials on the foreign policy process. The editors of the volume sought to present a representative selection of documents chosen to elucidate the primary intellectual themes that ran through and influenced both Nixon and Ford's foreign policy: a continued belief in interdependence and cooperation in relation to energy and economic issues, an emphasis upon *détente*, and the primacy of the executive branch in the formulation and conduct of foreign policy. The documentation chronicles the perspectives of not only Nixon and Ford but also Secretaries of State Rogers and Kissinger, Secretaries of Defense Laird and Schlesinger, and others.

Editorial Methodology

The documents are presented chronologically according to Washington time. Memoranda of conversations are placed according to the date and time of the conversation, rather than the date a memorandum was drafted. Documents chosen for printing are authoritative or signed copies, unless otherwise noted.

Editorial treatment of the documents published in the *Foreign Relations* series follows Office style guidelines, supplemented by guidance from the General Editor and the Chief of the Declassification and Publishing Division. The documents are reproduced as exactly as possible, including marginalia or other notations, which are described in the footnotes. Texts are transcribed and printed according to accepted conventions for the publication of historical documents within the limitations of modern typography. A heading has been supplied by the editors for each document included in the volume. Spelling, capitalization, and punctuation are retained as found in the original text, except that obvious typographical errors are silently corrected. Other mistakes and omissions in the documents are corrected by bracketed insertions: a correction is set in italic type; an addition in roman type. Words or phrases underlined in the source text are printed in italics. Abbreviations and contractions are preserved as found in the or-

iginal text, and a list of abbreviations is included in the front matter of each volume. In telegrams, the telegram number (including special designators such as Secto) is printed at the start of the text of the telegram.

Bracketed insertions are also used to indicate omitted text that deals with an unrelated subject (in roman type) or that remains classified after declassification review (in italic type). The amount and, where possible, the nature of the material not declassified has been noted by indicating the number of lines or pages of text that were omitted. Entire documents withheld for declassification purposes have been accounted for and are listed with headings, source notes, and number of pages not declassified in their chronological place. All brackets that appear in the original text are so identified in footnotes. All ellipses are in the original documents.

The first footnote to each document indicates the document's source, original classification, distribution, and drafting information. This note also provides the background of important documents and policies and indicates whether the President or his major policy advisers read the document.

Editorial notes and additional annotation summarize pertinent material not printed in the volume, indicate the location of additional documentary sources, provide references to important related documents printed in other volumes, describe key events, and provide summaries of and citations to public statements that supplement and elucidate the printed documents. Information derived from memoirs and other first-hand accounts has been used where appropriate to supplement or explicate the official record.

The numbers in the index refer to document numbers rather than to page numbers.

Advisory Committee on Historical Diplomatic Documentation

The Advisory Committee on Historical Diplomatic Documentation, established under the *Foreign Relations* statute, reviews records, advises, and makes recommendations concerning the *Foreign Relations* series. The Advisory Committee monitors the overall compilation and editorial process of the series and advises on all aspects of the preparation and declassification of the series. The Advisory Committee does not necessarily review the contents of individual volumes in the series, but it makes recommendations on issues that come to its attention and reviews volumes as it deems necessary to fulfill its advisory and statutory obligations.

Presidential Recordings and Materials Preservation Act Review

Under the terms of the Presidential Recordings and Materials Preservation Act (PRMPA) of 1974 (44 U.S.C. 2111 note), the Nixon Presidential Library in Yorba Linda, California, has custody of the Nixon Presidential historical materials. The requirements of the PRMPA and

implementing regulations govern access to the Nixon Presidential historical materials. The PRMPA and implementing public access regulations require the Nixon Library to review for additional restrictions in order to ensure the protection of the privacy rights of former Nixon White House officials, since these officials were not given the opportunity to separate their personal materials from public papers. Thus, the PRMPA and implementing public access regulations require the Nixon Library formally to notify the Nixon Estate and former Nixon White House staff members that the agency is scheduling for public release Nixon White House historical materials. The Nixon Estate and former White House staff members have 30 days to contest the release of Nixon historical materials in which they were a participant or are mentioned. Further, the PRMPA and implementing regulations require the Nixon Library to segregate and return to the creator of files private and personal materials. All *Foreign Relations* volumes that include materials from the Nixon Library are processed and released in accordance with the PRMPA.

Nixon White House Tapes

Access to the Nixon White House tape recordings is governed by terms of the PRMPA and an access agreement with the Office of Presidential Libraries of the National Archives and Records Administration and the Nixon Estate. In February 1971, President Nixon initiated a voice activated taping system in the Oval Office of the White House and, subsequently, in the President's Office in the Executive Office Building, Camp David, the Cabinet Room, and White House and Camp David telephones. The audiotapes include conversations of President Nixon with his Assistant for National Security Affairs, Henry Kissinger, other White House aides, Secretary of State Rogers, other Cabinet officers, members of Congress, and key foreign officials. Readers are advised that the tape recording is the official document; the transcript represents an interpretation of that document. The clarity of the voices on the tape recordings is often very poor, but the editor has made every effort to verify the accuracy of the transcripts included in this volume. Through the use of digital audio and other advances in technology, the Office of the Historian has been able to enhance the tape recordings and over time produce more accurate transcripts. The result is that some transcripts printed here may differ from transcripts of the same conversations printed in previous *Foreign Relations* volumes. The most accurate transcripts possible, however, cannot substitute for listening to the recordings. Readers are urged to consult the recordings themselves for a full appreciation of those aspects of the conversations that cannot be captured in a transcript, such as the speakers' inflections and emphases that may convey nuances of meaning, as well as the larger context of the discussion.

Declassification Review

The Office of Information Programs and Services, Bureau of Administration, conducted the declassification review for the Department

of State of the documents published in this volume. The review was conducted in accordance with the standards set forth in Executive Order 12958, as amended, on Classified National Security Information and other applicable laws.

The principle guiding declassification review is to release all information, subject only to the current requirements of national security, as embodied in law and regulation. Declassification decisions entailed concurrence of the appropriate geographic and functional bureaus in the Department of State, other concerned agencies of the U.S. Government, and the appropriate foreign governments regarding specific documents of those governments. The declassification review of this volume, which began in 2008 and was completed in 2012, resulted in the decision to make an excision of a paragraph or more in one document and minor excisions of less than one paragraph in four documents.

The Office of the Historian is confident, on the basis of the research conducted in preparing this volume and as a result of the declassification review process described above, that the record presented here provides an accurate and comprehensive account of the foundations of U.S. foreign policy between 1973 and 1976.

Acknowledgements

The editors wish to acknowledge the assistance of officials and staff at the Gerald R. Ford Presidential Library at Ann Arbor, Michigan, the Nixon Presidential Materials Project of the National Archives and Records Administration (Archives II), at College Park, Maryland. The editors also wish to acknowledge the Richard Nixon Estate for allowing access to the Nixon Presidential recordings and the Richard Nixon Library & Birthplace for facilitating that access.

Kristin L. Ahlberg and Alexander Wieland collected the documentation for this volume and selected and edited it under the supervision of M. Todd Bennett, chief of the Europe and General Division, and Edward C. Keefer, General Editor of the *Foreign Relations* series. Kristin L. Ahlberg compiled the chapters for 1973, 1974, and 1975; Alexander Wieland compiled the chapter for 1976. Chris Tudda coordinated the declassification review under the direction of Susan C. Weetman, Chief of the Declassification and Publishing Division. Aaron W. Marrs performed the copy and technical editing. Breffni Whelan prepared the index.

Bureau of Public Affairs
August 2012

Dr. Stephen Randolph
The Historian

Contents

Preface	III
Sources	XI
Abbreviations and Terms	XV
Persons	XIX
Foundations of Foreign Policy, 1973–1976	1
Index	483

Sources

Sources for the Foreign Relations Series

The Foreign Relations statute requires that the published record in the *Foreign Relations* series include all records needed to provide comprehensive documentation on major U.S. foreign policy decisions and significant U.S. diplomatic activity. It further requires that government agencies, departments, and other entities of the U.S. Government engaged in foreign policy formulation, execution, or support cooperate with the Department of State Historian by providing full and complete access to records pertinent to foreign policy decisions and actions and by providing copies of selected records. Many of the sources consulted in the preparation of this volume have been declassified and are available for review at the National Archives and Records Administration.

The editors of the *Foreign Relations* series have complete access to all the retired records and papers of the Department of State: the central files of the Department; the special decentralized files ("lot files") of the Department at the bureau, office, and division levels; the files of the Department's Executive Secretariat, which contain the records of international conferences and high-level official visits, correspondence with foreign leaders by the President and Secretary of State, and memoranda of conversations between the President and Secretary of State and foreign officials; and the files of overseas diplomatic posts. The Department's indexed central files through December 1975 have been permanently transferred to the National Archives and Records Administration at College Park, Maryland (Archives II). Many of the Department's decentralized office files covering the 1969–1976 period, which the National Archives deems worthy of permanent retention, have been transferred, or are in the process of being transferred, from the Department's custody to Archives II.

The editors of the *Foreign Relations* series also have full access to the papers of Presidents Nixon and Ford and other White House foreign policy records. Presidential papers maintained and preserved at the Presidential libraries and formerly at the Nixon Presidential Materials Project at Archives II include some of the most significant foreign affairs-related documentation from the Department of State and other Federal agencies including the National Security Council, the Central Intelligence Agency, the Department of Defense, and the Joint Chiefs of Staff. Dr. Henry Kissinger has approved access to his papers at the Library of Congress. These papers are an important source for the Nixon-Ford subseries of *Foreign Relations*.

Research for this volume was completed through special access to restricted documents at the Nixon Presidential Materials Project, the Ford Library, the Library of Congress, and other agencies. While all the material printed in this volume has been declassified, some of it is extracted from still-classified documents. Nixon's papers were transferred to their permanent home at the Nixon Presidential Library and Museum in Yorba Linda, California, after research for this volume was completed. The Nixon Library staff and Ford Library staff are processing and declassifying many of the documents used in the volume, but they may not be available in their entirety at the time of publication.

Sources for Foreign Relations, 1969–1976, Volume XXXVIII, Part I

Much of the documentation included in this volume on the intellectual foundations of U.S. foreign policy was drawn from public sources. Speeches and policy statements were garnered from a number of these sources, the most important of which were the *Public Papers of the Presidents of the United States* and the *Department of State Bulletin*. A very useful source of information on the intellectual assumptions underlying foreign policy proved to be the background briefings that Kissinger periodically provided to the press. These briefings were not classified, but they were not made public in order to protect the identities of those giving the briefings. The background briefings are located in the Library of Congress, Manuscript Division, Kissinger Papers, Subject File, Boxes CL 425–426.

Among the classified sources consulted, the most useful were found in the Presidential papers and other White House records maintained by the Nixon Presidential Materials Project and the Ford Library. The Nixon-era National Security Council Files—specifically the Presidential/HAK MemCons, Kissinger Office Files, and Subject Files—proved particularly helpful in illuminating the President and Kissinger's world view. Similarly, the Ford-era National Security Adviser Files, notably the Memoranda of Conversations file, provide key documentation of the President's meetings with his Cabinet, senior foreign policy officials, and world leaders.

Of the files of the Department of State, the most useful for the purposes of this compilation were the Policy Planning Staff (S/P) Director's Files. Winston Lord's records contain copies of Kissinger's speeches, memoranda of conversation with members of Congress, and background materials.

In addition to the paper files cited below, a growing number of documents are available on the Internet. The Office of the Historian maintains a list of these Internet resources on its website and encourages readers to consult that site on a regular basis.

Unpublished Sources

Department of State

Central Files. *See* National Archives and Records Administration *below*.

Lot Files

Files of Lawrence S. Eagleburger: Lot 84D204

National Archives and Records Administration, College Park, Maryland

Record Group 59, General Records of the Department of State

Central Foreign Policy Files, 1973–1976

Part of the online Access to Archival Databases; Electronic Telegrams, P-Reel Index, P-Reel microfilm

Lot Files

Records of Joseph Sisco, 1951–76, Lots 74D131 and 76D251, Entry 5405

Policy Planning Council (S/PC), Policy Planning Staff (S/P), Director's Files (Winston Lord) 1969–77, Lot 77D112, Entry 5027

Records of Deputy Secretary of State Charles W. Robinson, 1976–1977, Lot 77D117, Entry 5176

Records of the Office of the Counselor Helmut Sonnenfeldt, Lot 81D286, Entry 5339

Records of Henry A. Kissinger, 1973–77, Lot 91D414, Entry 5403

Nixon Presidential Materials Project, National Archives and Records Administration, College Park, Maryland (now at the Nixon Presidential Library and Museum, Yorba Linda, California)

National Security Council Files

Country Files

Kissinger Office Files

Country Files

HAK Administrative and Staff Files

HAK Trip Files

Presidential/HAK MemCons

Subject Files

National Security Council Institutional Files (H-Files)

NSC Meeting Minutes

White House Central Files

Daily Diary

White House Special Files

President's Office Files

President's Personal Files

White House Tapes

Gerald R. Ford Library, Ann Arbor, Michigan

Cabinet Meetings

National Security Adviser

Kissinger Reports on USSR, China, and Middle East Discussions

Kissinger/Scowcroft West Wing Office Files
Memoranda of Conversations
National Security Study Memoranda and Decision Memoranda
Presidential Files of NSC Logged Documents
Presidential Name File
Presidential Subject Files
Presidential Transition File, 1974

Staff Secretary's Office

Daily Diary
Presidential Handwriting File

National Security Council
Institutional Files

Library of Congress, Washington, DC

Henry Kissinger Papers

Published Sources

- Congress and the Nation*. Volume IV, 1973–1976. Washington: Congressional Quarterly, 1977.
- Congress and the Nation*. Volume V, 1977–1980. Washington: Congressional Quarterly, 1981.
- Kissinger, Henry A. *Years of Upheaval*. Boston: Little, Brown, 1982.
- . *Years of Renewal*. New York: Simon and Schuster, 1999.
- Nixon, Richard M. RN: *The Memoirs of Richard Nixon*. New York: Grosset & Dunlap, 1978.
- United States. Congress. House. Committee on House Administration. *The Presidential Campaign, 1976*. Volume 1, Part 1, *Jimmy Carter*. Washington: Government Printing Office, 1978.
- . Department of State. *Bulletin*, 1973–1977.
- . National Archives and Records Administration. *Public Papers of the Presidents of the United States: Richard M. Nixon, 1973, 1974*. Washington: Government Printing Office, 1975.
- . *Public Papers of the Presidents of the United States: Gerald R. Ford, 1974, 1975, 1976–1977*. Washington: Government Printing Office, 1975, 1977, 1979.

Abbreviations and Terms

ABM, anti-ballistic missile

ACDA, Arms Control and Disarmament Agency

AEC, Atomic Energy Commission

AF, Air Force; also Bureau of African Affairs, Department of State

AHEPA, American Hellenic Educational Progressive Association

AID, Agency for International Development

Amb, Ambassador

AP, Associated Press

ARA, Bureau of Inter-American Affairs, Department of State

ASEAN, Association of Southeast Asian Nations

ASTP, Apollo-Soyuz Test Project

B-1, strategic bomber

B-52, all-weather, intercontinental, strategic heavy bomber powered by eight turbojet engines

C, Office of the Counselor of the Department of State; also confidential

CBS, Columbia Broadcasting System

CDU, *Christliche-Demokratische Union* (Christian Democratic Union), West German political party

CEA, Council of Economic Advisers

CECLA, *Comisión Especial de Coordinación Latino Americano* (Special Commission for Latin American Coordination)

CENTO, Central Treaty Organization

CIA, Central Intelligence Agency

CIEC, Conference on International Economic Cooperation

CL, classified

CNO, Chief of Naval Operations

CPI, Consumer Price Index

CPSU, Communist Party of the Soviet Union

CSCE, Conference on Security and Cooperation in Europe

CU, Bureau of Educational and Cultural Affairs, Department of State

CY, calendar year

D, Democrat; also Office of the Deputy Secretary of State

DAR, Daughters of the American Revolution

DCA, defense cooperation agreement

DCI, Director of Central Intelligence

DEFCON, defense readiness condition

Dept, Department of State

DG, Director General of the Foreign Service, Department of State

DOD, Department of Defense

DRV, Democratic Republic of Vietnam (North Vietnam)

E, Office of the Under Secretary of State for Economic Affairs

EA, Bureau of East Asian and Pacific Affairs, Department of State

EB, Bureau of Economic and Business Affairs, Department of State

XVI Abbreviations and Terms

EC, European Community
EEC, European Economic Community
E.O., Executive Order
ER, Executive Registry
EUR, Bureau of European Affairs, Department of State
EUR/PP, Policy Planning Staff, Bureau of European Affairs, Department of State
EX, executive
Exdis, exclusive distribution
EXIM, Export-Import Bank

FAM, *Foreign Affairs Manual*
FARK, *Forces Armées Royales Khmeres* (Royal Khmer Armed Forces)
FG, federal government
FMS, foreign military sales
FNLA, *Frente Nacional de Libertação de Angola* (National Front for the Liberation of Angola)
FRG, Federal Republic of Germany (West Germany)
FS, Foreign Service
FY, fiscal year
FYI, for your information

GA, United Nations General Assembly
GATT, General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade
GI, government issue
GNP, gross national product
GRC, Government of the Republic of China
GRF, Gerald R. Ford
GSP, Generalized System of Preferences
GVN, Government of Vietnam

H, Bureau of Congressional Relations, Department of State
HAK, Henry A. Kissinger
HR, House Resolution

I, Independent
IBRD, International Bank for Reconstruction and Development (World Bank)
IC, Intelligence Community
ICA, International Communication Agency
ICBM, inter-continental ballistic missile
IDB, Inter-American Development Bank
IEA, International Energy Agency
IFAD, International Fund for Agricultural Development
IFI, international financial institution
IG, Interdepartmental Group; also Inspector General
IMF, International Monetary Fund
IO, Bureau of International Organization Affairs, Department of State
IRB, International Resources Bank
IRS, Internal Revenue Service
ISA, Office of International Security Affairs, Department of Defense

JCS, Joint Chiefs of Staff
JFK, John Fitzgerald Kennedy

K, Kissinger

KT, kiloton

L, Office of the Legal Adviser, Department of State

LDC, less developed country

LSE, Lawrence S. Eagleburger

MASF, military assistance support funded

MBFR, Mutual and Balanced Force Reduction

MemCon, memorandum of conversation

MFN, most favored nation

MiG, Soviet fighter aircraft

MIRV, Multiple Independently-targeted Reentry Vehicle

MPLA, *Movimento Popular de Libertação de Angola* (Popular Movement for the Liberation of Angola)

MTN, multilateral trade negotiations

NAC, North Atlantic Council

NATO, North Atlantic Treaty Organization

NBC, National Broadcasting Company

NID, National Intelligence Daily

Nodis, no distribution (other than to persons indicated)

NSC, National Security Council

NSDM, National Security Decision Memorandum

NSSM, National Security Study Memorandum

OAS, Organization of American States

OASGA, Organization of American States General Assembly

OAU, Organization of African Unity

OECD, Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development

OMB, Office of Management and Budget

OPEC, Organization of Petroleum Exporting Countries

P, Office of the Under Secretary of State for Political Affairs

PA, Bureau of Public Affairs, Department of State

PDB, President's Daily Brief

PFIAB, President's Foreign Intelligence Advisory Board

PL, Public Law

PL-480, Food for Peace Program

PLO, Palestine Liberation Organization

PM, Bureau of Politico-Military Affairs, Department of State

PNE, peaceful nuclear explosion

POW, prisoner of war

PRC, People's Republic of China

R, Republican

Res, resolution

RG, Record Group

RL, Radio Liberty

RNC, Republican National Committee

ROC, Republic of China

S, Office of the Secretary of State; also U.S. Senate, secret

S/P, Policy Planning Staff, Department of State

XVIII Abbreviations and Terms

S/PC, Planning and Coordination Staff, Department of State
S/PRS, Office of Press Relations, Department of State
S/S, Executive Secretariat, Department of State
S/S-O, Deputy Duty Officer, Executive Secretariat, Department of State
SA, supporting assistance; also security assistance
SAC, Strategic Air Command
SALT, Strategic Arms Limitation Talks
SAM, surface-to-air missile
SEATO, Southeast Asia Treaty Organization
SELA, *Systema Economico Latinoamericano* (Latin American Economic System)
Sen., Senator
SIOP, single integrated operational plan
SPD, *Sozialdemokratische Partei Deutschlands* (Social Democratic Party), West German political party
STR, Office of the Special Trade Representative
SVN, South Vietnam

T, Office of the Under Secretary of State for Arms Control and International Security
TASS, *Telegrafnoye Agentstvo Sovyetskovo Soyuzu* (Telegraphic Agency of the Soviet Union), Soviet news agency
Tohak, series indicator for telegrams sent to Kissinger when away from Washington
TS, top secret
TTB, technology test bed; also threshold test ban
TV, television

UK, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland
UN, United Nations
UNCTAD, United Nations Conference on Trade and Development
UNDOF, United Nations Disengagement Observer Force
UNGA, United Nations General Assembly
UNITA, *União Nacional para a Independência Total de Angola* (National Union for the Total Independence of Angola)
UNSC, United Nations Security Council
UPI, United Press International
US, United States
USA, United States of America; also United States Army
USAF, United States Air Force
USC, Under Secretaries Committee
USLO, United States Liaison Office
USMC, United States Marine Corps
USN, United States Navy
USS, United States Ship
USSR, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics
USUN, United States Mission to the United Nations

WH, White House
WIN, Whip Inflation Now
WSAG, Washington Special Actions Group
WWII, World War II

Persons

- Abrams, Creighton W., Jr.**, General, USA; Army Chief of Staff until September 1974
- Acheson, Dean**, Secretary of State from January 21, 1949, until January 20, 1953
- Adenauer, Konrad**, Chancellor of the Federal Republic of Germany from 1949 until 1963; head of the CDU until 1966
- Agnew, Spiro T.**, Vice President of the United States until October 10, 1973
- Ahern, Paul L.**, staff member, Office of Management Operations, Department of State
- Aherne, Richard W.**, Executive Assistant to the Secretary of State, 1976
- Aiken, George D.**, Senator (R-Vermont) until January 3, 1975
- Akalovsky, Alexander**, staff member, Bureau of Politico-Military Affairs, Department of State
- Albert, Carl B.**, member, U.S. House of Representatives (D-Oklahoma); Speaker of the House until January 1977
- Aleksandrov-Agentov, Andrei M.**, Assistant to Soviet General Secretary Brezhnev
- Allende Gossens, Salvador**, Chilean President until September 11, 1973
- Andersen, Knud Borge**, Danish Foreign Minister
- Anderson, George W., Jr.**, Admiral, USN (ret.); Chairman of the President's Foreign Intelligence Advisory Board until 1976
- Anderson, Jack**, syndicated newspaper columnist, author of "Washington Merry-Go-Round"
- Anderson, John B.**, member, U.S. House of Representatives (R-Illinois)
- Arafat, Yasser**, Chairman, Central Committee of the Palestine Liberation Organization
- Arends, Leslie C.**, member, U.S. House of Representatives (R-Illinois) until December 31, 1974; Minority Whip
- Armstrong, Anne L.**, Counselor to the President from 1973 until 1974; U.S. Ambassador to the United Kingdom after March 17, 1976
- Armstrong, Willis C.**, Assistant Secretary of State for Economic Affairs until April 16, 1974
- Assad (Asad), Hafez**, Syrian President
- Ash, Roy L.**, Assistant to the President for Executive Management and Director, Office of Management and Budget from February 2, 1973, until February 3, 1975
- Bahr, Egon**, State Secretary, West German Federal Chancellery; Federal Minister for Special Affairs until 1974; Minister for Economic Cooperation from 1974 until 1976
- Ball, George W.**, Under Secretary of State from 1961 until 1966; U.S. Representative to the United Nations, 1968
- Baroody, William J., Jr.**, Special Assistant to the President and Chief, White House Office of Public Liaison
- Bartholomew, Reginald**, Director, Policy Planning Staff, Department of Defense from 1973 until 1974; Deputy Director, Policy Planning Staff, Department of State from 1974 until 1977
- Beall, John Glenn, Jr.**, Senator (R-Maryland) until January 3, 1977
- Bell, Alphonzo**, member, U.S. House of Representatives (R-California) until January 3, 1977
- Bellmon, Henry**, Senator (R-Oklahoma)
- Biestler, Edward G., Jr., (Pete)**, member, U.S. House of Representatives (R-Pennsylvania) until January 3, 1977
- Bingham, Jonathan B.**, member, U.S. House of Representatives (D-New York)

- Boggs, Thomas Hale, Sr.**, member, U.S. House of Representatives (D–Louisiana); House Majority Leader until January 1, 1973, when he was presumed dead after disappearing during an October 1972 trip to Alaska
- Borg, Arthur C.**, Deputy Chief of Mission, U.S. Embassy in Germany until 1974; Deputy Executive Secretary, Department of State until June 1975; Executive Secretary from July 1976 until April 1977
- Borg, Parker W.**, staff officer, Executive Secretariat, and Special Assistant to the Director General of the Foreign Service, Department of State until 1974; Special Assistant to the Secretary of State from 1974 until 1975
- Boumediene, Houari**, Algerian President
- Brademas, John**, member, U.S. House of Representatives (D–Indiana); Majority Whip from January 1977
- Brandt, Willy**, Chancellor of the Federal Republic of Germany until May 7, 1974
- Bray, William G.**, member, U.S. House of Representatives (R–Indiana) until January 3, 1975; thereafter Commissioner, American Battle Monuments Commission
- Bremer, L. Paul (Jerry)**, Special Assistant to the Secretary of State from 1973 until 1976
- Brennan, Peter J.**, Secretary of Labor from February 2, 1973, until March 15, 1975
- Brezhnev, Leonid I.**, General Secretary of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union
- Brimelow, Sir Thomas**, British Deputy Under Secretary of State
- Brinegar, Claude S.**, Secretary of Transportation from February 2, 1973, until February 1, 1975
- Brooke, Edward W., III**, Senator (R–Massachusetts)
- Broomfield, William S.**, member, U.S. House of Representatives (R–Michigan)
- Brown, George S.**, General, USAF; Chief of Staff, U.S. Air Force from August 1, 1973, until June 30, 1974; thereafter Chairman, Joint Chiefs of Staff
- Bruce, David K.E.**, U.S. Ambassador to the United Kingdom from 1961 until 1969; Head of the U.S. Liaison Office in Beijing from May 14, 1973, until September 25, 1974; U.S. Permanent Representative to the North Atlantic Treaty Organization from October 17, 1974, until February 12, 1976
- Buchanan, John Hall, Jr.**, member, U.S. House of Representatives (R–Alabama); member, U.S. Delegation to the United Nations, 1973
- Buchen, Philip W.**, Executive Director, Domestic Council Committee on the Right of Privacy from March until August 1974; White House Counsel from August 15, 1974, until January 20, 1977
- Bundy, McGeorge**, President's Special Assistant for National Security Affairs from 1961 until 1966; thereafter President of the Ford Foundation
- Burch, Dean**, Chairman of the Federal Communications Commission until 1974; Counselor to the President from 1974 until 1975
- Burger, Warren E.**, Chief Justice of the United States Supreme Court
- Bush, George H.W.**, U.S. Permanent Representative to the United Nations until January 18, 1973; Chairman of the Republican National Committee from 1973 until 1974; Head of the U.S. Liaison Office in Beijing from October 21, 1974, until December 7, 1975; Director of Central Intelligence from January 30, 1976, until January 20, 1977
- Butz, Earl L.**, Secretary of Agriculture until October 4, 1976
- Byrd, Harry Flood, Jr.**, Senator (I–Virginia)
- Byrnes, James**, Secretary of State from 1945 until 1947
- Campbell, J. Phil**, Under Secretary of Agriculture
- Carlucci, Frank C.**, Under Secretary of Health, Education and Welfare until 1974; U.S. Ambassador to Portugal from January 24, 1975
- Carstens, Karl**, Chairman, CDU/CSU Parliamentary Group in the German Bundestag; member, CDU Federal Executive Committee

- Carter, Jimmy (James E.)**, Governor of Georgia from January 1971 until January 1975; Democratic Presidential candidate from 1975 until 1976; President of the United States from January 20, 1977
- Case, Clifford P.**, Senator (R–New Jersey), member, Senate Foreign Relations Committee
- Casey, William J.**, Chairman, Securities and Exchange Commission until 1973; Under Secretary of State for Economic Affairs from February 2, 1973, until March 14, 1974; President and Chairman, Export-Import Bank from 1974 until 1976; member, President's Foreign Intelligence Advisory Board from 1976
- Castro Ruz, Fidel**, Premier of Cuba
- Ceausescu, Nicolae**, Romanian President
- Cederberg, Elford A.**, member, U.S. House of Representatives (R–Michigan)
- Chaban-Delmas, Jacques**, French Prime Minister from June 1969 until July 1972
- Chapin, Dwight L.**, Deputy Assistant to the President from 1971 until 1973
- Cheney, Richard B.**, Deputy Assistant to the President from December 1974 until November 1975; White House Chief of Staff and Assistant to the President from November 1975 until January 1977
- Clark, Richard C. (Dick)**, Senator (D–Iowa)
- Clements, William P.**, Deputy Secretary of Defense from 1973 until 1976
- Cochran, William Thad**, member, U.S. House of Representatives (R–Mississippi) from January 3, 1973
- Cohen, William S.**, member, U.S. House of Representatives (R–Maine) from January 3, 1973
- Colby, William E.**, Executive Director–Comptroller, Central Intelligence Agency until March 1973; Deputy Director of Central Intelligence for Operations from March 2, 1973, until August 24, 1973; Director of Central Intelligence from September 4, 1973, until January 30, 1976
- Cole, Kenneth R., Jr.**, Executive Director, Domestic Council from December 1972 and Assistant to the President for Domestic Affairs from January 1974 until March 1975
- Colson, Charles W. (Chuck)**, Special Counsel to the President until March 1973
- Conable, Barber Benjamin, Jr.**, member, U.S. House of Representatives (R–New York)
- Coughlin, Robert Lawrence**, member, U.S. House of Representatives (R–Pennsylvania)
- Cranston, Alan**, Senator (D–California); Democratic Whip and Chairman, Senate Committee on Veterans' Affairs from January 1977
- Cromer, Earl of (George Rowland Stanley Baring)**, British Ambassador to the United States until 1974
- Cushman, Robert E., Jr.**, General, USMC; Commandant, U.S. Marine Corps
- Davignon, Etienne**, Belgian Director General for Political Affairs
- Davis, Jeanne W.**, National Security Council Staff Secretary
- Dayan, Moshe**, Israeli Defense Minister until 1974; thereafter member, Israeli Knesset
- DeGaulle, Charles**, French President until April 28, 1969
- Deng Xiaoping**, Vice Premier of State Council, People's Republic of China after 1973
- Dent, Frederick B.**, Secretary of Commerce from February 2, 1973, until March 26, 1975; thereafter Special Representative for Trade Negotiations
- DePalma, Samuel**, Assistant Secretary of State for International Organization Affairs until June 20, 1973
- Dillon, C. Douglas**, Secretary of the Treasury from January 1961 until April 1965; member, Commission on CIA Activities Within the United States (Rockefeller Commission) from January until June 1975
- Dobrynin, Anatoly F.**, Soviet Ambassador to the United States
- Donaldson, William H.**, Under Secretary of State for Security Assistance from November 26, 1973, until May 10, 1974; thereafter Counsel to the Vice President
- Donelan, Joseph F., Jr.**, Assistant Secretary of State for Administration until March 31, 1973

Douglas-Home, Sir Alec, British Foreign Secretary until March 4, 1974

Dunlop, John T., Director, Cost of Living Council from 1973 until 1974; Secretary of Labor from March 18, 1975, until January 31, 1976

Eagleburger, Lawrence S., Acting Assistant Secretary of Defense for International Security Affairs from January 31, 1973, until May 10, 1973; member, National Security Council Staff from June 1973 until February 1975; Executive Assistant to the Secretary of State from September 1973; Deputy Under Secretary of State for Management from May 14, 1975, until February 26, 1977

Echeverría, Luis, Mexican President until 1976

Ehrlichman, John D., Assistant to the President for Domestic Affairs until April 1973

Eisenhower, Dwight D., President of the United States from January 21, 1953, until January 20, 1961

Eliot, Theodore L., Jr., Special Assistant to the Secretary of State and Executive Secretary of the Department of State until 1973; thereafter U.S. Ambassador to Afghanistan

Ellsworth, Robert F., Assistant Secretary of Defense for International Security Affairs from June 5, 1974, until December 22, 1975; Deputy Secretary of Defense from December 23, 1975, until January 10, 1977

Esch, Marvin L., member, U.S. House of Representatives (R-Michigan) until January 3, 1977

Fahmy, Ismail, Egyptian Foreign Minister after October 31, 1973

Flanigan, Peter M., Assistant to the President and Executive Director of the Council on International Economic Policy until 1974

Ford, Gerald R., member, U.S. House of Representatives (R-Michigan) and Minority Leader until December 6, 1973; thereafter Vice President of the United States until August 9, 1974; thereafter President of the United States until January 20, 1977

Fraser, Donald M., member, U.S. House of Representatives (DFL-Minnesota)

Frelinghuysen, Peter H.B., member, U.S. House of Representatives (R-New Jersey) until 1974

Frenzel, William E., member, U.S. House of Representatives (R-Minnesota)

Friedersdorf, Max L., Special Assistant to the President for Legislative Affairs until 1973; Deputy Assistant to the President for the House of Representatives from 1973 until 1974; Assistant to the President for Legislative Affairs from 1975 until 1977

Fulbright, J. William, Senator (D-Arkansas); Chairman, Senate Foreign Relations Committee until 1974

Gergen, David R., Special Assistant to the President from 1973 until 1974

Gibbons, Sam Melville, member, U.S. House of Representatives (D-Florida)

Giscard d'Estaing, Valéry, French Minister of Economics and Finance until May 27, 1974; thereafter French President

Goodpaster, Andrew J., General, USA; Supreme Allied Commander, Europe, until 1974

Graybeal, Sidney, Chairman, SALT Consultative Committee (also known as Standing Consultative Committee)

Grechko, Marshal Andrei, Soviet Defense Minister until April 26, 1976

Green, Marshall, Assistant Secretary of State for East Asian and Pacific Affairs until May 10, 1973; U.S. Ambassador to Australia from March 27, 1973, until July 31, 1975; also U.S. Ambassador to Nauru from February 28, 1974, until July 31, 1975

Greenspan, Alan, Chairman of the Council of Economic Advisers from 1974 until 1977

Griffin, Robert P., Senator (R-Michigan); Minority Whip

Gromyko, Andrei A., Soviet Foreign Minister

- Habib, Philip C.**, U.S. Ambassador to the Republic of Korea until August 19, 1974; Assistant Secretary of State for East Asian and Pacific Affairs from September 27, 1974, until June 30, 1976; Under Secretary of State for Political Affairs from July 1, 1976, until April 1, 1978; Secretary of State ad interim from January 20, 1977, until January 23, 1977
- Haig, Alexander Meigs, Jr.**, Brigadier General, USA; Deputy Assistant to the President for National Security Affairs until January 1973; Army Vice Chief of Staff from 1973 until 1974; Assistant to the President and White House Chief of Staff from May 1973 until August 1974; thereafter Commander-in-Chief, European Command and Supreme Allied Commander, Europe
- Haldeman, H.R. (Bob)**, Assistant to the President and White House Chief of Staff until April 1973
- Hammer, Armand**, CEO, Occidental Petroleum
- Hardin, Clifford M.**, Secretary of Agriculture from January 21, 1969, until November 17, 1971
- Harlow, Bryce N.**, Counselor to the President
- Harriman, W. Averell**, Under Secretary of State for Political Affairs from 1963 until 1965; Ambassador at Large; Chairman, Foreign Policy Task Force, Democratic National Committee, 1976
- Harrington, Michael J.**, member, U.S. House of Representatives (D–Massachusetts)
- Hartmann, Robert T.**, Assistant to Vice President Ford; Counselor to the President from August 9, 1974
- Hatfield, Mark O.**, Senator (R–Oregon)
- Heath, Edward**, British Prime Minister until March 1974
- Hersh, Seymour**, *New York Times* journalist
- Ho Chi Minh**, President of the Democratic Republic of Vietnam until September 3, 1969
- Holdridge, John H.**, member, National Security Council Operations Staff/East Asia until March 1973; co-Deputy Chief of Mission, U.S. Liaison Office in Beijing from 1973 until 1975; U.S. Ambassador to Singapore from August 1975
- Holton, A. Linwood**, Assistant Secretary of State for Congressional Relations from February 28, 1974, until January 31, 1975
- Horton, Frank J.**, member, U.S. House of Representatives (R–New York)
- Huang Zhen**, Chief of the People's Republic of China Liaison Office in the United States
- Humphrey, Hubert H., Jr.**, Vice President of the United States from January 21, 1965, until January 20, 1969; Senator (D–Minnesota) from January 1971; Chairman, Joint Economic Committee from 1975 until 1976
- Hussein I, ibn Talal**, King of Jordan
- Hyland, William G.**, senior member, National Security Council Staff until January 1974; Director, Bureau of Intelligence and Research, Department of State from January 1974 until November 1975; President's Deputy Assistant for National Security Affairs from November 1975 until January 1977
- Iklé, Frederick C.**, Director, Arms Control and Disarmament Agency from July 10, 1973
- Ingersoll, Robert S.**, U.S. Ambassador to Japan until November 8, 1973; Assistant Secretary of State for East Asian and Pacific Affairs from January 8, 1974, until July 9, 1974; Deputy Secretary of State from July 10, 1974, until March 31, 1976
- Inouye, Daniel K.**, Senator (D–Hawaii); Chairman, Select Committee on Intelligence from May 20, 1976
- Jackson, Henry M. (Scoop)**, Senator (D–Washington); Chairman, Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs and Committee on Energy and Natural Resources
- Jaworski, Leon**, Watergate Special Prosecutor from November 1, 1973, until October 25, 1974

Jenkins, Alfred leSesne, Director, Office of Asian Communist Affairs, Bureau of East Asian and Pacific Affairs, Department of State until March 1973, thereafter co-Deputy Chief of Mission, U.S. Liaison Office in Beijing

Jobert, Michel, Secretary General of the French Presidency until April 1973; French Foreign Minister from April 1973 until May 1974

Johnson, James Paul (Jim), member, U.S. House of Representatives (R-Colorado) from January 3, 1973

Johnson, Lyndon B., President of the United States from November 22, 1963, until January 20, 1969

Johnson, U. Alexis, Under Secretary of State for Political Affairs until February 1, 1973; thereafter Ambassador at Large and head of the U.S. Delegation to the Strategic Arms Limitation Talks

Jorden, William J., member, National Security Council Staff; U.S. Ambassador to Panama from April 17, 1974

Judd, Walter, member, U.S. House of Representatives (R-Minnesota) from 1943 until 1963

Katzir, Ephraim, Israeli President

Kennan, George F., U.S. Ambassador to the Soviet Union, 1952; U.S. Ambassador to Yugoslavia from 1961 until 1963

Kennedy, Edward M., Senator (D-Massachusetts)

Kennedy, John F., President of the United States from January 20, 1961, until November 22, 1963

Kennedy, Richard T., Colonel, USA; Director of Planning and Coordination, National Security Council Staff until January 1975; thereafter Commissioner, Nuclear Regulatory Commission

Kissinger, Henry A., President's Assistant for National Security Affairs until November 3, 1975; Secretary of State from September 21, 1973, until January 20, 1977

Kornienko, Georgi M., Director, USA Department and member of the Collegium, Soviet Ministry of Foreign Affairs

Korologos, Thomas C., Deputy Assistant to the President for Legislative Affairs from 1973 until 1974

Kosygin, Alexei N., Chairman, Council of Ministers of the Soviet Union

Kubisch, Jack B., Assistant Secretary of State for Inter-American Affairs from May 29, 1973, until September 4, 1974; Ambassador to Greece from September 26, 1974

Kubitschek de Oliveira, Juscelino, Brazilian President from 1956 until 1961

Laird, Melvin R., Secretary of Defense until January 29, 1973; Counselor to the President for Domestic Affairs from June 1973 until February 1974

Land, Edwin H., CEO and founder, Polaroid Corporation and member, President's Foreign Intelligence Advisory Board

Le Duc Tho, member of the Politburo of the Democratic Republic of Vietnam and Special Adviser to the DRV Delegation to the Paris Peace Talks

Lee Kuan Yew (Harry), Prime Minister of Singapore

Lewis, Samuel W., Deputy Director for Planning, Policy Planning Staff, Department of State from March 1974 until December 1975; Assistant Secretary of State for International Organization Affairs from December 24, 1975, until April 13, 1977

Lodal, Jan M., Director, Program Analysis, National Security Council Staff

Lodge, Henry Cabot, II, former U.S. Ambassador to the Republic of Vietnam and Head of the U.S. Delegation to the Paris Peace Talks

Lord, Winston, Special Assistant to the President's Assistant for National Security Affairs until 1973; Director, Policy Planning Staff (until February 27, 1974, known as the Policy and Coordination Staff), Department of State from October 12, 1973, until January 20, 1977

- Love, John A.**, Governor of Colorado from 1963 until 1973; Director, White House Office of Energy Policy, and President's Assistant for Energy Matters until December 3, 1973
- Luns, Joseph**, Secretary-General, North Atlantic Treaty Organization
- Lynn, James T.**, Under Secretary of Commerce until February 1973; Secretary of Housing and Urban Development from February 2, 1973, until February 5, 1975; Assistant to the President for Management and Budget and Director, Office of Management and Budget from February 5, 1975, until January 20, 1977
- Makarios, Archbishop**, Cypriot President
- Malek, Frederic V.**, Special Assistant to the President until 1973; Deputy Director, Office of Management and Budget from 1973 until 1975
- Mansfield, Michael J. (Mike)**, Senator (D-Montana); Senate Majority Leader until 1977; thereafter U.S. Ambassador to Japan; Chairman, Select Committee on Secret and Confidential Documents from 1973 until 1974
- Mao Zedong (Mao Tse-tung)**, Chairman, Chinese Communist Party and Politburo of the People's Republic of China
- Marsh, John O., Jr.**, Counselor to the President from August 10, 1974, until January 20, 1977; Chairman, White House Intelligence Coordination Group from 1975 until 1976
- McClellan, John L.**, Senator (D-Arkansas); Chairman, Committee on Appropriations
- McCloskey, Robert J.**, U.S. Ambassador to Cyprus from June 20, 1973, until January 14, 1974; Ambassador at Large, 1974; Assistant Secretary of State for Congressional Relations from February 21, 1975, until September 10, 1976; U.S. Ambassador to the Netherlands from October 22, 1976
- McCloy, John J.**, former Assistant Secretary of War; President, World Bank from 1947 until 1949; High Commissioner to Germany from 1947 until 1953
- McFall, John J.**, member, U.S. House of Representatives (D-California); Majority Whip from 1973 until 1977
- McNamara, Robert S.**, Secretary of Defense from January 21, 1961, until February 29, 1968; thereafter President, World Bank
- Meir, Golda**, Israeli Prime Minister until 1974
- Meyer, Armin H.**, U.S. Ambassador to Japan from 1969 until 1972; Chairman, Inter-agency Working Group of the Cabinet Committee to Combat Terrorism
- Mitchell, John N.**, Attorney General of the United States from January 21, 1969, until March 1, 1972
- Mondale, Walter F.**, Senator (D-Minnesota)
- Moore, George C.**, Deputy Chief of Mission of the U.S. Embassy in Sudan until March 2, 1973
- Moorer, Thomas H.**, Admiral, USN; Chairman, Joint Chiefs of Staff until July 1, 1974
- Morton, Rogers C.B.**, Secretary of the Interior until April 30, 1975; Chairman, Energy Resources Council from October 1974 until 1975; Secretary of Commerce from May 1, 1975, until February 2, 1976; thereafter Counselor to the President
- Moynihan, Daniel P.**, U.S. Ambassador to India from February 28, 1973, until January 7, 1975; U.S. Representative to the United Nations from June 30, 1975, until February 2, 1976
- Nessen, Ronald**, White House Press Secretary from September 1974 until January 1977
- Newsom, David D.**, Assistant Secretary of State for African Affairs until January 13, 1974; thereafter U.S. Ambassador to Indonesia
- Nguyen Van Thieu**, South Vietnamese President until April 21, 1975
- Nitze, Paul H.**, former Director of the Policy Planning Staff, Department of State; Assistant Secretary of Defense for International Security Affairs; Secretary of the Navy; and Deputy Secretary of Defense; member, U.S. Delegation to the Strategic Arms Limitation Talks until 1973; thereafter Assistant Secretary of Defense for International Security Affairs

- Nixon, Richard M.**, President of the United States from January 20, 1969, until August 9, 1974
- Noel, Cleo A., Jr.**, U.S. Ambassador to Sudan until March 2, 1973
- O'Neill, Thomas P. (Tip)**, member, U.S. House of Representatives (D–Massachusetts); House Majority Leader from 1973 until 1977
- Packwood, Robert W.**, Senator (R–Oregon)
- Pahlavi, Mohammed Reza**, Shah of Iran
- Park Chung Hee**, South Korean President
- Parker, Daniel**, Administrator of the Agency for International Development from October 31, 1973, until January 19, 1977
- Parker, David N.**, Special Assistant to the President from 1973 until 1974
- Passman, Otto E.**, member, U.S. House of Representatives (D–Louisiana) until January 3, 1977
- Pastore, John O.**, Senator (D–Rhode Island) until December 28, 1976; Co-Chairman, Joint Committee on Atomic Energy from 1975 until 1976
- Pauly, John**, Lieutenant General, USAF; Assistant to the Chairman, Joint Chiefs of Staff from July 1974 until September 1975; thereafter Deputy Chief of Staff for Plans and Operations, Headquarters, U.S. Air Force
- Pedersen, Richard F.**, Counselor of the Department of State until 1973; thereafter U.S. Ambassador to Hungary from September 10, 1973, until March 26, 1975
- Peterson, Peter G.**, Secretary of Commerce until February 1, 1973
- Pompidou, Georges**, French President until April 2, 1974
- Popper, David H.**, Assistant Secretary of State for International Organization Affairs from July 12, 1973, until January 2, 1974; U.S. Ambassador to Chile from February 22, 1974
- Porter, William J.**, Under Secretary of State for Political Affairs from February 2, 1973, until February 18, 1974; U.S. Ambassador to Canada from March 13, 1974, until December 16, 1975; U.S. Ambassador to Saudi Arabia from February 21, 1976, until May 27, 1977
- Price, Raymond K., Jr.**, Special Consultant to the President from 1973 until 1974
- Rabin, Yitzhak**, Israeli Deputy Prime Minister from 1973 until 1974; Prime Minister from June 3, 1974
- Reagan, Ronald W.**, Governor of California from 1967 until 1975; member, Commission on CIA Activities Within the United States (Rockefeller Commission) from January until June 1975; candidate for the Republican Presidential nomination, 1976
- Reston, James (Scotty)**, syndicated columnist and Vice President of the *New York Times*
- Rhodes, John J.**, member, U.S. House of Representatives (R–Arizona); House Minority Leader
- Ribicoff, Abraham A.**, Senator (D–Connecticut); Chairman, Committee on Government Operations from 1975
- Richardson, Elliot L.**, Secretary of Health, Education and Welfare until January 29, 1973; Secretary of Defense from January 30, 1973, until May 24, 1973; Attorney General from May 25, 1973, until October 20, 1973; U.S. Ambassador to the United Kingdom from March 21, 1975, until January 16, 1976; Secretary of Commerce from February 2, 1976, until January 20, 1977
- Richardson, John, Jr.**, Assistant Secretary of State for Educational and Cultural Affairs
- Robinson, Charles W.**, Under Secretary of State for Economic Affairs from January 3, 1975, until April 9, 1976; Deputy Secretary of State from April 9, 1976, until January 20, 1977
- Rockefeller, David**, CEO, Chase Manhattan Bank; member, Council of the Americas; Chairman, Council on Foreign Relations

- Rockefeller, Nelson A.**, former Governor of New York; Vice President of the United States from December 19, 1974; Chairman of the Commission on CIA Activities Within the United States (Rockefeller Commission) from January until June 1975; member, President's Foreign Intelligence Advisory Board until December 19, 1975
- Rodman, Peter W.**, member, National Security Council Staff and Office of the Assistant for National Security Affairs, and Special Assistant to Henry Kissinger
- Roe, Robert A.**, member, U.S. House of Representatives (D-New Jersey)
- Rogers, William D.**, Assistant Secretary of State for Inter-American Affairs from October 7, 1974, until June 18, 1976; Under Secretary for Economic Affairs from June 18, 1976, until December 31, 1976
- Rogers, William P.**, Secretary of State until August 23, 1973
- Roosevelt, Franklin D.**, President of the United States from March 4, 1933, until April 12, 1945
- Rumsfeld, Donald H.**, U.S. Permanent Representative to the North Atlantic Treaty Organization from February 2, 1973, until December 5, 1974; Assistant to the President from September 27, 1974, until November 19, 1975; Secretary of Defense from November 20, 1975, until January 20, 1977
- Ruppe, Philip E.**, member, U.S. House of Representatives (R-Michigan)
- Rush, Kenneth W.**, former U.S. Ambassador to Germany; Deputy Secretary of Defense until January 1973; Deputy Secretary of State from February 2, 1973, until May 29, 1974; Secretary of State ad interim from September 3 until 22, 1973; U.S. Ambassador to France from November 21, 1974
- Rusk, Dean**, Secretary of State from January 21, 1961, until January 20, 1969
- Ryan, John D.**, General, USAF; Chief of Staff, U.S. Air Force until July 31, 1973
- Sadat, Anwar el-**, Egyptian President
- St. Clair, James D.**, Special Counsel to President Nixon during Watergate
- Saukham Khoy**, President of the Khmer Republic, April 1975
- Saunders, Harold H. (Hal)**, member, National Security Council Operations Staff until 1974; Deputy Assistant Secretary of State for Near Eastern and South Asian Affairs from 1974 until 1975; Director, Bureau of Intelligence and Research, Department of State, from December 1, 1975
- Saxbe, William B.**, Senator (R-Ohio) until January 3, 1974; Attorney General of the United States from January 4, 1974, until February 1, 1975; thereafter U.S. Ambassador to India until November 1976
- Scali, John A.**, former special consultant to the President; U.S. Permanent Representative to the United Nations from February 20, 1973, until June 29, 1975
- Scheel, Walter**, Vice Chancellor of the Federal Republic of Germany and Foreign Minister until 1974; thereafter President
- Schlesinger, James R.**, Chairman of the Atomic Energy Commission until February 1973; Director of Central Intelligence from February 2 until July 2, 1973; Secretary of Defense from July 2, 1973, until November 19, 1975
- Schneebeli, Herman T.**, member, U.S. House of Representatives (R-Pennsylvania) until January 3, 1977
- Schubert, Richard F.**, Under Secretary of Labor from 1973 until 1975
- Schweiker, Richard**, Senator (R-Pennsylvania)
- Scott, Hugh D., Jr.**, Senator (R-Pennsylvania) until January 3, 1977; Senate Minority Leader
- Scowcroft, Brent A.**, Major General, USAF; President's Deputy Assistant for National Security Affairs from April 1973 until November 3, 1975; President's Assistant for National Security Affairs from November 3, 1975, until January 20, 1977
- Scranton, William W.**, former Governor of Pennsylvania; U.S. Permanent Representative to the United Nations from March 15, 1976, until January 19, 1977

- Seidman, L. William**, Assistant to the President for Economic Affairs from 1974 until 1977
- Shriver, Garner E.**, member, U.S. House of Representatives (R-Kansas) until January 3, 1977
- Shultz, George P.**, Secretary of the Treasury and Assistant to the President until May 8, 1974; member, President's Foreign Intelligence Advisory Board
- Sihanouk, Prince Norodom**, leader of the Cambodian government-in-exile in Beijing
- Silberman, Lawrence H.**, Deputy Attorney General from 1974 until 1975; U.S. Ambassador to Yugoslavia from May 26, 1975, until December 26, 1976
- Simon, William E.**, Deputy Secretary of the Treasury from January 22, 1973, until May 1974; Director, Federal Energy Office from December 1973 until April 1974; Secretary of the Treasury from May 8, 1974, until January 20, 1977; Chairman, East-West Foreign Trade Board from April 8, 1975
- Sisco, Joseph J.**, Assistant Secretary of State for Near Eastern and South Asian Affairs until February 18, 1974; thereafter Under Secretary of State for Political Affairs until June 30, 1976
- Smith, Ian D.**, Rhodesian Prime Minister
- Smith, Mary Louise**, Chairman, Republican National Committee
- Solzhenitsyn, Aleksandr**, Soviet author
- Sonnenfeldt, Helmut**, senior member, National Security Council Staff; thereafter Counselor of the Department of State from January 7, 1974, until February 21, 1977
- Sparkman, John J.**, Senator (D-Alabama); Co-Chairman, Joint Committee on Defense Production and Chairman, Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs until 1974; Chairman, Senate Foreign Relations Committee from 1975
- Spivak, Lawrence**, NBC News reporter; moderator, "Meet the Press," until 1975
- Springsteen, George S., Jr.**, Executive Secretary of the Department of State from January 31, 1974, until July 14, 1976; thereafter Director of the Foreign Service Institute, Department of State
- Stalin, Josif**, General Secretary of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union from 1922 until 1953
- Steelman, Alan W.**, member, U.S. House of Representatives (R-Texas) from January 3, 1973, until January 3, 1977
- Stennis, John C.**, Senator (D-Mississippi); Chairman, Select Committee on Standards and Conduct until 1975; also Chairman, Committee on Armed Services
- Stevenson, Adlai E., III**, Senator (D-Illinois); Chairman, Select Committee on the Senate Committee System from 1975 until 1976; also Chairman, Select Committee on Ethics from 1977
- Stoessel, Walter J., Jr.**, Assistant Secretary of State for European Affairs until January 7, 1974; thereafter U.S. Ambassador to the Soviet Union
- Suharto**, Indonesian President
- Sukhodrev, Viktor M.**, First Secretary, Soviet Ministry of Foreign Affairs and interpreter
- Tanaka Takeuei**, Japanese Prime Minister until December 9, 1974
- Tarr, Curtis W.**, Under Secretary of State for Arms Control and International Security Affairs until November 25, 1973; Acting Deputy Under Secretary of State for Management from April 4, 1973, until December 28, 1973
- Teller, Edward**, founder, Lawrence Livermore Laboratory and member, President's Foreign Intelligence Advisory Board
- Thurmond, J. Strom**, Senator (R-South Carolina)
- Timmons, William E.**, Assistant to the President for Legislative Affairs until 1974
- Tito, Josip Broz**, Yugoslav President
- Trend, Sir Burke**, British Cabinet Secretary until 1973
- Trudeau, Pierre Elliott**, Canadian Prime Minister

Truman, Harry S, President of the United States from April 12, 1945, until January 20, 1953

Tunney, John, Senator (D-California) until January 1, 1977

Vance, Cyrus, former Under Secretary of Defense; Secretary of State from January 1977

Vanik, Charles, member, U.S. House of Representatives (D-Ohio)

Vavilov, Andrei, USA Department, Soviet Ministry of Foreign Affairs

Vest, George, Director of the Bureau of Politico-Military Affairs, Department of State, from April 29, 1974

Waldheim, Kurt, Secretary-General of the United Nations

Warren, Gerald L., Deputy White House Press Secretary from 1973 until 1974

Wehner, Herbert, Chairman of the SPD Parliamentary Group in the German Bundestag; also SPD Deputy Party Chairman

Weinberger, Caspar W., Director, Office of Management and Budget until 1973; Counselor to the President, 1973; Secretary of Health, Education and Welfare from February 12, 1973, until August 8, 1975

Weyand, Frederick C., General, USA; Army Chief of Staff from October 3, 1974, until September 31, 1976

Wilson, Harold, British Prime Minister from 1974 until 1976

Wright, W. Marshall, Assistant Secretary of State for Congressional Relations from May 29, 1973, until February 2, 1974

Zablocki, Clement J., member, U.S. House of Representatives (D-Wisconsin)

Zhou Enlai, Premier of the People's Republic of China

Ziegler, Ronald L., White House Press Secretary and Assistant to the President from 1973 until 1974

Zumwalt, Elmo R., Jr., Admiral, USN; Chief of Naval Operations until June 29, 1974

Foundations of Foreign Policy, 1973–1976

1. Memorandum From President Nixon to the White House Chief of Staff (Haldeman)¹

Washington, January 25, 1973.

In talking to Kissinger, Colson, et al with regard to the Vietnam peace settlement² some of the following points should be borne in mind:

1. When Henry goes down to the Capitol³ he must at all costs give no quarter whatever to the doves and to tilt his remarks wherever he must tilt them on the side of those who have stood with us rather than trying to pander to those who have always opposed us.

2. This means that not only there but in everything that all of our surrogates and other spokesmen do over these next few days and weeks we must emphasize these points:

A. This was a peace with honor which achieved the major goals for which the war was waged.

B. We were able to get a settlement that under no stretch of the imagination can possibly be described as a coalition government and

¹ Source: National Archives, Nixon Presidential Materials, Staff Member and Office Files, White House Special Files, President's Personal Files, Memoranda From the President, 1969–1974, Box 4, Memos—January 1973. No classification marking. Printed from an uninitialed copy.

² On January 23, Nixon announced that the United States and the Democratic Republic of Vietnam had negotiated an end to the Vietnam war. For the text of Nixon's televised remarks, see *Public Papers: Nixon, 1973*, pp. 18–20.

³ Haldeman requested that Kissinger brief the House and Senate leadership prior to the January 27 ceremony in Paris when Rogers would sign the peace agreement for the United States. See *Foreign Relations, 1969–1976*, volume IX, Vietnam, October 1972–January 1973, Document 335. On January 26, Kissinger met with Senators from 1:30 until 2:35 p.m. and with Representatives from 3 until 4:20 p.m. The transcripts of these conversations are in the National Archives, Nixon Presidential Materials, NSC Files, Box 317, Subject Files, Congressional Jan 1973–May 1973, Vol. 8. The text and accompanying protocols of the “Agreement on Ending the War and Restoring Peace in Vietnam,” usually referred to as the Paris Peace Accords, are printed in Department of State *Bulletin*, February 12, 1973, pp. 169–188. For information on the January 27 signing ceremony, see *Foreign Relations, 1969–1976*, volume IX, Vietnam, October 1972–January 1973, Document 340.

one that assures the right of the people of South Vietnam to determine their future without having a Communist government imposed upon them, directly or indirectly.

C. The settlement we achieved, rather than being a bug-out which might have ended the war for us, is one that ends the war for the 50 million people of Indochina. This is a fundamental point that has not adequately been brought out except in the line that I wrote into my speech on it at the last moment.⁴ The difference between the Senate and House doves' position of POWs for withdrawal and the peace we finally got is very simply that the prisoners for withdrawal proposal would have meant that the United States would get out and let the war go ahead. In other words, it would end the war for us and have the war continue for those that remained with 1,000 casualties a week at least ad infinitum. What we have done by sticking in there was to get a peace which ends the war for the long-suffering people of South Vietnam, Cambodia and Laos as well.

D. Henry must be prepared to point out how the settlement has been improved from October and also why it was not possible to settle in December. It is obvious that our critics are already beginning to pick up the line with some assist from Hanoi that we could have had the same settlement we eventually achieved in October or in December when the talks broke down. We all know this is totally untrue but the point must be made simply and directly without too much detail.

E. Henry must flatly indicate, whenever he gets the opportunity, that the resolutions passed by the House and Senate caucuses over the years we were negotiating and by the full Senate from time to time prolonged the war, and only by the strong action that we took in December were we able to convince the enemy that the enemy should settle and not take the risk of waiting for the Congress to give them even more than they were willing to settle for with us.

In essence, the simple points must be made that our opponents in the Congress and in the media wanted to end the war in Vietnam with

⁴ Nixon was referencing this sentence in his January 23 address: "Now that we have achieved an honorable agreement, let us be proud that America did not settle for a peace that would have betrayed our allies, that would have abandoned our prisoners of war, or that would have ended the war for us but would have continued the war for the 50 million people of Indochina." (*Public Papers: Nixon, 1973*, p. 20) The President reiterated this point during his January 31 news conference, referencing his administration's accomplishment of achieving peace with honor: "I know it gags some of you to write that phrase, but it is true, and most Americans realize it is true, because it would be peace with dishonor had we—what some have used, the vernacular—'bugged out' and allowed what the North Vietnamese wanted: the imposition of a Communist government or a coalition Communist government in the South Vietnamese. That goal they have failed to achieve. Consequently, we can speak of peace with honor and with some pride that it has been achieved." (*Ibid.*, p. 55)

dishonor and what amounted really to an abject surrender and defeat for the United States. We persisted in seeing it through until the war was ended with honor. Our opponents would have ended the war in a way that would have led at the very least to a Communist coalition government for South Vietnam or a totally Communist government for South Vietnam. We have ended in a way that assures the people of South Vietnam the right to determine their own future in free, internationally supervised elections, which means that there will be no Communist government unless the people want it and this is something that no one anticipates will really happen. And finally, our opponents with all their talk about peace were only interested in getting peace for America and would have ended our involvement in a way that would have allowed the war to continue indefinitely for the long-suffering people of Indochina. In other words, peace with honor means peace with independence for South Vietnam and peace for the people of Southeast Asia. Peace with surrender and dishonor means peace for us but a Communist government for South Vietnam and continued war for the 50 million people of Indochina.

It is imperative that Henry particularly make these points strongly and vigorously when he is before the Congress in his opening statement without going into any detail. I would suggest the opening statement be perhaps no more than 10 minutes and then field questions. He will without question enormously impress the Congress as he has the press with his performance. He must remember that rather than impressing the Congress we want to leave three or four simple, hard messages for them that they can understand and that they, we hope, will go out and peddle to others.

2. Editorial Note

President Richard Nixon met with General Andrew J. Goodpaster, USA, Supreme Allied Commander, Europe, at 11 a.m. on February 15, 1973. The meeting took place in the Oval Office at the White House. Pool reporters were present for Nixon's opening remarks on the state of U.S.-European relations:

"I have said this is the year of Europe. . . . This is not to say that we are not placing enormous emphasis on completing the settlement in Southeast Asia and on continuing to build our relationship and dialog with the PRC and the Soviet Union, and our policy in this hemisphere—in Latin America. But the year of Europe becomes very impor-

tant in both the economic context, which was brought home by the recent monetary situation, and also in terms of the national security context, because of the fact that MBFR—mutual balanced force reductions—will be a subject on our agenda this year, not only first with our European allies but also with the Soviet Union, and also because of the European Security Conference. It will not be specifically military matters. . . .”

Nixon commented that U.S., European, and Japanese officials planned to devote additional time to discussing MBFR and the European Security Conference, predicting that such deliberations would lead to an examination of American global relationships and responsibilities:

“We must not overlook the fact that tied into all this are the security arrangements that we have with Europe and Japan. The United States at the present time, after going through Vietnam, will hear, understandably, voices raised, very sincere voices, that ‘After Vietnam, let’s throw up our hands, turn inward, and withdraw from our obligations in the world.’

“One of the reasons I considered it vitally important that the war in Vietnam be ended in what I think was the right way, peace with honor, was that it was essential to demonstrate both to our allies in Europe, the Japanese, and other allies, the Thais and so forth, and to potential adversaries, that the United States is a dependable ally. All the power in the world lodged in the United States means nothing unless those who depend upon U.S. power to protect them from the possibilities of aggression from other powers—which they themselves would not be able to do—all the power in the world here means nothing unless there is some assurance, some confidence, some trust that the United States will be credible, will be dependable.” (*Public Papers: Nixon, 1973*, page 103)

After the reporters departed at 11:20, Nixon and Goodpaster continued their conversation. In a memorandum for the President’s files prepared by Brigadier General Brent Scowcroft, the President’s Deputy Assistant for National Security Affairs, Nixon further commented on the allied relationship:

“The President said that the U.S. always turns the other cheek, but in this case, what had been an alliance of interest and friendship is now just an alliance of interest. Why were we in Vietnam, after all? The issue was not a small strip of land but the credibility and dependability of the United States to its allies and friends. We will not bear grudges, but when an ally is so presumptuous that it attacks us without waiting, for its own political purposes, we will henceforth base our relationship solely on the national interest, not on friendship.”

Nixon and Goodpaster also discussed the future of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization and current proposals related to MBFR:

“The President thought that the principal problem was psychological. We need to work out, he said, what we can do and still preserve confidence in the alliance. General Goodpaster felt we should not be afraid to put out proposals simply for fear that the USSR would not accept them. He mentioned, as examples, ideas for a common ceiling on troop strength and mixed package reductions of elements which were of the most concern to each side. General Goodpaster observed that the opening of negotiations by the President with the USSR and the PRC had been one of the most constructive developments in the world today, that we must continue to negotiate, and that we should not let the USSR play one ally against another. Some force reduction was possible, even though the military were generally opposed.” Nixon and Goodpaster concluded their meeting at 12:02 p.m. (National Archives, Nixon Presidential Materials, Staff Member and Office Files, White House Special Files, President’s Office Files, President’s Meeting File, 1969–1974, Box 91, Memoranda for the President—Beginning February 4 [1973])

The President then departed for the Pentagon for a meeting with Secretary of Defense Elliot Richardson, the Joint Chiefs of Staff, and Scowcroft. According to a memorandum of conversation, Nixon commented on the isolationist sentiment permeating American society:

“This tendency is fed by the information media. But still, thank God we don’t have government television, putting out just one line.

“Other countries have to have the support of the peaceniks to survive. During the recent bombing, the only ones to stand with us were the British, the Germans, and the Turks. All the others took a cheap shot at the bombing. Trudeau, Tanaka, Schmidt. The bombings in World War II killed millions but that was a ‘good war.’ This is a ‘bad war,’ so the bombing was ‘evil.’ There is a real double standard, and isolationism is rampant.

“Clinking glasses with the Chinese and the Soviet leaders wasn’t friendship but mutual interests. We talk to both countries, not to divide them but to seek sound relations with them. We must realize, however, that good relations don’t come simply from knowing other people better.

“There is a tendency in the rimland of Asia and elsewhere to tell the U.S. to go home. But Indonesia and Suharto don’t. Should this develop in the NATO countries, or should they reduce their forces, the Congress will jump at the chance to cut all NATO forces. We are in danger of not getting enough from Congress, and Europe will encourage these forces which will want us to come home. We would like to be able to put the DOD budget into welfare, but if we did, the world would eventually fall under the Communist system. Despite the setback in South Asia and pressure from Congress, the situation is not hopeless.

That is what the Chinese and Soviet initiatives were all about. Expansion is an article of Communist faith, but so also is caution.

“The Korean War was not about Korea, but basically about Japan. The U.S. stand in Korea was a watershed. So it is with Vietnam, although the domino theory is rejected. Vietnam was important not for itself but because of what it demonstrated in terms of support for our friends and allies and in terms of showing our will to our enemies. We had to see it through. I could have ‘bugged out’ free in Vietnam after the ‘68 election, but we had to see it through—but not necessarily the way it had been fought up to then. We have made strong moves in such crises as Jordan, Cienfuegos, etc. All these were important in demonstrating our commitments to our friends and our determination to our enemies.

“I understand what vilification you, the military, have gone through over Vietnam, but you should remember that the big issue in the war was the American spirit.”

The remainder of the conversation focused upon ways in which the military could recognize the returning prisoners of war and ease their reentry into American society. (Library of Congress, Manuscript Division, Kissinger Papers, Box CL 279, Memoranda of Conversations, Presidential File Jan.–Mar. 1973) The full record of this conversation is scheduled for publication in *Foreign Relations, 1969–1976*, volume XXXV, National Security Policy, 1973–1976.

3. Memorandum From the President’s Assistant for National Security Affairs (Kissinger) to President Nixon¹

Washington, March 2, 1973.

SUBJECT

My Trip to China

[Omitted here is discussion of Indochina and Southeast Asia.]

¹ Source: National Archives, Nixon Presidential Materials, NSC Files, Kissinger Office Files, Box 98, Country Files—Far East, HAK China Trip—February 1973, Memcons & Reports (Originals) [TS 1 of 2]. Top Secret; Sensitive; Exclusively Eyes Only. The date is handwritten. There is no indication that Nixon saw the memorandum. Printed in full in *Foreign Relations, 1969–1976*, volume XVIII, China, 1973–1976, Document 18. Kissinger visited Beijing February 15–19 and met with Chairman Mao Zedong and Premier Zhou Enlai. For the records of these meetings, see *ibid.*, Documents 9–14. Briefing memoranda for Kissinger’s trip are in the National Archives, Nixon Presidential Materials, NSC Files,

Evolution of Our Relationship

The progression of our relationship in the past twenty months is remarkable. I believe it is one of your most striking successes in foreign policy. If we continue to handle it carefully, it should continue to pay dividends—in relaxing tensions in Asia, in furthering relations with Moscow, and generally in building a structure of peace.

When you sent me to China in July 1971² we had almost no idea what to expect as we penetrated twenty years of accumulated isolation, distrust and enmity. Since then we have progressed faster and further than anyone would have predicted, or the rest of the world realizes. *For in plain terms we have now become tacit allies.* The evolution has gone as follows:

—*When you took office* there was total lack of diplomatic communication between our two governments, no personal or commercial interchange between our two peoples, mutual public recrimination, and clashing world views.

—*In the first two and a half years of your Administration*, we put out private feelers through third countries, took unilateral public steps in such fields as trade and passports in order to send signals, and pointed our rhetoric toward a new relationship. This resulted in agreement in principle that you would meet the Chinese leaders and my secret exploratory trip of July 1971.

—*My July 1971 trip* reestablished direct communications, confirmed your trip to Peking and suggested that the PRC was ready to move toward normalization. On the other hand, Chou presented his quota of rhetoric and our policies clashed on most major issues.

—*In October 1971*³ we established the framework for your trip, including the outlines of the joint communiqué. The Taiwan issue remained hanging in the communiqué, however, and our policies continued to conflict in many areas.

—*Your February 1972 visit*⁴ was the watershed. It stamped your and Mao's personal imprints on the move toward normalization. The Shanghai Communiqué contained joint principles in international affairs, finessed the Taiwan problem through mutual and ambiguous compromise, set in motion bilateral trade and exchanges, established the public Paris channel, and accelerated the private New York

Box 526, Country Files—Far East, People's Republic of China, Vol. 6, Jan–Apr 1973 [1 of 3].

² Kissinger traveled to China prior to Nixon's February 1972 visit. See *Foreign Relations*, 1969–1976, volume XVII, China, 1969–1972, Documents 139–144.

³ See *ibid.*, Documents 162–165.

⁴ See *ibid.*, Documents 194–204.

channel.⁵ However, as the communiqué publicly, and your conversations privately demonstrated, we were improving our relations *despite* different world outlooks.

—*My June 1972 trip*⁶ marked substantial evolution toward our views in the Chinese private positions on international issues. But the Vietnam war continued to inhibit the Chinese, and publicly all we could register was a modest increase in exchanges and trade.

—*On this trip in February 1973*, the flood gates opened privately and publicly for the reasons stated. The Chinese leaders are among the very few in the world with a global and longer term perspective—and it now parallels ours in many important respects. In such areas as the Soviet Union, Europe, South Asia and even Japan we have similar outlooks. In others, like Indochina and Korea, we each back our allies but share an interest in independent states and relaxed tensions. And on Taiwan we have reached a clear *modus vivendi*—on our part, continued, concrete evolution toward full relations with all its implications; and on their part, patience and a pragmatism reflected most vividly in the coming side-by-side presence of a GRC Embassy and a PRC Liaison Office. On the bilateral plane, it is full speed ahead on trade and exchanges. As for public relations, the Chinese have long since singled out the USSR for attack and have shown increasing cordiality in their public contacts with us.

Following are the main points of my talks with the Chinese, topic by topic.

Soviet Union

The Soviet Union dominated our conversations. In 1971 there were somewhat guarded references by the Chinese to Soviet designs, but they ritualistically linked the US and the USSR as the two superpowers seeking hegemony. By the time of your visit the Chinese leaders were quite candid about the Soviet menace but stayed away from extended discussion. By last June the Soviet Union had become one of the two major topics in my conversations, the other one being Indochina. On this trip it was the centerpiece and completely permeated our talks. The Chinese views generally surfaced in the regional discussion and are detailed later in this report. Following are the more general observations.

Chou raised the USSR in our first meeting and kept coming back to it. He called a special meeting the night of February 17 to discuss this subject and at the end of his presentation he announced my meeting with Mao, where again it was a major topic. We discussed it at length

⁵ The Shanghai Communiqué was issued February 27, 1972, at the end of Nixon's visit. For the text, see *ibid.*, Document 203.

⁶ See *ibid.*, Documents 231–234.

the next day as well. In literally every region of the world the Chinese see the Soviet hand at play. As you will see in the area discussions below, Mao and Chou urged us to counter the Russians everywhere—to work closely with our allies in Europe and Japan, and to take more positive action to prevent the Soviets filling vacuums or spreading their influence in areas like the Middle East, Persian Gulf, Near East, South Asia and Indian Ocean.

In our first meeting, after my opening statement, Chou asked me in effect whether we thought the world was moving toward peace or war. I said that there were some positive developments, but we were not naive about potential dangers, such as the intensive Soviet military buildup. I made clear that we had major business to do with Moscow, but we were under no illusions about its possible motivations. We would continue our policy of keeping the Chinese fully informed and not concluding any agreements that could be directed against Peking.

Chou pointed to developments in Europe and said perhaps we sought to “push the ill waters of the Soviet Union eastward.” He also cited our diversion of fighters from Taiwan to South Vietnam last fall in Enhance Plus as an example of our taking advantage of Peking; somewhat out of context, he said that this showed that we might be standing on Chinese shoulders to reach out toward the Soviet Union.

The next day I purposely detailed our proposed force reductions on Taiwan and then made a more sweeping analysis of our policy toward the Soviet Union. I said that the nature of our relationship meant that we had to pursue a more complicated policy than the PRC which could oppose the Soviet Union outright on issues. We were making several agreements with Moscow, but we would not let these constrain us in the event that our interests were jeopardized. I pointed out that the USSR could follow one of two courses. If they truly wanted peace, we would welcome that course, and the agreements we were making might contribute to that end. If, however, as seemed more likely, they were bent on a more threatening road, we had shown in the past that we would react strongly if our interests were jeopardized. In any event, I emphasized, we would maintain strong defenses and improve our strategic forces so long as the Soviet buildup continued. And on issues of direct concern to Peking we would take Chinese interests into account, such as on the Soviet initiative on a nuclear understanding, where we have been fighting a delaying action ever since last spring.

Chou and then Mao, however, both replayed the theme that we might be helping the Soviet Union, whether or not purposely. Whereas we saw two possibilities, i.e. that the Soviet Union would either pursue a peaceful or a menacing course, the Chinese saw only the latter. They were spreading their influence everywhere with the help of their satel-

lites, like India, and were out to isolate the Chinese. The “new czars” were neurotic and omnipresent. It was the Chinese duty to try and expose their designs wherever possible, however lonely their efforts in a world enamored with false *détente*.

Mao even went so far as to suggest that we might like to see the Russians bogged down in an attack on China; after wearing themselves out for a couple of years, we would then “poke a finger” in Moscow’s back. I rejoined that we believe that a war between the two Communist giants was likely to be uncontrollable and have unfortunate consequences for everyone. We therefore wished to prevent such a conflict, not take advantage of it.

Given Mao’s and Chou’s skeptical comments on this issue, I treated it at considerable length the day after my meeting with the Chairman. I said there were three hypothetical US motives in a policy that contributed to pressures on the PRC from the USSR. First, we might want the Soviet Union to defeat China. I stressed emphatically that whether Moscow defeated China or Europe first, the consequences for us would be the same; we would be isolated and the ultimate target. Thus this could never be our policy.

The second possible motive was the one Mao mentioned—our wish for a stalemated Moscow attack on Peking, so as to exhaust the Soviet Union. I pointed out that even partial Soviet dominance of China could have many of the consequences of the first option. In any event, such a major conflict would have unpredictable consequences. The Soviet Union might take rash actions if they were stymied as the Chairman claimed we had been in Vietnam. And we would be forced either to demonstrate our impotence and irrelevance, or make a series of extremely complex decisions.

The third possibility was that we might contribute to a war between China and the Soviet Union through misjudgment rather than policy. This I recognized as a danger despite our intentions. I then analyzed at length our policy around the world, with emphasis on Europe, to demonstrate that we plan to maintain our defense, continue a responsible international role, and work closely with our allies. In short, while seeking relaxation with Moscow, we would also ensure that if it did not choose a peaceful course we and our friends would be in a position to resist and defend our national interests. And I made it evident that we would consider aggression against China as involving our own national security.

It is not at all clear that we have fully allayed Chinese suspicions. While they have nowhere else to go in the short term, they will certainly watch our Soviet moves with wariness, and take out insurance with Japan and Europe.

[Omitted here is discussion of Europe, South Asia, Near and Middle East, Indochina and Southeast Asia, Japan, Korea, Taiwan, and bilateral relations between the United States and the People's Republic of China.]

Problems

The current trend therefore is positive, but there are no grounds for complacency. There are at least two areas which have substantial potential for trouble in our relationship:

—*Our dealings with the Soviet Union.* To date the Soviet factor has been the main leverage in our dealings with the PRC. At the same time—and contrary to the predictions of almost all Soviet experts—our opening to Peking has paid us substantial dividends with Moscow as well. With conscientious attention to both capitals we should be able to continue to have our mao tai and drink our vodka too. Peking, after all, assuming continued hostility with the USSR, has no real alternative to us as a counterweight (despite its recent reaching out to Japan and Western Europe as insurance). And Moscow needs us in such areas as Europe and economics.

But this is nevertheless a difficult balancing act that will increasingly face us with hard choices. Mao and Chou both suggested that, inadvertently or not, our Soviet policies could increase the pressures on China. It was even intimated that we might favor a Sino-Soviet conflict, so as to bog down the Soviet Union and weaken it for our own attack. A cutting edge is the Soviet initiative on a nuclear understanding. One of Moscow's motives is certainly to embarrass us in our relations with Peking, since they know their initiative is anathema to Peking. We have fought a delaying action on this issue for almost a year now, but Brezhnev is apt to push it to a head in conjunction with his visit here.⁷ To satisfy him and not dissatisfy Chou at the same time will be a challenge. Other concrete awkward areas in our triangular relationship include European security policies and the granting of credits to Moscow.

—*The coming change in Chinese leadership.* Mao is in his 80s and has received an "invitation" from "God." Chou is 75 and has just publicly noted the need for new leadership soon in his country. They obviously control PRC policy now, but it is not at all clear that they can assure continuity in their policy lines. The Lin Piao affair was obviously a major challenge and may have been a close thing. They have not managed to fill many key party and military posts since then. Mao constantly referred to the difficulties posed by women in China, undoubtedly a reference to his wife who represents the challenge from the left. All of this

⁷ See Document 14.

is reflected in Chinese eagerness to institutionalize our relationship, even if it means bending the sacred “one China” policy to do it.

We know little about power relationships in the PRC and even less about the succession problem. We can only assume—both from the above indices and because of the objective choices facing China—that substantial opposition to present policies exist and that this includes foreign policy. There are undoubtedly those who favor accommodation with Moscow over Washington, for example. Thus, before the present dynasty passes from the scene, we must strengthen bilateral ties, get our two peoples used to a closer relationship, and reach out to more layers of Chinese leadership so as to strengthen the advocates of an opening to America.⁸

There are two other potential problems, but these would seem to be more manageable and under our control:

—*The need for a strong American world role.* We are useless to Peking as a counterweight to Moscow if we withdraw from the world, lower our defenses, or play a passive international game. Mao and Chou urged a more aggressive American presence—countering Soviet designs in various areas, keeping close ties with our allies, maintaining our defense posture. If the Chinese became convinced that we were heeding the inward impulses of voluble sectors of Congress, the public and the press, we would undoubtedly witness a sharp turn in Peking’s attitude. You and I have, of course, assured the PRC leaders privately, as well as proclaiming publicly, our intentions to maintain a responsible international role. So long as you are President, Peking should certainly be convinced that we will be a crucial factor in the world balance.

—*The issue of Taiwan.* The Chinese have been farsighted and patient on this question. Their willingness to ease our predicament is now most dramatically shown in their setting up a liaison office in Washington while we maintain diplomatic relations with the GRC. On the other hand, we have largely bought their public reasonableness with your own private assurances—to normalize fully our relations by 1976 and to withdraw our forces from Taiwan now that the Vietnam War is over. Taiwan is a problem we should be able to control, both interna-

⁸ The Department of State’s Bureau of Intelligence and Research prepared a study on the possibility of a post-Mao succession crisis. On March 16, Kissinger transmitted the study, accompanied by a January 8 covering memorandum from Rogers, to Nixon. Kissinger noted: “While officials stress that there is ‘collective leadership,’ it is anticipated that the death of Mao Tse-tung and/or Chou En-lai could lead to considerable instability as political institutions are still fragile four years after the conclusion of the Cultural Revolution.” Nixon underlined “death of Mao Tse-Tung and/or Chou En-lai” adding: “K—what is your analysis as to what we can expect in this event?—What should our contingency be?” (*Foreign Relations, 1969–1976, volume XVIII, China, 1973–1976, Document 23*)

tionally and domestically, as we continue to add to the handwriting on the wall and condition our audiences. However, we should be under no illusions that our final step will be anything but painful—there are few friends as decent as our allies on Taiwan.

4. Memorandum for the President's Files by the President's Press Secretary (Ziegler)¹

Washington, March 6, 1973.

SUBJECT

Department of State Luncheon with Secretary William P. Rogers and State Department Officials, Tuesday, March 6, 1973 at 12:50 p.m.

[Omitted here is discussion of the murders of the diplomats in the Sudan by terrorists.]

Discussion then moved to the defense budget. There was comment that most people don't understand that the defense budget has already been cut. Discussion went to the period immediately after World War II when our foreign policy did accomplish great objectives in terms of NATO and the Greek-Turkish situation,² but at that point we went too far down in our defense budget and helped create the conditions that lead to Korea. The ability to get support for adequate foreign policy and foreign assistance, the President said, is going to be quite a challenge. How do we combat opposition to it? It means a united front for maintaining adequate defense and foreign assistance. We must get across

¹ Source: National Archives, Nixon Presidential Materials, Staff Member and Office Files, White House Special Files, President's Office Files, President's Meeting File, 1969–1974, Box 91, Memoranda for the President—Beginning February 4 [1973]. No classification marking. Nixon attended a luncheon at the Department of State where he met with Rogers, Kissinger, Kenneth Rush, William Porter, William Casey, Curtis Tarr, William Macomber, Richard Pedersen, Joseph Donelan, David Newsom, Willis Armstrong, Marshall Green, Walter Stoessel, Marshall Wright, Samuel DePalma, William Hall, Joseph Sisco, John Richardson, U. Alexis Johnson, Armin Meyer, Robert McCloskey, Theodore Eliot, and Ziegler. (President's Daily Diary; *ibid.*, White House Central Files) Nixon also delivered remarks to Department of State personnel at an afternoon memorial ceremony honoring Ambassador to the Sudan Cleo Noel, Jr., and Deputy Chief of Mission George Curtis Moore. Members of the Black September terrorist group had kidnapped and slain Noel, Moore, and Belgian Chargé d'Affaires Guy Eid on March 2. For text of these remarks, see *Public Papers: Nixon, 1973*, pp. 169–171.

² Reference is to the founding of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization in 1949 and the events leading to the promulgation of the Truman Doctrine in 1947.

the point that to have the US to turn inward would be dangerous. If the US turns inward the China and Soviet initiatives will go down the drain. The day the US ceases to be a formidable defense and diplomatic power, economics will not be enough to hold it together. It is a dangerous situation, the President said. The old isolationists and the new isolationists could be a majority. Our failure to succeed could lead to a period when we could draw away from our responsibility. We must inform the country that having ended the war and with our new initiatives in China and the Soviet Union, this is the time for the US to continue to play a forceful role in the world—militarily, economically and diplomatically. The President recalled when he left Washington in 1960, we had an 8 to 1 defense advantage. Today we are behind in throw weight.

With the Vietnam war over, we must inspire the American spirit and accept the role of world leadership. The game is more difficult to play today than before. If the Soviet Union and the PRC continue fighting with one another, that adds to the complexities. Let's not let the impression get around that now that we have gotten out of Vietnam, let's get out of the world. The President then expressed his appreciation to all of those present.

Rogers said that he had spent two days on the Hill and he didn't detect opposition. The President said, "That's combat pay now,"—referring to a trip to the Hill.

The President said that Scott³ had told him in the morning that we would lose our Foreign Assistance Bill 65–34, and was talking about how your leaders are supposed to come in and build you up when you've had a hard day. And, referring to Scott's comment, the President said, "I've had a helluva hard day!"

"The U.S. must play a world role but a different world role. We can't call all the shots; we can't dominate; but, we can't let the world be shaped in a way that would be counter to our interests."

If we can get people in this country proud of their world role and the record in Vietnam, then there is much to be accomplished. But if you tell them that it was all in vain, we will never get them to try again. "This country needs a sense of direction; this country needs a sense of pride; this country needs a positive attitude," the President said.

³ Senate Minority Leader Hugh Scott (R-Pennsylvania).

5. Message to the Congress Transmitting President Nixon's First Annual International Economic Report¹

Washington, March 22, 1973.

To the Congress of the United States:

The Nation is again at peace. We also are firmly on the course of strong economic growth at home. Now we must turn more of our attention to the urgent problems we face in our economic dealings with other nations. International problems may seem to some of us to be far away, but they have a very direct impact on the jobs, the incomes and the living standards of our people. Neither the peace we have achieved nor the economic growth essential to our national welfare will last if we leave such matters unattended, for they can diminish our prosperity at home and at the same time provoke harmful friction abroad.

Our major difficulties stem from relying too long upon outdated economic arrangements and institutions despite the rapid changes which have taken place in the world. Many countries we helped to rebuild after World War II are now our strong economic competitors. Americans can no longer act as if these historic developments had not taken place. We must do a better job of preparing ourselves—both in the private sector and in the Government—to compete more effectively in world markets, so that expanding trade can bring greater benefits to our people.

In the summer of 1971, this Administration initiated fundamental changes in American foreign economic policy.² We have also introduced proposals for the reform of the international monetary and trading systems which have lost their ability to deal with current problems. The turmoil in world monetary affairs has demonstrated clearly that greater urgency must now be attached to constructive reform.

¹ Source: *Public Papers: Nixon, 1973*, pp. 219–220. Nixon's message and the first annual report of the Council on International Economic Policy were printed in a 94-page booklet entitled "International Economic Report of the President, Transmitted to the Congress March 1973." Nixon had underscored the necessity for international monetary reform in his January 31 economic report to Congress: "Nowhere is the need to make 1973 a year of economic reform more apparent than in our international relations." (*Ibid.*, p. 51) The administration's Trade Reform bill, submitted to Congress on April 10, subsequently provided a framework for further cooperation and engagement between the United States and other global powers in the world trading system. For the text of the message transmitting the bill to Congress, see *ibid.*, pp. 258–270. See also *Foreign Relations, 1969–1976*, volume XXXI, Foreign Economic Policy, 1973–1976, Document 169.

² A reference to the administration's August 1971 New Economic Policy, which removed the United States from the gold standard. See *ibid.*, volume III, Foreign Economic Policy; International Monetary Policy, 1969–1972, Document 168.

At home, we have continued our fight to maintain price stability and to improve our productivity—objectives which are as important to our international economic position as to our domestic welfare.

What is our next step?

In my State of the Union message on the economy last month, I outlined certain measures to strengthen both our domestic and international economic position. One of the most important is trade reform.³

In choosing an international trade policy which will benefit all Americans, I have concluded that we must face up to more intense long-term competition in the world's markets rather than shrink from it. Those who would have us turn inward, hiding behind a shield of import restrictions of indefinite duration, might achieve short-term gains and benefit certain groups, but they would exact a high cost from the economy as a whole. Those costs would be borne by all of us in the form of higher prices and lower real income. Only in response to unfair competition, or the closing of markets abroad to our goods, or to provide time for adjustment, would such restrictive measures be called for.

My approach is based both on my strong faith in the ability of Americans to compete, and on my confidence that all nations will recognize their own vital interest in lowering economic barriers and applying fairer and more effective trading rules.

The fact that most of these comments are addressed to the role of our Government should not divert attention from the vital role which private economic activity will play in resolving our current problems. The cooperation and the initiative of all sectors of our economy are needed to increase our productivity and to keep our prices competitive. This is essential to our international trading position. Yet there are certain necessary steps which only the Government can take, given the worldwide scope of trading activity and the need for broad international agreement to expand trade fairly and effectively. I am determined that we shall take those steps.

I know that the American people and their representatives in the Congress can be counted on to rise to the challenge of the changing world economy. Together we must do what is needed to further the prosperity of our country, and of the world in which we live.

Richard Nixon

³ Breaking with tradition, Nixon delivered six shorter State of the Union messages to Congress during February and March 1973: an overview and five messages focusing upon natural resources and the environment, human resources, community development, law enforcement and drug abuse prevention, and the economy. While primarily domestic in theme and scope, the economic message contained several references to improving American relationships with its global trading partners. See *Public Papers: Nixon, 1973*, pp. 117–124.

6. Address by President Nixon¹

Washington, March 29, 1973.

Good evening:

Four years and two months ago, when I first came into this office as President, by far the most difficult problem confronting the Nation was the seemingly endless war in Vietnam. Five hundred and fifty thousand Americans were in Vietnam. As many as 300 a week were being killed in action. Hundreds were held as prisoners of war in North Vietnam. No progress was being made at the peace negotiations.

I immediately initiated a program to end the war and win an honorable peace.

Eleven times over the past 4 years I have reported to the Nation from this room on the progress we have made toward that goal. Tonight, the day we have all worked and prayed for has finally come.

For the first time in 12 years, no American military forces are in Vietnam. All of our American POW's are on their way home. The 17 million people of South Vietnam have the right to choose their own government without outside interference, and because of our program of Vietnamization, they have the strength to defend that right. We have prevented the imposition of a Communist government by force on South Vietnam.

There are still some problem areas. The provisions of the agreement requiring an accounting for all missing in action in Indochina, the provisions with regard to Laos and Cambodia, the provisions prohibiting infiltration from North Vietnam into South Vietnam have not been complied with. We have and will continue to comply with the agreement. We shall insist that North Vietnam comply with the agreement. And the leaders of North Vietnam should have no doubt as to the consequences if they fail to comply with the agreement.

But despite these difficulties, we can be proud tonight of the fact that we have achieved our goal of obtaining an agreement which provides peace with honor in Vietnam.

On this day, let us honor those who made this achievement possible: those who sacrificed their lives, those who were disabled, those who made every one of us proud to be an American as they returned from years of Communist imprisonment, and every one of the 2½ million Americans who served honorably in our Nation's longest war.

¹ Source: *Public Papers: Nixon, 1973*, pp. 234–238. The President spoke at 9:01 p.m. from the White House Oval Office. His address was broadcast live on nationwide radio and television networks.

Never have men served with greater devotion abroad with less apparent support at home.

Let us provide these men with the veterans benefits and the job opportunities they have earned. Let us honor them with the respect they deserve. And I say again tonight, let us not dishonor those who served their country by granting amnesty to those who deserted America.

Tonight I want to express the appreciation of the Nation to others who helped make this day possible. I refer to you, the great majority of Americans listening to me tonight, who, despite an unprecedented barrage of criticism from a small but vocal minority, stood firm for peace with honor. I know it was not easy for you to do so.

We have been through some difficult times together. I recall the time in November 1969 when hundreds of thousands of demonstrators marched on the White House, the time in April 1970 when I found it necessary to order attacks on Communist bases in Cambodia, the time in May 1972 when I ordered the mining of Haiphong and airstrikes on military targets in North Vietnam in order to stop a massive Communist offensive in South Vietnam, and then—and this was perhaps the hardest decision I have made as President—on December 18, 1972, when our hopes for peace were so high and when the North Vietnamese stonewalled us at the conference table, I found it necessary to order more airstrikes on military targets in North Vietnam in order to break the deadlock.

On each of these occasions, the voices of opposition we heard in Washington were so loud they at times seemed to be the majority. But across America, the overwhelming majority stood firm against those who advocated peace at any price—even if the price would have been defeat and humiliation for the United States.

Because you stood firm—stood firm for doing what was right—[Air Force Lt.] Colonel [George G.]² McKnight was able to say for his fellow POW's, when he returned home a few days ago, "Thank you for bringing us home on our feet instead of on our knees."

[Omitted here is discussion of domestic budgetary issues.]

As we end America's longest war, let us resolve that we shall not lose the peace. During the past year we have made great progress toward our goal of a generation of peace for America and the world. The war in Vietnam has been ended. After 20 years of hostility and confrontation, we have opened a constructive new relationship with the People's Republic of China where one-fourth of all the people in the world live. We negotiated last year with the Soviet Union a number of

² Brackets are in the original.

important agreements, including an agreement which takes a major step in limiting nuclear arms.

Now there are some who say that in view of all this progress toward peace, why not cut our defense budget?

Well, let's look at the facts. Our defense budget today takes the lowest percentage of our gross national product that it has in 20 years. There is nothing I would like better than to be able to reduce it further. But we must never forget that we would not have made the progress toward lasting peace that we have made in this past year unless we had had the military strength that commanded respect.

This year we have begun new negotiations with the Soviet Union for further limitations on nuclear arms. And we shall be participating later in the year in negotiations for mutual reduction of forces in Europe.

If prior to these negotiations we in the United States unilaterally reduce our defense budget, or reduce our forces in Europe, any chance for successful negotiations for mutual reduction of forces or limitation of arms will be destroyed.

There is one unbreakable rule of international diplomacy. You can't get something in a negotiation unless you have something to give. If we cut our defenses before negotiations begin, any incentive for other nations to cut theirs will go right out the window.

If the United States reduces its defenses and others do not, it will increase the danger of war. It is only a mutual reduction of forces which will reduce the danger of war. And that is why we must maintain our strength until we get agreements under which other nations will join us in reducing the burden of armaments.

What is at stake is whether the United States shall become the second strongest nation in the world. If that day ever comes, the chance for building a new structure of peace in the world would be irreparably damaged, and free nations everywhere would be living in mortal danger.

A strong United States is not a threat to peace. It is the free world's indispensable guardian of peace and freedom.

I ask for your support tonight, for keeping the strength—the strength which enabled us to make such great progress toward world peace in the past year and which is indispensable as we continue our bold new initiatives for peace in the years ahead.

As we consider some of our problems tonight, let us never forget how fortunate we are to live in America at this time in our history. We have ended the longest and most difficult war in our history in a way that maintains the trust of our allies and the respect of our adversaries. We are the strongest and most prosperous nation in the world. Because

of our strength, America has the magnificent opportunity to play the leading role of bringing down the walls of hostility which divide the people of the world, in reducing the burden of armaments in the world, of building a structure of lasting peace in the world. And because of our wealth, we have the means to move forward at home on exciting new programs—programs for progress which will provide better environment, education, housing, and health care for all Americans and which will enable us to be more generous to the poor, the elderly, the disabled, and the disadvantaged than any nation in the history of the world.

These are goals worthy of a great people. Let us, therefore, put aside those honest differences about war which have divided us and dedicate ourselves to meet the great challenges of peace which can unite us. As we do, let us not overlook a third element, an element more important even than military might or economic power, because it is essential for greatness in a nation.

The pages of history are strewn with the wreckage of nations which fell by the wayside at the height of their strength and wealth because their people became weak, soft, and self-indulgent and lost the character and the spirit which had led to their greatness.

As I speak to you tonight, I am confident that will not happen to America. And my confidence has been increased by the fact that a war which cost America so much in lives and money and division at home has, as it ended, provided an opportunity for millions of Americans to see again the character and the spirit which made America a great nation.

A few days ago in this room, I talked to a man who had spent almost 8 years in a Communist prison camp in North Vietnam.³ For over 4 years he was in solitary confinement. In that 4-year period he never saw and never talked to another human being except his Communist captors. He lived on two meals a day, usually just a piece of bread, a bowl of soup. All he was given to read was Communist propaganda. All he could listen to was the Communist propaganda on radio.

I asked him how he was able to survive it and come home, standing tall and proud, saluting the American flag. He paused a long time before he answered. And then he said, "It is difficult for me to answer. I am not very good at words. All I can say is that it was faith—faith in God and faith in my country."

³ The President was referring to Col. Robinson Risner, USAF, with whom he met on March 12, 1973. On the same day, the President also met with former prisoner of war Capt. Jeremiah A. Denton, Jr., USN. [Footnote is in the original.]

If men who suffered so much for America can have such faith, let us who have received so much from America renew our faith—our faith in God, our faith in our country, and our faith in ourselves.

If we meet the great challenges of peace that lie ahead with this kind of faith, then one day it will be written: This was America's finest hour.

Thank you and good evening.

7. Secretary of State Rogers's Annual Report on U.S. Foreign Policy¹

Washington, April 19, 1973.

1973—A YEAR OF BUILDING

1973 will be a year of building in American foreign policy—for in 1973 we will be initiating new negotiations and developing new relationships which could determine the political-economic structure of the world for the remainder of this century. As President Nixon stated in his second Inaugural Address: "We are embarking on an era that presents challenges as great as those any nation or any generation has ever faced."²

We have reached this formative stage in international affairs as a result of the dramatic changes of the past year, changes due in substantial measure to innovations we began to introduce into American foreign policy four years ago.

We can take special pride in the four accomplishments of last year that are enabling us to complete the transition from the concerns of the past to the construction of a new and more peaceful international environment.

—The profound transformation the United States brought about during 1972 in our relations with the People's Republic of China is

¹ Source: Department of State *Bulletin*, May 7, 1973, pp. 545–557. The complete 743-page report is entitled "United States Foreign Policy 1972: A Report of the Secretary of State." Rogers sent the report to Congress on April 19 under a transmittal letter, in which he noted that "1973 will be a year of building, a year of intensive negotiations that will move us forward into the structure of peace which President Nixon has made our foremost national goal." (*Ibid.*, p. 545)

² See *Public Papers: Nixon*, 1973, pp. 12–15.

opening new opportunities for an Asia at peace. A “new start” was the phrase Premier Chou En-lai used in his toast during President Nixon’s first night in Peking. Today—as the first official Americans to reside in Peking since 1949 have already arrived—there is no question that a new start in our relations is being carried forward.³ We are particularly hopeful that progress in U.S.-Chinese relations will lead toward an improving international climate throughout Asia.

—Firm foundations for a new era of cooperative efforts between the world’s two most powerful nations now exist in the aftermath of the Moscow Summit.⁴ A fabric of common interests and of instruments of cooperation is being created that will serve to perpetuate better relations. And agreements to limit offensive and defensive arms have been concluded that may well be viewed historically as the critical point when risks of nuclear conflict between us turned permanently downward.

—The flash point of Europe’s dangers for 25 years, Berlin, has been defused, and the Quadripartite Agreement⁵ has proven to be a major stimulant to favorable evolution in the European situation. Not only has the inner German agreement followed, but movement toward conferences on European security and cooperation and on mutual and balanced force reductions has been hastened as a result.

—The Paris Agreement on Vietnam⁶ is bringing an end to this century’s longest war. Though it is yet imperfectly observed a cease-fire has been established in Vietnam and Laos. And a framework for a peaceful environment in Indochina has been established.

[Omitted here are Rogers’s comments on nine areas: European unity, Asian stability, Middle East negotiations, Western Hemispheric ties, African economic growth, expansion of international trade and monetary reform, acceleration of per capita growth in developing nations, multilateral trading arrangements, and international law.]

³ The United States and the PRC established liaison offices in Beijing and Washington in March 1973. Ambassador David K.E. Bruce, who had served as Ambassador to France, Germany, the United Kingdom, and the Paris Peace Talks, was appointed Chief of the United States Liaison Office (USLO). Alfred LeS. Jenkins, Director of the Office of Asian Communist Affairs, Bureau of East Asian and Pacific Affairs, Department of State, and NSC Staff member John H. Holdridge were named as Bruce’s deputies.

⁴ See *Foreign Relations*, 1969–1976, volume XIV, Soviet Union, October 1971–May 1972, Documents 224–302, for documentation on the May 1972 Moscow summit meetings.

⁵ The Quadripartite Agreement, ratified by the West German Bundestag in 1972 and signed by the United States, France, the United Kingdom, and the Soviet Union, regularized relations between the Federal Republic of Germany and the German Democratic Republic and the status of Berlin within the context of the Four-Power relationship. A summary of the treaty’s provisions is *ibid.*, volume XL, Germany and Berlin, 1969–1972, Document 383.

⁶ See Document 1 and footnote 3 thereto.

This introduction can only hope to outline the most important of the Administration's foreign policy objectives. I have elaborated here upon those which collectively give 1973 the characteristic of a year of building—the building of relations and institutions that could determine the course of the rest of the century. Given the President's strong interest and leadership in this effort, we have every reason to expect that further substantial progress toward lasting peace and cooperation will be made in the coming year.

It is now commonplace to hear that there are no more dramatic accomplishments possible in foreign affairs. I do not agree. 1973 can be a dramatic year—not in breaking old patterns but in building new ones, a year when we begin to erect the framework for a generation of peace.

But 1973 will be just beginning. The road ahead will be as difficult and dangerous as it will be promising. It will require the continued perseverance and engagement of this great nation. That is why our foreign policy must continue to be a policy of engagement—engagement with adversaries in building cooperation, engagement with allies on a basis of shared values and interests, engagement with developing nations in the effort to raise the living standards of their people.

For many years the economic and political health of the world has been heavily affected by the state of the American society. Now our condition increasingly is affected by the welfare of others. The degree of interdependence among nations and many of the principal trends of international affairs are succinctly evident in the statistical indicators of the state of the world I have appended to this introduction.⁷ In concise terms they illustrate both the necessity of our engagement in the world and the nature of many of the issues the world must still face.

In my first foreign policy report,⁸ I expressed the hope that we could fashion a foreign policy which would overcome the deep and destructive divisions within this country and restore a sense of common purpose in America's approach to world affairs. Today the obstacles to such a common purpose have been overcome, and we have found a new self-confidence, devoid both of arrogance and of destructive self-doubts. The foreign policy objectives we are setting forth are moderate and constructive ones. It will be my earnest endeavor so to carry them out that the Administration and the Congress, the leadership of both parties, the government and the citizenry can again move forward

⁷ Rogers's report as printed in the Department of State *Bulletin* contains a table entitled "The State of the World in Statistics." Under the headings Human Welfare, Interdependence, and Military, the table traces trends in population, infant mortality, literacy, international travel, energy, and men under arms in 1960, 1965, and 1970. (Department of State *Bulletin*, May 7, 1973, p. 557)

⁸ *United States Foreign Policy, 1969–1970: A Report of the Secretary of State* (Washington: Government Printing Office, 1971).

harmoniously in their support. With such cooperation 1973 will be a year of substantial progress toward the more peaceful and prosperous world we all desire.

8. Address by the President's Assistant for National Security Affairs (Kissinger)¹

New York, April 23, 1973.

The Year of Europe

This year has been called the year of Europe, but not because Europe was less important in 1972 or in 1969. The alliance between the United States and Europe has been the cornerstone of all postwar foreign policy. It provided the political framework for American engagements in Europe and marked the definitive end of U.S. isolationism. It insured the sense of security that allowed Europe to recover from the devastation of the war. It reconciled former enemies. It was the stimulus for an unprecedented endeavor in European unity and the principal means to forge the common policies that safeguarded Western security in an era of prolonged tension and confrontation. Our values, our goals, and our basic interests are most closely identified with those of Europe.

Nineteen seventy-three is the year of Europe because the era that was shaped by decisions of a generation ago is ending.² The success of those policies has produced new realities that require new approaches:

¹ Source: Department of State *Bulletin*, May 14, 1973, pp. 593–598. Kissinger delivered his remarks at the annual meeting of the Associated Press editors, held at the Waldorf-Astoria Hotel. Kissinger recalled that the timing of the speech, preceding the resignations of H.R. Haldeman and John Ehrlichman by a week, “proved disastrous,” and suggested that the Watergate crisis doomed the Year of Europe. (*Years of Upheaval*, pp. 101 and 153)

² In a March 10 draft memorandum to Kissinger, Nixon commented on this transition: “The way the Europeans are talking today, European unity will not be in our interest, certainly not from a political viewpoint or from an economic viewpoint. When we used to talk about European unity, we were thinking in terms of the men who would be at the top of Europe who would be in control. Those men were people that we could get along with. Today, however, when we talk of European unity, and when we look far ahead, we have to recognize the stark fact that a united Europe will be led primarily by Left-leaning or Socialist heads of government.” (National Archives, Nixon Presidential Materials, Staff Member and Office Files, White House Special Files, President’s Personal Files, Memoranda From the President, 1969–1974, Box 4, Memos—April 1973)

—The revival of western Europe is an established fact, as is the historic success of its movement toward economic unification.

—The East-West strategic military balance has shifted from American preponderance to near-equality, bringing with it the necessity for a new understanding of the requirements of our common security.

—Other areas of the world have grown in importance. Japan has emerged as a major power center. In many fields, “Atlantic” solutions to be viable must include Japan.

—We are in a period of relaxation of tensions. But as the rigid divisions of the past two decades diminish, new assertions of national identity and national rivalry emerge.

—Problems have arisen, unforeseen a generation ago, which require new types of cooperative action. Insuring the supply of energy for industrialized nations is an example.

These factors have produced a dramatic transformation of the psychological climate in the West—a change which is the most profound current challenge to Western statesmanship. In Europe, a new generation to whom war and its dislocations are not personal experiences takes stability for granted. But it is less committed to the unity that made peace possible and to the effort required to maintain it. In the United States, decades of global burdens have fostered, and the frustrations of the war in Southeast Asia have accentuated, a reluctance to sustain global involvements on the basis of preponderant American responsibility.

Inevitably this period of transition will have its strains. There have been complaints in America that Europe ignores its wider responsibilities in pursuing economic self-interest too one-sidedly and that Europe is not carrying its fair share of the burden of the common defense. There have been complaints in Europe that America is out to divide Europe economically, or to desert Europe militarily, or to bypass Europe diplomatically. Europeans appeal to the United States to accept their independence and their occasionally severe criticism of us in the name of Atlantic unity, while at the same time they ask for a veto on our independent policies—also in the name of Atlantic unity.

Our challenge is whether a unity forged by a common perception of danger can draw new purpose from shared positive aspirations.

If we permit the Atlantic partnership to atrophy, or to erode through neglect, carelessness, or mistrust, we risk what has been achieved and we shall miss our historic opportunity for even greater achievement.

In the forties and fifties the task was economic reconstruction and security against the danger of attack; the West responded with courage and imagination. Today the need is to make the Atlantic relationship as

dynamic a force in building a new structure of peace, less geared to crisis and more conscious of opportunities, drawing its inspirations from its goals rather than its fears. The Atlantic nations must join in a fresh act of creation equal to that undertaken by the postwar generation of leaders of Europe and America.

This is why the President is embarking on a personal and direct approach to the leaders of western Europe. In his discussions with the heads of government of Britain, Italy, the Federal Republic of Germany, and France, the Secretary General of NATO, and other European leaders, it is the President's purpose to lay the basis for a new era of creativity in the West.

His approach will be to deal with Atlantic problems comprehensively. The political, military, and economic issues in Atlantic relations are linked by reality, not by our choice nor for the tactical purpose of trading one off against the other. The solutions will not be worthy of the opportunity if left to technicians. They must be addressed at the highest level.

In 1972 the President transformed relations with our adversaries to lighten the burdens of fear and suspicion.

In 1973 we can gain the same sense of historical achievement by reinvigorating shared ideals and common purposes with our friends.

The United States proposes to its Atlantic partners that by the time the President travels to Europe toward the end of the year we will have worked out a new Atlantic charter setting the goals for the future, a blueprint that:

- Builds on the past without becoming its prisoner.
- Deals with the problems our success has created.
- Creates for the Atlantic nations a new relationship in whose progress Japan can share.

We ask our friends in Europe, Canada, and ultimately Japan to join us in this effort.

This is what we mean by the year of Europe.

Problems in Atlantic Relationships

The problems in Atlantic relationships are real. They have arisen in part because during the fifties and sixties the Atlantic community organized itself in different ways in the many different dimensions of its common enterprise.

—In economic relations the European Community has increasingly stressed its regional personality; the United States at the same time must act as part of, and be responsible for, a wider international trade and monetary system. We must reconcile these two perspectives.

—In our collective defense we are still organized on the principle of unity and integration, but in radically different strategic conditions. The full implications of this change have yet to be faced.

—Diplomacy is the subject of frequent consultations but is essentially being conducted by traditional nation-states. The United States has global interests and responsibilities. Our European allies have regional interests. These are not necessarily in conflict, but in the new era neither are they automatically identical.

In short, we deal with each other regionally and even competitively on an integrated basis in defense, and as nation-states in diplomacy. When the various collective institutions were rudimentary, the potential inconsistency in their modes of operation was not a problem. But after a generation of evolution and with the new weight and strength of our allies, the various parts of the construction are not always in harmony and sometimes obstruct each other.

If we want to foster unity we can no longer ignore these problems. The Atlantic nations must find a solution for the management of their diversity to serve the common objectives which underlie their unity. We can no longer afford to pursue national or regional self-interest without a unifying framework. We cannot hold together if each country or region asserts its autonomy whenever it is to its benefit and invokes unity to curtail the independence of others.

We must strike a new balance between self-interest and the common interest. We must identify interests and positive values beyond security in order to engage once again the commitment of peoples and parliaments. We need a shared view of the world we seek to build.

Agenda for the Future

Economic

No element of American postwar policy has been more consistent than our support of European unity. We encouraged it at every turn. We knew that a united Europe would be a more independent partner. But we assumed, perhaps too uncritically, that our common interests would be assured by our long history of cooperation. We expected that political unity would follow economic integration and that a unified Europe working cooperatively with us in an Atlantic partnership would ease many of our international burdens.

It is clear that many of these expectations are not being fulfilled.

We and Europe have benefited from European economic integration. Increased trade within Europe has stimulated the growth of European economies and the expansion of trade in both directions across the Atlantic.

But we cannot ignore the fact that Europe's economic success and its transformation from a recipient of our aid to a strong competitor has produced a certain amount of friction. There have been turbulence and a sense of rivalry in international monetary relations.

In trade, the natural economic weight of a market of 250 million people has pressed other states to seek special arrangements to protect their access to it. The prospect of a closed trading system embracing the European Community and a growing number of other nations in Europe, the Mediterranean, and Africa appears to be at the expense of the United States and other nations which are excluded. In agriculture, where the United States has a comparative advantage, we are particularly concerned that Community protective policies may restrict access for our products.

This divergence comes at a time when we are experiencing a chronic and growing deficit in our balance of payments and protectionist pressures of our own. Europeans in turn question our investment policies and doubt our continued commitment to their economic unity.

The gradual accumulation of sometimes petty, sometimes major, economic disputes must be ended and be replaced by a determined commitment on both sides of the Atlantic to find cooperative solutions.

The United States will continue to support the unification of Europe. We have no intention of destroying what we worked so hard to help build. For us, European unity is what it has always been: not an end in itself but a means to the strengthening of the West. We shall continue to support European unity as a component of a larger Atlantic partnership.

This year we begin comprehensive trade negotiations with Europe as well as with Japan. We shall also continue to press the effort to reform the monetary system so that it promotes stability rather than constant disruptions. A new equilibrium must be achieved in trade and monetary relations.

We see these negotiations as a historic opportunity for positive achievement. They must engage the top political leaders, for they require above all a commitment of political will. If they are left solely to the experts the inevitable competitiveness of economic interests will dominate the debate. The influence of pressure groups and special interests will become pervasive. There will be no overriding sense of direction. There will be no framework for the generous solutions or mutual concessions essential to preserve a vital Atlantic partnership.

It is the responsibility of national leaders to insure that economic negotiations serve larger political purposes. They must recognize that economic rivalry, if carried on without restraint, will in the end damage other relationships.

The United States intends to adopt a broad political approach that does justice to our overriding political interest in an open and balanced trading order with both Europe and Japan. This is the spirit of the President's trade bill³ and of his speech to the International Monetary Fund⁴ last year. It will guide our strategy in the trade and monetary talks. We see these negotiations not as a test of strength, but as a test of joint statesmanship.

Defense

Atlantic unity has always come most naturally in the field of defense. For many years the military threats to Europe were unambiguous, the requirements to meet them were generally agreed on both sides of the Atlantic, and America's responsibility was preeminent and obvious. Today we remain united on the objective of collective defense, but we face the new challenge of maintaining it under radically changed strategic conditions and with the new opportunity of enhancing our security through negotiated reductions of forces.

The West no longer holds the nuclear predominance that permitted it in the fifties and sixties to rely almost solely on a strategy of massive nuclear retaliation. Because under conditions of nuclear parity such a strategy invites mutual suicide, the alliance must have other choices. The collective ability to resist attack in western Europe by means of flexible responses has become central to a rational strategy and crucial to the maintenance of peace. For this reason, the United States has maintained substantial conventional forces in Europe and our NATO allies have embarked on a significant effort to modernize and improve their own military establishments.

While the Atlantic alliance is committed to a strategy of flexible response in principle, the requirements of flexibility are complex and expensive. Flexibility by its nature requires sensitivity to new conditions and continual consultation among the allies to respond to changing circumstances. And we must give substance to the defense posture that our strategy defines. Flexible response cannot be simply a slogan wrapped around the defense structure that emerges from lowest-common-denominator compromises driven by domestic considerations. It must be seen by ourselves and by potential adversaries as a credible, substantial, and rational posture of defense.

A great deal remains to be accomplished to give reality to the goal of flexible response:

³ See footnote 1, Document 5.

⁴ Nixon addressed the Board of Governors of the International Monetary Fund and the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development on September 25, 1972. See *Public Papers: Nixon, 1972*, pp. 907–911.

—There are deficiencies in important areas of our conventional defense.

—There are still unresolved issues in our doctrine; for example, on the crucial question of the role of tactical nuclear weapons.

—There are anomalies in NATO deployments as well as in its logistics structure.

To maintain the military balance that has insured stability in Europe for 25 years, the alliance has no choice but to address these needs and to reach an agreement on our defense requirements. This task is all the more difficult because the lessening of tensions has given new impetus to arguments that it is safe to begin reducing forces unilaterally. And unbridled economic competition can sap the impulse for common defense. All governments of the Western alliance face a major challenge in educating their peoples to the realities of security in the 1970's.

The President has asked me to state that America remains committed to doing its fair share in Atlantic defense. He is adamantly opposed to unilateral withdrawals of U.S. forces from Europe. But we owe to our peoples a rational defense posture, at the safest minimum size and cost, with burdens equitably shared. This is what the President believes must result from the dialogue with our allies in 1973.

When this is achieved, the necessary American forces will be maintained in Europe, not simply as a hostage to trigger our nuclear weapons but as an essential contribution to an agreed and intelligible structure of Western defense. This, too, will enable us to engage our adversaries intelligently in negotiations for mutual balanced reductions.

In the next few weeks the United States will present to NATO the product of our own preparations for the negotiations on mutual balanced force reductions which will begin this year.⁵ We hope that it will be a contribution to a broader dialogue on security. Our approach is designed not from the point of view of special American interests, but of general alliance interests. Our position will reflect the President's view that these negotiations are not a subterfuge to withdraw U.S. forces regardless of consequences. No formula for reductions is defensible, whatever its domestic appeal or political rationale, if it undermines security.

Our objective in the dialogue on defense is a new consensus on security, addressed to new conditions and to the hopeful new possibilities of effective arms limitations.

⁵ The negotiations formally began in Vienna on October 30.

Diplomacy

We have entered a truly remarkable period of East-West diplomacy. The last two years have produced an agreement on Berlin, a treaty between West Germany and the U.S.S.R., a strategic arms limitation agreement, the beginning of negotiations on a European Security Conference and on mutual balanced force reductions, and a series of significant practical bilateral agreements between Western and Eastern countries, including a dramatic change in bilateral relations between the United States and the U.S.S.R. These were not isolated actions, but steps on a course charted in 1969 and carried forward as a collective effort. Our approach to détente stressed that negotiations had to be concrete, not atmospheric, and that concessions should be reciprocal. We expect to carry forward the policy of relaxation of tensions on this basis.

Yet this very success has created its own problems. There is an increasing uneasiness—all the more insidious for rarely being made explicit—that superpower diplomacy might sacrifice the interests of traditional allies and other friends. Where our allies' interests have been affected by our bilateral negotiations, as in the talks on the limitation of strategic arms, we have been scrupulous in consulting them; where our allies are directly involved, as in the negotiations on mutual balanced force reductions, our approach is to proceed jointly on the basis of agreed positions. Yet some of our friends in Europe have seemed unwilling to accord America the same trust in our motives as they received from us or to grant us the same tactical flexibility that they employed in pursuit of their own policies. The United States is now often taken to task for flexibility where we used to be criticized for rigidity.

All of this underlines the necessity to articulate a clear set of common objectives together with our allies. Once that is accomplished, it will be quite feasible, indeed desirable, for the several allies to pursue these goals with considerable tactical flexibility. If we agree on common objectives it will become a technical question whether a particular measure is pursued in a particular forum or whether to proceed bilaterally or multilaterally. Then those allies who seek reassurances of America's commitment will find it not in verbal reaffirmations of loyalty, but in an agreed framework of purpose.

We do not need to agree on all policies. In many areas of the world our approaches will differ, especially outside of Europe. But we do require an understanding of what should be done jointly and of the limits we should impose on the scope of our autonomy.

We have no intention of buying an illusory tranquillity at the expense of our friends. The United States will never knowingly sacrifice the interests of others. But the perception of common interests is not automatic; it requires constant redefinition. The relaxation of tensions to which we are committed makes allied cohesion indispensable yet more

difficult. We must insure that the momentum of détente is maintained by common objectives rather than by drift, escapism, or complacency.

America's Contribution

The agenda I have outlined here is not an American prescription, but an appeal for a joint effort of creativity. The historic opportunity for this generation is to build a new structure of international relations for the decades ahead. A revitalized Atlantic partnership is indispensable for it. The United States is prepared to make its contribution:

—We will continue to support European unity. Based on the principles of partnership, we will make concessions to its further growth. We will expect to be met in a spirit of reciprocity.

—We will not disengage from our solemn commitments to our allies. We will maintain our forces and not withdraw from Europe unilaterally. In turn, we expect from each ally a fair share of the common effort for the common defense.

—We shall continue to pursue the relaxation of tensions with our adversaries on the basis of concrete negotiations in the common interest. We welcome the participation of our friends in a constructive East-West dialogue.

—We will never consciously injure the interests of our friends in Europe or in Asia. We expect in return that their policies will take seriously our interests and our responsibilities.

—We are prepared to work cooperatively on new common problems we face. Energy, for example, raises the challenging issues of assurance of supply, impact of oil revenues on international currency stability, the nature of common political and strategic interests, and long-range relations of oil-consuming to oil-producing countries. This could be an area of competition; it should be an area of collaboration.

—Just as Europe's autonomy is not an end in itself, so the Atlantic community cannot be an exclusive club. Japan must be a principal partner in our common enterprise.

We hope that our friends in Europe will meet us in this spirit. We have before us the example of the great accomplishments of the past decades and the opportunity to match and dwarf them. This is the task ahead. This is how, in the 1970's, the Atlantic nations can truly serve our peoples and the cause of peace.

9. President Nixon's Fourth Annual Report to the Congress on U.S. Foreign Policy¹

Washington, May 3, 1973.

[Omitted here is the table of contents.]

INTRODUCTION

In January 1969, America needed to change the philosophy and practice of its foreign policy.

Whoever took office four years ago would have faced this challenge. After a generation, the postwar world had been transformed and demanded a fresh approach. It was not a question of our previous policies having failed; indeed, in many areas they had been very successful. It was rather that new conditions, many of them achievements of our policies, summoned new perspectives.

The World We Found

The international environment was dominated by seemingly intractable confrontation between the two major nuclear powers. Throughout the nuclear age both the fears of war and hopes for peace revolved around our relations with the Soviet Union. Our growing nuclear arsenals were largely directed at each other. We alone had the capacity to wreak catastrophic damage across the planet. Our ideologies clashed. We both had global interests, and this produced many friction points. We each led and dominated a coalition of opposing states.

As a result, our relationship was generally hostile. There were positive interludes, but these were often atmospheric and did not get at the roots of tension. Accords were reached on particular questions, but there was no broad momentum in our relationship. Improvements in the climate were quickly replaced by confrontation and, occasionally, crisis. The basic pattern was a tense jockeying for tactical advantage around the globe.

This was dangerous and unsatisfactory. The threat of a major conflict between us hung over the world. This in turn exacerbated local and regional tensions. And our two countries not only risked collision but were constrained from working positively on common problems.

¹ Source: *Public Papers: Nixon, 1973*, pp. 348–518. The report was issued by the White House in a 234-page booklet entitled “U.S. Foreign Policy for the 1970’s: Shaping a Durable Peace; A Report to Congress by Richard Nixon, President of the United States, May 3, 1973.” Under a November 16, 1972, covering memorandum, Rogers forwarded to Kissinger a paper entitled “Themes and Textual Suggestions for the President’s Annual Review of American Foreign Policy.” (National Archives, Nixon Presidential Materials, NSC Files, Subject Files, Box 328, The President’s Annual Review of Foreign Policy 1972 (Agency Submissions) Vol I)

The weight of China rested outside the international framework. This was due partly to its own attitude and its preoccupation with internal problems, and partly to the policies of the outside world, most importantly the United States. In any event, this Administration inherited two decades of mutual estrangement and hostility. Here the problem was not one of a fluctuating relationship but rather of having no relationship at all. The People's Republic of China was separated not only from us but essentially from the world as a whole.

China also exemplified the great changes that had occurred in the Communist world. For years our guiding principle was containment of what we considered a monolithic challenge. In the 1960's the forces of nationalism dissolved Communist unity into divergent centers of power and doctrine, and our foreign policy began to differentiate among the Communist capitals. But this process could not be truly effective so long as we were cut off from one-quarter of the globe's people. China in turn was emerging from its isolation and might be more receptive to overtures from foreign countries.

The gulf between China and the world distorted the international landscape. We could not effectively reduce tensions in Asia without talking to Peking. China's isolation compounded its own sense of insecurity. There could not be a stable world order with a major power remaining outside and hostile to it.

Our principal alliances with Western Europe and Japan needed adjustment. After the devastation of the Second World War we had helped allies and former adversaries alike. Fueled by our assistance and secure behind our military shield, they regained their economic vigor and political confidence.

Throughout the postwar period our bonds with Europe had rested on American prescriptions as well as resources. We provided much of the leadership and planning for common defense. We took the diplomatic lead. The dollar was unchallenged. But by the time this Administration took office, the tide was flowing toward greater economic and political assertiveness by our allies. European unity which we had always encouraged, was raising new issues in Atlantic relations. The economic revival of Europe was straining the Atlantic monetary and commercial framework. The relaxation of tensions with the Communist world was generating new doctrines of defense and diplomacy.

The imperatives of change were equally evident in our Pacific partnership with Japan. Its recovery of strength and self-assurance carried political and psychological implications for our relationship. Its spectacular economic growth had made it the world's third industrial power; our entire economic relationship was undergoing transformation. The earlier paternalism of U.S.-Japanese relations no longer suited either partner.

The Vietnam war dominated our attention and was sapping our self-confidence. Our role and our costs had steadily grown without decisive impact on the conflict. The outlook at the conference table was bleak. The war was inhibiting our policy abroad and fostering dissent and self-doubt at home. There was no prospect of either an end to the fighting or an end to our involvement.

Although the historical imperatives for a new international approach existed independently, the war made this challenge at once more urgent and more difficult. More than any other factor, it threatened to exhaust the American people's willingness to sustain a reliable foreign policy. As much as any other factor, the way we treated it would shape overseas attitudes and American psychology.

The context for our national security policy was fundamentally altered. From the mid-1940's to the late 1960's we had moved from America's nuclear monopoly to superiority to rough strategic balance with the Soviet Union. This created fresh challenges to our security and introduced new calculations in our diplomacy. The U.S. defense effort remained disproportionate to that of our allies who had grown much stronger. The threats from potential enemies were more varied and less blatant than during the more rigid bipolar era. These changes, combined with spiraling military costs and the demands of domestic programs, were prompting reexamination of our defense doctrines and posture. They were underlining the importance of arms control as an element in national security. They were also leading some in this country to call for policies that would seriously jeopardize our safety and world stability.

Around the world, friends were ready for a greater role in shaping their own security and well-being. In the 1950's and 1960's other nations had looked to America for ideas and resources, and they found us a willing provider of both. Our motives were sound, the needs were clear, and we had many successes. By 1969, scores of new nations, having emerged from colonial status or dependency on major powers, were asserting themselves with greater assurance and autonomy.

Four years ago this growing capacity of friends was not reflected in the balance of contributions to security and development. This meant that others could do more, and the United States need do proportionately less, in the provision of material resources. More fundamentally, it meant that increasingly the devising of plans belonged outside of Washington. The sweeping American presence was likely to strain our capabilities and to stifle the initiative of others.

There were new issues that called for global cooperation. These challenges were not susceptible to national solutions or relevant to national ideologies. The vast frontiers of space and the oceans beckoned international exploration for humanity's gain. Pollution of air, sea, and land could not be contained behind national frontiers. The brutal tools of as-

sassination, kidnapping, and hijacking could be used to further any cause in any country. No nation's youth was immune from the scourge of international drug traffic. The immediate tragedies of national disasters and the longer-term threat of overpopulation were humanitarian, not political, concerns.

At home we faced pressures that threatened to swing America from over-extension in the world to heedless withdrawal from it. The American people had supported the burdens of global leadership with enthusiasm and generosity into the 1960's. But after almost three decades, our enthusiasm was waning and the results of our generosity were being questioned. Our policies needed change, not only to match new realities in the world but also to meet a new mood in America. Many Americans were no longer willing to support the sweeping range of our postwar role. It had drained our financial, and especially our psychological, reserves. Our friends clearly were able to do more. The Vietnam experience was hastening our awareness of change. Voices in this country were claiming that we had to jettison global concerns and turn inward in order to meet our domestic problems.

Therefore the whole underpinning of our foreign policy was in jeopardy. The bipartisan consensus that once existed for a vigorous American internationalism was now being torn apart. Some of the most active proponents of America's commitment in the world in previous decades were now pressing for indiscriminate disengagement. What was once seen as America's overseas obligation was now seen as our overseas preoccupation. What was once viewed as America's unselfishness was now viewed as our naivete. By 1969 we faced the danger that public backing for a continuing world role might be swept away by fatigue, frustration and over-reaction.

This Administration's Approach

We were determined to shape new policies to deal with each of these problems. But our first requirement was philosophic. We needed a fresh vision to inspire and to integrate our efforts.

We began with the conviction that a major American commitment to the world continued to be indispensable. The many changes in the postwar landscape did not alter this central fact. America's strength was so vast, our involvement so broad, and our concerns so deep, that to remove our influence would set off tremors around the globe. Friends would despair, adversaries would be tempted, and our own national security would soon be threatened. There was no escaping the reality of our enormous influence for peace.

But the new times demanded a new definition of our involvement. For more than a score of years our foreign policy had been driven by a global mission that only America could fulfill—to furnish political

leadership, provide for the common defense, and promote economic development. Allies were weak and other nations were young, threats were palpable and American power was dominant.

By 1969, a mission of this scale was no longer valid abroad or supportable at home. Allies had grown stronger and young nations were maturing, threats were diversified and American power was offset. It was time to move from a paternal mission *for* others to a cooperative mission *with* others. Convinced as we were that a strong American role remained essential for world stability, we knew, too, that a peace that depends primarily on the exertions of one nation is inherently fragile.

So we saw the potential and the imperative of a pluralistic world. We believed we could move from an environment of emergencies to a more stable international system. We made our new purpose a global structure of peace—comprehensive because it would draw on the efforts of other countries; durable because if countries helped to build it, they would also help to maintain it.

To pursue this fundamental vision, we had to move across a wide and coordinated front, with mutually reinforcing policies for each challenge we faced.

Peace could not depend solely on the uneasy equilibrium between two nuclear giants. We had a responsibility to work for positive relations with the Soviet Union. But there was ample proof that assertions of good will or transitory changes in climate would not erase the hard realities of ideological opposition, geopolitical rivalry, competing alliances, or military competition. We were determined not to lurch along—with isolated agreements vulnerable to sudden shifts of course in political relations, with peaks and valleys based on atmosphere, with incessant tension and maneuvering. We saw as well that there were certain mutual interests that we could build upon. As the two powers capable of global destruction, we had a common stake in preserving peace.

Thus we decided to follow certain principles in our policy toward the Soviet Union. We would engage in concrete negotiations designed to produce specific agreements, both where differences existed and where cooperation was possible. We would work with Moscow across a broad front, believing that progress in one area would induce progress in others. Through the gathering momentum of individual accords we would seek to create vested interests on both sides in restraint and the strengthening of peace. But this process would require a reduction in tactical maneuvering at each other's expense in favor of our shared interest in avoiding calamitous collision, in profiting from cooperation, and in building a more stable world.

Peace could not exclude a fourth of humanity. The longer-term prospects for peace required a new relationship with the People's Republic of China. Only if China's weight was reflected in the international

system would it have the incentive, and sense of shared responsibility, to maintain the peace. Furthermore, the time was past when one nation could claim to speak for a bloc of states; we would deal with countries on the basis of their actions, not abstract ideological formulas. Our own policies could be more flexible if we did not assume the permanent enmity of China. The United States had a traditional interest in an independent and peaceful China. We seemed to have no fundamental interests that need collide in the longer sweep of history. There was, indeed, rich potential benefit for our two peoples in a more normal relationship.

So we launched a careful process of private diplomacy and public steps to engage the People's Republic of China with us and involve it more fully in the world. We did so, confident that a strong, independent China was in our national interest; resolved that such a process need not—and would not—be aimed at any other country; and looking for a reciprocal attitude on the part of the Chinese.

Peace must draw upon the vitality of our friends. Our alliances with Western Europe and Japan would continue as major pillars of our foreign policy, but they had not kept pace with the changed international environment. We thus sought to forge more equal partnerships based on a more balanced contribution of both resources and plans.

America had been the automatic source of political leadership and economic power. Now we needed new modes of action that would accommodate our partners' new dynamism. The challenge was to reconcile traditional unity with new diversity. While complete integration of policy was impossible, pure unilateralism would be destructive.

Before, we were allied in containment of a unified Communist danger. Now Communism had taken various forms; our alliances had stabilized the European and Northeast Asian environments; and we had laid the foundations for negotiation. We had to decide together not only what we were against, but what we were for.

Peace required the ending of an ongoing war. Our approach to the Vietnam conflict and our shaping of a new foreign policy were inextricably linked. Naturally, our most urgent concern was to end the war. But we had to end it—or at least our involvement—in a way that would continue to make possible a responsible American role in the world.

We could not continue on the course we inherited, which promised neither an end to the conflict nor to our involvement. At the same time, we would not abandon our friends, for we wanted to shape a structure of peace based in large measure on American steadiness. So we sought peace with honor—through negotiation if possible, through Vietnamization if the enemy gave us no choice. The phased shifting of defense responsibilities to the South Vietnamese would give them the time and means to adjust. It would assure the American people that our

own involvement was not open-ended. It would preserve our credibility abroad and our cohesion at home.

Given the enemy's attitude, peace was likely to take time, and other problems in the world could not wait. So we moved promptly to shape a new approach to allies and adversaries. And by painting on this larger canvas we sought both to put the Vietnam war in perspective and to speed its conclusion by demonstrating to Hanoi that continued conflict did not frustrate our global policies.

Peace needed America's strength. Modifications in our defense policy were required, but one central truth persisted—neither our nation nor peace in the world could be secure without our military power. If superiority was no longer practical, inferiority would be unthinkable.

We were determined to maintain a national defense second to none. This would be a force for stability in a world of evolving partnerships and changing doctrines. This was essential to maintain the confidence of our friends and the respect of our adversaries. At the same time, we would seek energetically to promote national and international security through arms control negotiations.

Peace involved a fresh dimension of international cooperation. A new form of multilateral diplomacy was prompted by a new set of issues. These challenges covered a wide range—the promise of exploration, the pollution of our planet, the perils of crime—but they were alike in going beyond the traditional considerations of doctrine and geography. They required cooperation that reached not only across boundaries but often around the globe. So we resolved to work both with friends and adversaries, in the United Nations and other forums, to practice partnership on a global scale.

Above all, peace demanded the responsible participation of all nations. With great efforts during the postwar period we had promoted the revitalization of former powers and the growing assurance of new states. For this changed world we needed a new philosophy that would reflect and reconcile two basic principles: *A structure of peace requires the greater participation of other nations, but it also requires the sustained participation of the United States.*

To these ends, we developed the Nixon Doctrine of shared responsibilities.² This Doctrine was central to our approach to major allies in the Atlantic and Pacific. But it also shaped our attitude toward those in

² During a tour of Asia in July 1969, Nixon outlined what would become one of the major foreign policy themes of his administration. In reference to the U.S. role vis-à-vis Asia, Nixon declared that the United States would stand by its treaty commitments but expect Asian nations to shoulder their own defense burdens. For additional information on the Nixon Doctrine, see *Foreign Relations, 1969–1976*, volume I, *Foundations of Foreign Policy, 1969–1972*, Document 29, and *Public Papers: Nixon, 1969*, pp. 544–556.

Latin America, Asia, and Africa with whom we were working in formal alliances or friendship.

Our primary purpose was to invoke greater efforts by others—not so much to lighten our burdens as to increase their commitment to a new and peaceful structure. This would mean that increasingly they would man their own defenses and furnish more of the funds for their security and economic development. The corollary would be the reduction of the American share of defense or financial contributions.

More fundamental than this material redistribution, however, was a psychological reorientation. Nations had habitually relied on us for political leadership. Much time and energy went into influencing decisions in Washington. Our objective now was to encourage them to play a greater role in formulating plans and programs. For when others design their security and their development, they make their destiny truly their own. And when plans are their plans, they are more motivated to make them realities.

The lowering of our profile was not an end in itself. Other countries needed to do more, but they could not do so without a concerned America. Their role had to be increased, but this would prove empty unless we did what we must. We could not go from overinvolvement to neglect. A changing world needed the continuity of America's strength.

Thus we made clear that the Nixon Doctrine represented a new definition of American leadership, not abandonment of that leadership. In my 1971 Report,³ I set forth the need for a responsible balance:

"The Nixon Doctrine recognizes that we cannot abandon friends, and must not transfer burdens too swiftly. We must strike a balance between doing too much and thus preventing self-reliance, and doing too little and thus undermining self-confidence.

"The balance we seek abroad is crucial. We only compound insecurity if we modify our protective or development responsibilities without giving our friends the time and the means to adjust, materially and psychologically, to a new form of American participation in the world.

"Precipitate shrinking of the American role would not bring peace. It would not reduce America's stake in a turbulent world. It would not solve our problems, either abroad or at home."

Peace had a domestic dimension. Steadiness abroad required steadiness at home. America could continue to make its vital contribution in the world only if Americans understood the need and supported the ef-

³ For Nixon's second annual report on U.S. foreign policy, February 25, 1971, see *Public Papers: Nixon, 1971*, pp. 219–345.

fort to do so. But understanding and support for a responsible foreign policy were in serious jeopardy in 1969. Years of burdens, Cold War tensions, and a difficult war threatened to undermine our constancy.

While new policies were required to meet transformed conditions abroad, they were equally imperative because of the changing climate at home. Americans needed a new positive vision of the world and our place in it. In order to continue to do what only America could, we had to demonstrate that our friends were doing more. While maintaining strong defenses, we also had to seek national security through negotiations with adversaries. And where American families were most directly affected, we had to gain a peace with honor to win domestic support for our new foreign policy as well as to make it credible abroad.

We have thus paid great attention, as in these Reports, to the articulation, as well as the implementation, of our new role in the world.

[Omitted here are the remainder of the introduction, discussing accomplishments, disappointments, and goals, and the 158-page body of the report, which is divided into 7 parts.]

CONCLUSION

In the past four years, there have been fundamental changes and signal successes. We have cleared away vestiges of the past. We have erased or moderated hostilities. And we are strengthening partnerships.

The specific events or policies, however important, reflect a more profound enterprise. We are seeking the philosophical, as well as the practical, reorientation of our foreign policy. This is the primary challenge of a radically different world. If America is to provide the leadership that only it can, Americans must identify with new visions and purposes.

As we look toward this nation's two hundredth birthday, we shall continue our efforts—with the people and the Congress—to create this new consensus.

In the transition from the bipolar world of American predominance to the multipolar world of shared responsibilities, certain themes need emphasis. They indicate not only what our approach is, but what it is not.

We seek a stable structure, not a classical balance of power. Undeniably, national security must rest upon a certain equilibrium between potential adversaries. The United States cannot entrust its destiny entirely, or even largely, to the goodwill of others. Neither can we expect other countries so to mortgage their future. Solid security involves external restraints on potential opponents as well as self-restraint.

Thus a certain balance of power is inherent in any international system and has its place in the one we envision. But it is not the over-

riding concept of our foreign policy. First of all, our approach reflects the realities of the nuclear age. The classical concept of balance of power included continual maneuvering for marginal advantages over others. In the nuclear era this is both unrealistic and dangerous. It is unrealistic because when both sides possess such enormous power, small additional increments cannot be translated into tangible advantage or even usable political strength. And it is dangerous because attempts to seek tactical gains might lead to confrontation which could be catastrophic.

Secondly, our approach includes the element of consensus. All nations, adversaries and friends alike, must have a stake in preserving the international system. They must feel that their principles are being respected and their national interests secured. They must, in short, see positive incentive for keeping the peace, not just the dangers of breaking it. If countries believe global arrangements threaten their vital concerns, they will challenge them. If the international environment meets their vital concerns, they will work to maintain it. Peace requires mutual accommodation as well as mutual restraint.

Negotiation with adversaries does not alter our more fundamental ties with friends. We have made a concerted effort to move from confrontation to negotiation. We have done well. At the same time, our determination to reduce divisions has not eroded distinctions between friends and adversaries. Our alliances remain the cornerstones of our foreign policy. They reflect shared values and purposes. They involve major economic interests. They provide the secure foundation on which to base negotiations.

Although their forms must be adapted to new conditions, these ties are enduring. We have no intention of sacrificing them in efforts to engage adversaries in the shaping of peace. Indeed such efforts cannot succeed, nor can they have lasting meaning, without the bonds of traditional friendships. There is no higher objective than the strengthening of our partnerships.

Détente does not mean the end of danger. Improvements in both the tone and substance of our relations have indeed reduced tensions and heightened the prospects for peace. But these processes are not automatic or easy. They require vigilance and firmness and exertion. Nothing would be more dangerous than to assume prematurely that dangers have disappeared.

Thus we maintain strong military power even as we seek mutual limitation and reduction of arms. We do not mistake climate for substance. We base our policies on the actions and capabilities of others, not just on estimates of their intentions.

Détente is not the same as lasting peace. And peace does not guarantee tranquility or mean the end of contention. The world will hold perils for as far ahead as we can see.

We intend to share responsibilities, not abdicate them. We have emphasized the need for other countries to take on more responsibilities for their security and development. The tangible result has often been a reduction in our overseas presence or our share of contributions. But our purpose is to continue our commitment to the world in ways we can sustain, not to camouflage a retreat. We took these steps only when our friends were prepared for them. They have been successfully carried out because American backing remained steady. They have helped to maintain support in this country for a responsible foreign policy.

I underlined the vital importance of the redefined American role two years ago:

“Our participation remains crucial. Because of the abundance of our resources and the stretch of our technology, America’s impact on the world remains enormous, whether by our action or by our inaction. Our awareness of the world is too keen, and our concern for peace too deep for us to remove the measure of stability which we have provided for the past 25 years.”

Measured against the challenges we faced and the goals we set, we can take satisfaction in the record of the past four years. Our progress has been more marked in reducing tensions than in restructuring partnerships. We have negotiated an end to a war and made future wars less likely by improving relations with major adversaries. Our bonds with old friends have proved durable during these years of profound change. But we are still searching for more balanced relationships. This will be our most immediate concern, even as we pursue our other goals.

Where peace is newly planted, we shall work to make it thrive.

Where bridges have been built, we shall work to make them stronger.

Where friendships have endured, we shall work to make them grow.⁴

During the next four years—with the help of others—we shall continue building an international structure which could silence the sounds of war for the remainder of this century.

⁴ In remarks recorded for radio broadcast on May 3, Nixon added the following sentence: “We shall keep America strong, involved in the world, meeting the responsibilities which no other free nation is able to meet in building a structure of peace.” (*Public Papers: Nixon, 1973*, p. 347)

10. Conversation Between President Nixon and Ambassador David K.E. Bruce¹

Washington, May 3, 1973.

[Omitted here is Nixon and Bruce's meeting with reporters.]

Nixon: Well, the great thing for you, as you know, substantively, probably not a great deal will happen for a while.

Bruce: Yeah. [unclear]

Nixon: The most important thing about this is the symbolism. I mean, symbolism sometimes is not important, but, now, it's enormously important.

Bruce: Yeah, in this case particularly so—

Nixon: The fact—

Bruce: Yeah.

Nixon: The fact that you are there. Let me tell you one thing I—that I, particularly, would like is that—I know that the social world is a total pain in the rump, but, to the extent that you can, if you could get around, and have your colleagues get around, and give us an evaluation of the people on the way up, and who's—

Bruce: Yes.

Nixon: —coming after Mao.

Bruce: Yes. Yes.

Nixon: And you've got to understand: Mao will soon be leaving; Chou En-lai is in his 70s, but he's as vigorous as a bee—terrific. You're gonna really like him. You'll like them both. Chou En-lai is an amazing man because of—and—but, on the other hand, except for some men in their 30s—late 30s and 40s, I don't see much coming up. And then I think, you know, you can do that. Look around, see who the power is. That's the one thing that would be very important for us to know. Isn't it?

Bruce: Well, I think it is, yes. Because, if they have sort of a collegium [unclear] at this point in time.

Nixon: Hmm. The Russians have quite a few in their shop that, you know, might come along.

Bruce: Yes.

¹Source: National Archives, Nixon Presidential Materials, White House Tapes, Conversation 911–9. No classification marking. The editor transcribed the portion of the conversation printed here specifically for this volume. According to the President's Daily Diary, Bruce and Nixon met in the White House Oval Office from 9:48 until 10:12 a.m. (Ibid., White House Central Files) Appointed on March 15 as Chief of the new U.S. Liaison Office, Bruce presented his credentials in Beijing on May 14.

Nixon: And, you know, an interesting thing: the Russians too—at least, we realize Brezhnev [unclear]. So, pretty soon, you know—in 4 or 5 years, there'll be change there. But, there'll be a change in China, and—and the world changes. Well, there's that. Then, of course, the—just your, you know, your sense of—your sense of the country, its people. I mean, I'm really, really more interested in that than I am in the routine cables, "Well, today we did this, or that, or the other thing. We signed an agreement, you know, to test how we grow figs."

Bruce: Exactly. [laughs]

Nixon: Huh?

Bruce: Yes, I [unclear]—

Nixon: Don't you agree?

Bruce: I do agree.

Nixon: We're trying to see what this great—

Bruce: Exactly.

Nixon: Huh? I mean, we've got to get along with this one-fourth of all people in the world, the ablest people in the world, in my opinion, potentially. We're going to get along, or not. It's no problem for the next 5 years, but in the next 20 years, it's the critical problem of our age.

Bruce: Yes—

Nixon: China's it.

Bruce: Yes, I think it is—

Nixon: The other thing is, if you could, you know, constantly, of course, whenever you're talking—they're very subtle, but—and they're not like the Russians, who, of course, slobber at flattery, and all that sort of thing—but, you should let them know how—two things: one, from a personal standpoint, how much I appreciated our welcome when we were there. The second thing, we look forward to sometime returning. Third, we would very much hope that Chou En-lai will see his way clear to come here to the U.N.—

Bruce: Yes, of course—

Nixon: —or something, as I would like to entertain him here—

Bruce: Um-hmm.

Nixon: —and it can be worked out the proper way. And fourth—and I think this is the most important—that I look upon the Chinese and American relationship as, really, the key to peace in the world. Always have that in the back of your mind, without playing it too obviously, the fact that the only thing that makes the Russian game go is just the Chinese game.

Bruce: Um-hmm.

Nixon: Always have in the back of your mind that saying anything pro-Russian is not in our—always have in the back of your mind the fact that the Russians are their deadly enemies—

Bruce: Yes.

Nixon: —and they know it, and we know it, and that we will stand by them.

Bruce: Yes.

Nixon: And that's the commitment that I have made.

Bruce: Right, sir.

Nixon: I have.

Bruce: Yes.

Nixon: And, how we do it, I don't know, but that's what keeps. Because, David, what is, probably in our time, maybe, that great collision could occur. And collisions even between enemies, these days, will involve all nations of the world if they're that big. So, we want to avoid that, too. But, now, my point is—

Bruce: Yes?

Nixon: —the Chinese must be reassured they have one heck of a friend here. They hate the Indians, as you know well.

Bruce: Yes.

Nixon: They don't hate them, so as much as they have contempt for them.

Bruce: Um-hmm.

Nixon: They think that India's becoming a—you know, a sort of a satellite of Russia. And, of course, the Japanese, they have a fear and respect for them, as well. So, with the Japanese, sort of say the right thing in terms of, "We want to get along with Japan," and the rest. And, it's very important that we have our—that we maintain our—in other words, the shield there, because, otherwise, Japan goes into business for itself, and that's not in our interest. And the other point that they're fairly terribly interested in, looking at the world scene—another point, apart from the fact they'll go through the usual jazz as to [unclear] revolutions [unclear]. That's fine. What they do in Africa, I don't care anymore [unclear]. But, Europe—they don't want us to get out of Europe, because they realize as long as the Russians have a tie down in Europe, that that's—you see what I mean?

Bruce: Oh, I do.

[unclear exchange]

Nixon: So, if some—some of our well-intentioned Congressmen go over there. They go over there and reassure them, "Oh, look, we're going to get out of Asia—"

Bruce: Yes.

Nixon: —and we're going to get out of Japan. We're trying to reduce our forces in Europe." Well, that for the Chinese scares them to death.

Bruce: Well, I was very struck, sir, by the conversations that you've had, and how they came back to the necessity about preserving forces in Europe. I mean, they were almost—they were very pro-NATO, for their own reasons.

Nixon: Absolutely.

Bruce: Isn't it interesting?

Nixon: Right.

Bruce: Well, I've got all those points in mind. Those conversations that you had there, I've read [unclear]. I must say, they are—they really are quite—not only startling, but they're sort of fascinating to read.

Nixon: Yeah. You're one of the few that got to read them.

Bruce: I was told that.

Nixon: Yeah.

Bruce: I'd forgotten, but I do think they're absolutely fascinating.

Nixon: Yeah. A lot of history was made there.

Bruce: It was indeed. I think probably the most significant history, diplomatic history, of our time. No question about it. And I don't see anything, which could really ruin it in the time being. Without any hesitation I can tell you I always thought the preservation of good relations should have sort of ordinary courtesies and what not in the beginning, it'll probably be all business, but you try and get to know as many people as possible. [unclear]

Nixon: That's right.

Bruce: [unclear]

Nixon: But, let them think that we are strong and respected, and that we are not going to be pushed around by the Russians, or by anybody else. The Mideast, they could help us there. We have no answer there, as you know.

Bruce: I know.

Nixon: They haven't either. But I think—I think what they really, what concern—it's a—the great irony is, today, the United States, of all nations, is China's most important friend.

[laughter, unclear exchange]

Nixon: Romania? Huh?

Bruce: No, no.

Nixon: Tanzania?

Bruce: Albania, they'd probably say—

Nixon: Albania?

Bruce: Really, that's pretty good stuff.

Nixon: That's my—my point is that, with that in mind—

[Omitted here is a short discussion of beverages.]

Bruce: But, this is a most fascinating development, I think. I think they [unclear] replace the policies that have become so embedded, almost, in the American consciousness that nobody—the people complained about it, but nobody intended to do anything about it.

[unclear]

Nixon: Look, for 20 years—

Bruce: [unclear]

Nixon: For 20 years, as you know, we were sort of—now, look, I'm supposed to be the number one red-baiter in the country. I have earned that reputation for reasons that you know very well. That had we just continued the policy of, just, of a silent confrontation and almost non-communication with the PRC—

Bruce: Yes?

Nixon: —in the end we would reap a nuclear whirlwind. No, no, no question.

Bruce: Yes. Yes.

Nixon: We just had to break through.

Bruce: Yeah. Right.

Nixon: Also, as I said, it was so important to the Russian game. [laughs]

Bruce: It must be terribly important—

[unclear exchange]

Nixon: Yeah.

Bruce: Terribly important.

Nixon: Yeah.

Bruce: It must, though, keep them worrying how about does one explain to the Chinese [unclear] if you want to preserve a relationship, which is of great importance to us, an amiable meaningful relationship with Russia? The Chinese are undoubtedly our favorites, certainly, between the two. But—

Nixon: The Russians are saying, “Now, look, this is very important, that Nixon is having another meeting with Brezhnev, and there's going to be a lot of agreements coming out of that meeting.” But the important thing there is to remember that Russia and the United States are superpowers, that we—that our interests do rub together in the Mid-east and in Europe, particularly.

Bruce: Yes.

Nixon: That their rubbing together is a danger that is almost unbelievably great, and that under these circumstances, that we feel that what we have to do is to try to limit that danger as much as we can through communication. But, on the other hand, we do not consider putting it quite bluntly as between the two. We consider the Soviet, be-

cause of its power, and of its long history of expansionism, we consider it more of a danger that we have to deal with than we do China, even, which has a longer history of, frankly, defense. Now, I think a little of that history is—

Bruce: Yes.

Nixon: —is well worth saying. In other words—

Bruce: Yes.

Nixon: —[unclear] Also, I'd be very blunt about it. Just say that you've had a long—you've talked with the President, and there's no illusions. Our systems are different, both with the Chinese and the Russians. They're better Communists than the Russians are today. But, we finally plan to get back to national—natural interests. And the President considers—he's a man of the Pacific—he considers that China and America have a hell of a lot more in common than Russia and America, and that is the God's truth.

Bruce: Yes, that's true—

Nixon: And that, therefore—that looking at the historical process, I want to work toward that direction. And I think that's what we have to do. But the Chinese-American relationship can be the great lynchpin of peace in the world.

Bruce: Well, I'll tell you that after you've talked to Brezhnev [unclear] the Chinese will be filled in rather completely.

Nixon: Totally, I've—

Bruce: [unclear]

Nixon: —instructed—I'll have [unclear]. Of course, we'll keep in touch with you, but we'll probably have Kissinger go over again.

[unclear exchange]

Nixon: Incidentally, I want to tell you one thing: normally, on these visits, when he goes why he—he meets—and, this is very important, he has sometimes met alone with their leaders and so forth.

Bruce: Yeah.

Nixon: But, in this instance, I want you to feel, Dave, that you are basically, not the State Department's ambassador—

Bruce: Yes.

Nixon: —you are the President's, and I want you to be in on everything. You see what I mean?

Bruce: Well—

Nixon: You've got to remember that we cannot—there's parts of these games that we don't want to go to the bureaucracy. It's no lack of confidence in Bill, or any of the others—

Bruce: No, no.

[unclear exchange]

Nixon: Would you have this in mind, please?

Bruce: I will, Mr. President. I certainly will, because the security of the State Department is, to my mind, non-existent.

Nixon: It's non-existent—

[unclear exchange, laughter]

Bruce: In other words, that's to be the policy.

Nixon: That's right.

Bruce: Well, I think I understand that part of it perfectly, and that backchannel can be used when we think it's necessary—

Nixon: Fine. Well, I want to use the backchannel. And also, when Henry gets over there to do the briefings, I think it's very important that you be with him.

Bruce: Well, I would like that—

Nixon: So that you can—

Bruce: Yes.

Nixon: —you know, get the feel of the thing, too.

Bruce: Yes, I think it would be, on that occasion, good. He offered, when he came to Paris in connection with the Vietnam peace talks, to take me to secret meetings with him, and I was very indisposed to do it. I think it would have been a great mistake. He never would have been able to—

Nixon: Oh, yes. [unclear] When you were there? Yeah?

Bruce: Yes, but in China, I think it's probably a different thing.

Nixon: Well, in China, it could downgrade you. Frankly, if—[unclear]. I'll see that it's done.

Bruce: All right, sir.

[Omitted here is discussion of Cambodia and South Vietnam.]

11. Memorandum of Conversation¹

Washington, May 18, 1973, 8:30 a.m.

PARTICIPANTS

President Nixon
 Vice President Agnew
 Elliot Richardson, Attorney General
 Peter J. Brennan, Secretary of Labor
 Earl L. Butz, Secretary of Agriculture
 Frederick B. Dent, Secretary of Commerce
 Rogers C.B. Morton, Secretary of the Interior
 James T. Lynn, Secretary of Housing and Urban Development
 Anne Armstrong, Counsellor to the President
 Amb. George Bush, Ambassador to the UN
 William E. Simon, Deputy Secretary of the Treasury
 Frank C. Carlucci, Under Secretary, Department of Health, Education and Welfare
 Major General Brent Scowcroft, Deputy Assistant to the President for National Security Affairs

[Omitted here are oral reports presented by Armstrong, Richardson, Lynn, Dent, Butz, Carlucci, Morton, and Simon.]

The President: We will have this type of meeting monthly or every three weeks. In Paris, Dr. Kissinger has said we can't enforce the agreement² if we have neither a carrot nor a stick.

The problem in Southeast Asia is blown out of proportion because of Cambodia. Article 20 clearly provides for their withdrawal from Cambodia and Laos. But that has not been done, and that is the problem.

The purpose of bombing is not to get into a war in Cambodia, but to enforce the peace in Vietnam. We don't want to encourage the Communists to go on the rampage again.

We have a carrot. I know the tremendous unpopularity of North Vietnamese aid, but most of us agree that if we get North Vietnamese cooperation, the best way to proceed is to help in reconstruction in

¹ Source: National Archives, Nixon Presidential Materials, NSC Files, Box 1026, Presidential/HAK MemCons, MemCons—Jan.–Mar. 1973 Presidential/HAK. Secret; Nodis. According to the President's Daily Diary, the meeting took place in the Cabinet Room at the White House from 8:38 until 10:11 a.m. (Ibid., White House Central Files) The memorandum is mistakenly dated March 18. Scowcroft transmitted a summary of the meeting to Kissinger in Paris, who was engaged in discussions with Pompidou prior to Nixon's meeting with the French leader in late May. (WH31298/Tohak 81, May 18; ibid., Kissinger Office Files, Box 35, HAK Trip Files, Paris Trip May 17, 1973—Tohak 1–100 [1 of 2])

² Reference is to the Paris Peace Accords. See footnote 3, Document 1.

Southeast Asia. The meetings are going forward and if they don't succeed, Congress is responsible for the failure. This is restricted to this room.

The North Vietnamese have other disincentives:

—They don't want a long war.

—They want a relationship to the U.S.

—They have problems with their major allies.

I don't discuss it, but put yourself in the Chinese and Soviet Union's shoes. Why would they risk a relationship to the U.S. for the purposes of a small irrational ally?

So it all fits together—our relations. The Soviet Union is very important in what happens in Asia, the Middle East, and Europe. The Chinese too in Asia.

We shouldn't over-react to demonstrations against Rogers. The trip³ was successful but the press plays it up negative.

As we approach the summit,⁴ this is a watershed in world history. Either we move forward on a constructive basis as we began last year, or we stop. If it is the latter, the world will be a dangerous place. If we have no influence with the Soviet Union, the Chinese will have no use for us.

We are working on a trade agreement and SALT. Brezhnev is putting . . .

We will meet in Camp David and then San Clemente. A lot is riding on the visit.

In Vietnam, there is a vigorous economy and the South Vietnamese will survive a long time.

What happens in Cambodia and Laos, however, affects the states of Southeast Asia and also the PRC. If we fail there, the PRC will see us as a paper tiger.

In the Middle East is the problem of Israel. Israel's lobby is so strong that Congress is not reasonable. When we try to get Israel reasonable, the excuse is an Israeli election, the U.S. election, or something.

This is my primary occupation. Please don't take an all-out Israeli line. The Israelis are attractive and efficient, but the stakes are big.

We are trying to get this difficult issue off dead center.

The basic point is Israel can defeat the Arabs with our aid. But if our relationship with the Soviet Union collapses, and the Soviet Union aids the Arabs, Israel will be swamped. This is why we need to have

³ Reference is to Rogers's 17-day trip to Latin America May 12–28. See Department of State *Bulletin*, June 25, 1973, p. 903.

⁴ U.S.-Soviet summit meetings were scheduled for June. See Document 14.

movement on trade with MFN. We have to have policies which don't allow an obsession with one state to destroy our status in the Middle East.

These are problems—but when we came into office, we weren't talking to the PRC and not really to the Soviet Union. There was war in the Middle East and there were high casualties in Southeast Asia.

We have come a long way, but we must realize we never would have gotten here if we had had the thinking which dominates the Senate and much of the press. A weak U.S. which can't command respect, we will find. So if we need three billion to balance it, the easy thing is to squeeze it from DOD. But if the cost is to make the U.S. the second strongest power, having the cleanest cities won't matter because we won't be able to enjoy them.

I stand for a strong U.S. because no one else can keep stability in the world. Do you want a world where there is a prosperous U.S. but a leaner, tougher country decides the issues of peace and freedom in the world? You are going through a tough period. Most of the people in this Administration are fine. We have come a long way and the improvement is because of us. [War in the cities, etc.]⁵

Agnew: In the provinces, there is not the focus on Watergate like here. People come up to tell me of their confidence in the President.

The President: I am not Pollyanish. It is rough and will get rougher. They will go after us. My concern is not myself but all our family. The crap will fly, but don't think we have to deny every charge. Most of the charges will come from those who don't want us to succeed. Don't be deflected from your purpose. Be proud of our record and work to make it better.

Our major problem is with the politicians—ours too.

Agnew: Not even here.

The President: Go to the press—don't hide. But don't comment on the charges because of the legal processes. Just say you don't believe the President is involved. Express confidence in the judicial system.

⁵ Brackets are in the original.

12. Remarks by President Nixon¹

Washington, May 24, 1973.

[Omitted here are introductory comments.]

Now, let me come to the briefing and why I decided to have a briefing. Incidentally, we had first thought it would be a classified briefing, but while we knew there was no problem insofar as leaks as far as this group was concerned, our friends in the press very vigorously objected, and they said, “Look, with 600 there, let us come, too.”

So, welcome. We are glad to have our members of the press here. This will be on the record.

I will, however, speak quite bluntly about our foreign policy and our defense policy. I will try to tell you as much as I can without divulging any classified information, and I hope that you will take to heart some of the things that I say and, particularly, pick up the challenge that I am going to give you at the conclusion of my remarks today.

I begin with the question: Was it worth it? And I look over this group, and I remember having talked to a half dozen of you in my office. I think of what you went through, and I think of what you have come back to. And when you ask that question, was it worth it, you can think in personal terms, or you can think in much broader terms.

You could say, oh yes, it was worth it because we proved that we could tough it through. And thank God you did, because your faith meant a great deal to us.

But I would like to put it in the larger sense. Your sacrifice and the sacrifice of all of your colleagues and comrades who died in Vietnam, and the sacrifice of all who have served in Vietnam, will have been worth it only if we build a world of peace now. That is what it was all about.

We didn’t go to Vietnam for the purpose of conquering North Vietnam. We didn’t begin this war. We haven’t begun any war in this century, as you know. That is the greatness of U.S. foreign policy. We make our mistakes, but we always have as our motives defending peace, not breaking it, defending freedom, not destroying it.

¹ Source: *Public Papers: Nixon, 1973*, pp. 555–563. Nixon delivered his remarks at an afternoon reception for returned prisoners of war held at the Department of State. The White House invited POWs, their family members, members of Congress, and Cabinet officers, totaling 1,300 people, to attend several receptions, lectures, and a formal White House dinner the evening of May 24. For Nixon’s recollections of the events, see *RN*, pp. 859–869.

But when we think in terms of whether your sacrifice then was worth it, we have to think then about the broader aspects of peace, whether or not the world you come back to, the America you come back to, is a better world or is it, shall we say, a world that is not as safe as when you went to Hanoi or whatever area you were kept in captivity.

I cannot put it in the context of 6½ or 7 years, which some of you, of course, have been away. But I can put it in the context of the years I have been in this office. And perhaps we can see in perspective where we have been and where we are, but more important, where we are going to go.

First, when I came into this office 4½ years ago, 300 a week were being killed in action in Vietnam. There was no plan to end the war, no hope that it was going to be ended. Many of you were already prisoners of war. You had no hope.

Looking at the world scene, the United States had no communication whatever, in any meaningful sense, with the leaders of one-fourth of all the people in the world, those who govern the People's Republic of China. We were in constant confrontation with the Soviet Union, the other super power on the Earth, with no thought or even hope that there was a chance for arms control or trade or a lessening of tension between these two great super powers.

There were other troubled areas in the world. Some of them still are troubled. But looking at those three areas and seeing what has happened since, and then looking at the United States, we see some progress has been made.

Also 4½ years ago, this Nation was torn by riots. Hundreds of campuses were in flames. The American people seemed to have lost their way. There was a desire to move away from responsibilities in the world. There was a lack of national pride, a lack of patriotism. I don't mean among all the people, not even among a majority, but it was there. There was a crisis in terms of whether America, the greatest hope for peace in the world today, would dash that hope or whether it would be worthy of that hope. That was the situation 4½ years ago.

Now in describing that situation, I do not speak critically of those who preceded me in this office. President Eisenhower, John Kennedy, Lyndon Johnson loved this country. They worked for peace as I have tried to work for peace. They felt for you as I feel for you.

What I am simply saying is that in January of 1969 we did have a critical situation, and we started to move on it. And how I wish we could have moved faster. I remember that first Christmas in '69. I met with a group of the representatives of the League of Families down in

the library,² and I talked to these wonderful, remarkable women, and I saw their faith and their courage and their love of country, and I heard them tell me that their husbands had not gone to Vietnam simply for the purpose of getting back. In other words, they rejected totally the idea of “Get out, if you will give us our prisoners.”

They said, in effect, and they didn’t put it this way, but one of you put it very well, “Bring our men home, but bring them home on their feet and not on their knees.” And that is what we have done.

And so that was our goal over those 4 years. That is why we couldn’t achieve it perhaps quite as fast as we would have liked.

But the year 1972 saw remarkable progress, as you know. The year 1972, moving into 1973, in January, saw the return of all Americans from Vietnam, all of our combat forces, the return of all of our prisoners of war, the end of the American involvement in Vietnam, a peace agreement which, if adhered to, will mean peace for Vietnam and Southeast Asia.

That was one accomplishment. That is the one that most people talk about. They say, “Thank God that war is over. Thank God we have got peace.”

But in a broader sense, other events took place that will have even more meaning to the world and to peace than your return and the end of the war in Vietnam.

China, for example. That initiative, which was undertaken in early 1972, began in ’71, the negotiations, has finally started communication between the leaders of the People’s Republic of China and the leaders of the United States of America. Oh, it doesn’t mean they aren’t still Communists and that we are not still people who love freedom, but it does mean that instead of having hanging over us, looking down the road 10, 15, 20 years from now, a possible confrontation with a nation of the most able people in the world, armed with nuclear weapons equal to our own, instead of having that, there is a chance, a very good chance now, that we will have negotiations with them rather than confrontation, and that is the key to peace in the Pacific.

And then the second development was the meetings with the Soviet leaders. This did not happen just over a period of 1972. We worked for the whole 4 years. But it culminated in the summit in Moscow.³ You perhaps heard something about it since your return. But looking at that summit agreement, a great deal of emphasis can be placed on the aspects of trade and our cooperation in space and other areas which are

² See 1969 volume, Item 484. [Footnote is in the original. Reference is to *Public Papers: Nixon, 1969*, p. 1021.]

³ See footnote 4, Document 7.

important, but the most significant development, undoubtedly, was the first step, and a very important step, in limiting the arms race in the nuclear field.

We have, therefore, an agreement with the Soviet Union on defensive nuclear weapons, where we are both limited,⁴ and we are moving now toward getting a limitation in the offensive field.

And so those were the developments that occurred in the year 1972.

The other day I was talking to a Congressman. He is a Congressman who has always voted for strong national defense. He said, "Mr. President, give me an answer to my constituents to this question. They say, 'Since we have made such great progress towards peace, we have ended the war in Vietnam, we have had this initiative with China and this initiative with the Soviet Union, why can't we now reduce our defenses regardless of what the other side does and turn that money that we take away from defense to the very urgent problems at home?'"

Let me tell you, gentlemen, there is nothing I would like to do more. A President never likes to veto a bill when it is going to help somebody anywhere in this country—our schools or our hospitals or anything that you say.

But on the other hand, when we talk now about national defense, let me tell you what the challenge is—and you can help in this respect—and what the danger is, a mortal danger that we face insofar as reduction of our defenses is concerned.

First, our defense budget has been reduced. With a new volunteer armed force,⁵ considering the increased costs and the like, we find that it is approximately a third reduction of what it was in 1968.

But second, we must also look at this situation: When they say, "Now that we have made all this progress in 1972 towards peace, let's reduce our defenses regardless of what the other side does," what you are doing, in effect, is advocating changing a game plan that has worked.

Let me put it this way: We wouldn't have ended the war in Vietnam with honor, we wouldn't have had the initiative with China, and we would not have had, without question, the arms control and other

⁴ Reference is to the SALT I agreement signed by Nixon and Brezhnev in Moscow on May 26, 1972. See *Foreign Relations, 1969–1976*, volume XXXII, SALT I, 1969–1972, Documents 316–318.

⁵ During the 1968 Presidential campaign, Nixon had pledged the creation of an all-volunteer force. The administration established a draft lottery system in 1969 and renewed the system in 1971. By 1972, Nixon announced that the AVF would replace the Selective Service System by July 1973. See *ibid.*, volume XXXIV, National Security Policy, 1969–1972, Documents 131, 133, 135, 138, 139, and 228.

agreements with the Soviet Union, had the United States not been strong and respected.

Strength without respect is meaningless. That was another reason why this war had to be ended on an honorable basis, because otherwise we would have lost respect, not only of our allies and the neutrals but also of our potential adversaries in the world.

But when we see what has happened then, we find that the Soviet Union, at the present time, is preparing to come to the United States for a return summit visit in just a few weeks. We are going to have some very intensive negotiations. They are even more important than the negotiations we had last year, although those were the first and, therefore, the most newsworthy, because they will move in arms control and other fields of enormous importance to the future of the world.

But, gentlemen, let me tell you, in the event that the President of the United States goes into meetings with the Soviet leaders, with the Congress of the United States having unilaterally cut our defenses, then all hope for an arms control agreement is completely destroyed. Because when you really get down to it in the field of international diplomacy—and this is true in all fields in life—you can't get something from anybody else unless you have something to give.

And I say to you, we must never send the President of the United States into any negotiation with anybody as the head of the second strongest nation of the world.

Now, gentlemen, if you should go out and make that kind of a statement, you sometimes may find people say to you what they say to me: "Those who are for a strong defense are for war, and those who are for disarmament are for peace." It is just the other way around. Disarmament can lead to peace only if it is mutual. But let the day never come when we disarm and the other side arms, because that will enormously increase the danger of war.

Let me describe it in more specific terms. For example, in the field of offensive nuclear weapons, we are ready, and we believe they are ready, for an agreement in which we will mutually agree that we will have a limitation on the development of offensive nuclear weapons.

But in the event, before we go into the negotiations, we already have reduced our own strength in that area, then their incentive for making a deal is completely out the window, and we are second and they are first.

Let's go further. Many of you have served in Europe, I know, and you know one of the points that is going to come up in this Congress will be the problem with regard to what we do about our forces in Europe. And Americans, 25 years after World War II, justifiably are concerned about the fact that we carry such a heavy load in Europe.

Very well-intentioned men in the House and the Senate, therefore, say it is time for us to bring our men home—half of them or a third of them or a fourth of them, or what have you—regardless of what the other side does.

But here again, let's look at what would happen. In the fall we are going to have very significant negotiations with the Warsaw Pact countries for a mutual reduction of forces in Europe, a reduction on our side and on theirs. As long as it is a mutual reduction, the stability which is essential for peace in that critical area of the world will be maintained.

But if, on the other hand, before we go into those negotiations this fall, the United States unilaterally reduces its forces, all incentive that the Warsaw Pact forces and that the Soviet Union would have to reduce theirs is gone, and you would create that imbalance which would enormously increase instability and the chances for war.

So, what I am saying to you is this: I am for limitation of armaments, and I know every one of you is. I am for, certainly in the nuclear field, doing everything that we can to reduce that danger that is hanging over the world today.

But I also know that it is vitally important that in this field of limitation of armaments that we remember that the United States of America is not a threat to the peace of the world.

I have traveled in most of the countries of the world. I have been to the Communist countries and to the free countries. I have yet to talk to a world leader who believes that the United States of America threatens his peace or his freedom. A strong United States is a force for peace; a weak United States means that the peace will be threatened.

And so, that is why I say at this point, not that we want to be strong in order to dominate anybody else—that period was long gone, if it ever did exist in our own minds—but what we need to recognize is that we now have a balance in the world. We must maintain that balance. And that is why, let us keep our defenses up.

Oh, take the fat off, wherever we possibly can, but keep them up and be sure in negotiations we go down only if the other side goes down, and if we do that, then we contribute to the peace of the world in which we are all so very much interested.

One other subject that is somewhat sensitive that I will touch upon only briefly, that I would like to ask for your support on, is with regard to the security of the kind of negotiations that we have had.

I want to be quite blunt. Had we not had secrecy, had we not had secret negotiations with the North Vietnamese, had we not had secret negotiations prior to the Soviet summit, had we not had secret negotiations over a period of time with the Chinese leaders, let me say quite bluntly, there would have been no China initiative, there would have been no limitation of arms for the Soviet Union and no summit, and

had we not had that kind of security and that kind of secrecy that allowed for the kind of exchange that is essential, you men would still be in Hanoi rather than Washington today.

And let me say, I think it is time in this country to quit making national heroes out of those who steal secrets and publish them in the newspapers.⁶

Because, gentlemen, you see, in order to continue these great initiatives for peace, we must have confidentiality, we must have secret communications. It isn't that we are trying to keep anything from the American people that the American people should know. It isn't that we are trying to keep something from the press that the press should print. But it is that what we are trying to do is to accomplish our goal, make a deal. And when we are dealing with potential adversaries, those negotiations must have the highest degree of confidentiality.

And I can assure you that in my term of office as President in the first 4 years, and also in this second 4 years, I am going to meet my responsibility to protect the national security of the United States of America insofar as our secrets are concerned.

And by our secrets, what I am saying here is not that we are concerned about every little dribble here and there, but what I am concerned about is the highest classified documents in our National Security Council files, in the State Department, in the Defense Department, which if they get out, for example, in our arms control negotiations with the Soviets, would let them know our position before we ever got to the table. They don't tell us theirs. They have no problem keeping their secrets.

I don't want, and you don't want, their system and that kind of control, but I say it is time for a new sense of responsibility in this country and a new sense of dedication of everybody in the bureaucracy that if a document is classified, keep it classified.

Now, gentlemen, I turn to the challenge for the future. I have talked about the need for strength if we are going to have a mutual reduction of armaments in the world and, therefore, of the threat to peace in the world. I have talked about the need for national security where our highly classified documents are concerned, so we can continue these enormously important initiatives for peace.

I now want to talk about why the United States, after all that it has done for the world in World War II, after the billions that it has poured out since World War II, its sacrifices in Korea, its sacrifices in Vietnam, why we, the American people, have to continue to carry this load.

⁶ Presumably a reference to the 1971 unauthorized release of Vietnam war documentation, commonly known as the Pentagon Papers.

As I said earlier, believe me, as President, what a relief it would be to say, "Now that we have peace in Vietnam, we have a new relationship with China and Russia, we can simply turn away from the problems of the world and turn to the problems at home."

I can assure you gentlemen that if we were to follow that course, we would find very soon that we would be living in a terribly dangerous world. The world is safer today than it was 4½ years ago. It can be more safe in the years ahead. But that will only happen provided we follow the course that I have tried to lay out to you here today.

As I look to that future, therefore, it is vitally important that the United States continue to play the world role.

Let's look at just this century. We don't need to go back any further than that. I can imagine some of you in those long hours of captivity were thinking back over several centuries. But in any event, looking back just over this century, World War I, the United States could stand aside. After all, there was Britain, there was France, two great powers who thought as we did about the world, and they could carry the load. And then we came in toward the end. In World War II, the United States, for a time, could stand aside because Britain was still strong, and France at the beginning had some strength, but eventually we had to come in.

But today, look at the world. Among the free nations of the world there is no one else, not the Japanese, as you well know, even though they have the economic strength, they do not have the military strength and cannot be allowed to acquire it under their constitution; and not one nation in Europe, by itself, or Europe collectively, has the strength to be the peacemaker in the world.

So, it is all right here. It is in America. It is in that Oval Office, whoever is there, and it is there for the foreseeable future. In other words, the United States must maintain its strength in order to play a role between the great powers of the world and among the great powers of the world of reducing the danger of war, because our ideals and our goals—subject as they can be to much criticism as far as tactics are concerned in the world scene—our ideals and our goals are for a world of peace. Our ideals and our goals are for a world in which we reduce the burden of arms, and therefore, it is vitally important that this Nation that has that kind of ideals and that kind of goals maintains its strength so that we can play that role.

But maintaining the strength alone is not enough. It must be respected. And that means that we must continue to have a policy which commands respect throughout the world. We must continue to insist on adherence to agreements that are made. We must continue to let the world know that while we have no aggressive intentions anywhere in

the world, we will stand by our treaty commitments wherever they are in the world.

That, you see, is the language of peace rather than the language of bugging out of the world and turning to what people wistfully might think to be a fortress America. But let me tell you, fortress America might have been before World War II a concept that was viable. Today it is ridiculous. We cannot be apart from the world, not when weapons that can destroy us are 30 minutes away.

And so, we must play this role. And rather than playing it in terms of whining about it and complaining about it, let us do it proudly, because what greater mission could a people have than to say that in these years—the seventies—of 1971–2–3–4–5 and 6, when we reach our 200th birthday, the United States of America played a great role in the world and made the world safer, not only for ourselves but for everybody in the world. That is the stake, that is the challenge we must meet.

Today then, I ask for your support, obviously, for a strong national defense. That is like the preacher talking to the choir. But I know, as far as you are concerned, you will be for that, and I hope so many of you will stay in our Armed Forces. We need you.

But also, beyond that, I ask for your support in helping to develop the national spirit, the faith that we need in order to meet our responsibilities in the world. You have already contributed enormously to that by your statements on your return, by what you have said, what you have done, and I am sure you can contribute more to it in the future.

But the young people of America need to hear the truth. They will believe you. They will believe you, because you have suffered so much for this country and have proved that you will do anything that you can to do what is best for America, not just for yourselves.

Because at this particular point, America is the richest country in the world; militarily, it is the strongest and will always have that potential because of its wealth. The only question is whether we face up to our world responsibilities, whether we have the faith, the patriotism, the willingness to lead in this critical period.

Gentlemen, by what you did and what you said on your return, you have helped turn this country around. You have helped reinstall faith where there was doubt before. And for what you have done by your faith, you have built up America's faith. This Nation and the world will always be in your debt.

Those first 4 years in the office were not easy ones for me in the international front, fighting for an adequate defense budget, fighting for a responsible foreign policy, but looking toward the balance of the second 4 years, let me say I feel better, because out in this room, I think I have got some allies, and I will appreciate your help.

Thank you.

13. Memorandum for the President's File by William J. Jorden of the National Security Council Staff¹

Washington, June 7, 1973.

SUBJECT

Meeting with Board of Trustees of the Council of the Americas on Thursday, June 7, 1973 at 11:35 a.m to 12:30 p.m.

PARTICIPANTS

The President
Secretary of State Rogers
Brent Scowcroft (NSC)
William J. Jorden (NSC)
Board of Trustees of the Council of the Americas (list attached)

[Omitted here are Rogers's remarks concerning his Latin American mission, Council of the Americas Chairman Jose de Cubas's introductory points, and Nixon's comments on foreign investment.]

The President said a new wave of isolationism had surfaced—in Congress, in labor, and even in some business circles. You men, with an international mission, have to counteract this trend to isolationism. Otherwise our hopes for a more open world will go down the drain. He agreed that we need more flexibility in legislation on expropriation, flexibility for the President and the Administration. But he noted that there were Congressional problems that result from both domestic pressures and from public attitudes in Latin America. The President said that the attitude of some countries in Latin America is to play to the radical groups and to believe that the way to success is to kick the U.S. around publicly. He quoted a politician in the Philippines who once said: "Give the Americans hell—but don't drive them away." It is important for Latin American leaders to understand that they can only go so far before they drive us away. The Congress reacts to these things. Many Americans are tired of being kicked around.

¹ Source: National Archives, Nixon Presidential Materials, Staff Member and Office Files, White House Special Files, President's Office Files, President's Meeting File, 1969–1974, Box 92, Memoranda for the President—Beginning June 3 [1973]. Confidential. According to the President's Daily Diary, the meeting took place in the White House Cabinet Room from 11:33 a.m. until 12:31 p.m. (Ibid., White House Central Files) A list of attendees is attached but not printed. The Council of the Americas is a business organization founded by financier David Rockefeller to promote hemispheric free trade and open markets.

(He cited the example of Echeverría of Mexico who “goes around attacking us but privately is friendly.”² But the real questions are: what do we do about Mexican tomatoes, what do we do about salinity?)

A serious problem is those politicians who exploit the radical activists. We must fight this to the extent we can. We must get our friends—in government, in business—to know that this is a dangerous game.

(He quoted Henry Cabot Lodge as saying that Latin America was important in the UN and that without them the U.S. position would be weak.) We realize that Latin America is important. But the truth is that they need us more than we need them. He noted that government aid was a small proportion of our total involvement (\$16 billion invested). But when you go to Congress to try to get more done, it is rough. And it is getting rougher.

The President then reminisced about how much different the situation was today than when he last met with the Council of the Americas Trustees in November 1969. Then, he said, there were 300,000 demonstrators around the White House. We were losing 300 men a week in Vietnam. We were in confrontation with the Russians. We had no contact with China. The situation in Latin America was about the same, maybe a little better. When we see the changes that have taken place, there is no reason for euphoria but there is reason for hope. However, we live in a potentially dangerous world. A basic fact is that with the advent of nuclear weapons, there will be no conventional wars between major powers. Now it will all be done in 30 minutes.

It is important that we realize what we have done in the world despite the threat of war. The people are pleased with the end of the Vietnam War. Far more important is what we have done to change the world. That is what the China initiative was all about. It was not just handshaking. As President, I could not let one-fourth of the people of the world—with a future as a nuclear power—not have relations with us. We must look down the road 15 to 20 years in terms of our commu-

² On March 26 Kissinger, Deputy Chief of Mission of the Embassy in Mexico City Robert Dean, and NSC Staff member Jonathan Howe met with Echeverría at the Presidential residence at Las Pinos. According to a memorandum of conversation, Kissinger commented: “We have difficulty with Latin America because it is imperative for leaders to make anti-U.S. statements in order to take pro-U.S. measures (Echeverría laughs deeply). So, I understand. But if it goes beyond a certain point, then it turns into a contest between the developed United States and the underdeveloped world. It faces us with a dilemma. It helps create a political structure which freezes a country into a posture against us. And, as I say, this does create a real dilemma. We want independence but also a structure in which we can get along together.” (National Archives, Nixon Presidential Materials, NSC Files, Box 788, Country Files—Latin America, Mexico, Vol. IV, 1973 [1 of 3]) The full memorandum of conversation is scheduled for publication in *Foreign Relations, 1969–1976*, volume E-11, Documents on American Republics, 1973–1976.

nications with them. Interestingly enough, the U.S. is China's best friend.

Another thing—the meetings with the Soviet Union in Moscow³ were important. A number of agreements were signed. Overriding all of them was the first step in limiting nuclear arms. Far more important is the fact that the U.S. and the Soviet Union are in a position where we are negotiating. We have to find a way to avoid a nuclear explosion. The important thing is the fact that there is communication. The reason for that communication: the U.S. and Soviets are equal (in power) and China will be equal in 15 years. If a President of the U.S. decides he has to react, it means the death of 70 million Russians and 70 million Americans. "Anyone who sits in this chair has to avoid that happening," he said.

There is a tendency in Congress toward increasing isolationism. They see the end of the war in Vietnam and say "isn't that nice—let's cut \$10 billion from the Defense budget." We should not cut the Defense budget at this time because it means changing the game plan which is working. But that is what Congress is doing when it says "regardless of what you do, we are going to cut." We have to recognize that nothing is done in this field (*détente*) from love. It is done from respect, even fear. There must be mutual cuts. Otherwise our bargaining position is incredibly weaker. Our allies will lose trust. The Soviets will lose respect. And China will no longer feel that agreements with us are important.

We face the stark fact that in a nuclear world we are the only free country that counts. The British and French don't have the power; the Germans are not allowed to develop nuclear weapons; Japan must not be allowed to develop them. In terms of security of our alliances the power is all right here. Japan is keenly aware that without us, they will (1) have to make a deal with the Soviets or (2) go nuclear.

As for Latin America, we care about our closest friends there. Our actions (on other problems) should not be read as meaning we don't care.

This is not true. What we are talking about has great importance for our close friends and neighbors. They have a stake in a peaceful world. Latin America is most important to us. Vitrally important in terms of economics. We must do everything we can to reinforce our interest. But we must also let them know that it is to their advantage to work with us. However, we should not infringe on their sensitivities.

The major danger spot is the Middle East. There are no easy answers. But we are working on it. It is the most likely area of big power

³ See footnote 4, Document 7.

conflict. The Vietnam war was not that important to Soviet interests. The Middle East is that important. Europe gets 90% of its fuel from the Middle East. Japan gets 80% of its fuel from there.

I raise these other parts of the world—not to downgrade Latin America, but to put things in perspective. We must get along with the Soviet Union and with China. We must get along with Europe. Latin America is still important to us, even more important than it was. Your concerns will get our deepest consideration. We need your support, in defense and in total policy. For our friendship with Latin America will not be important if we become the second most powerful nation.

Mr. David Rockefeller said he agreed with everything the President had said. He said that Latin Americans note that we talk of the Five Major Power centers (the U.S., Europe, the Soviet Union, China and Japan). They ask: where are we in that scheme? It is important for us to find ways to assure them of our esteem.

Regarding investment, it is big—\$16 billion is already at stake. However, private enterprise is under fire there (in Latin America) and in our own Congress. We have a defensive battle of our own. It is all the more important for us to find ways for our role to be constructive. We need a more organized role with the U.S. Government and Latin governments. The Council's proposed idea of an advisory council could contribute toward this.

The President said he did not want to end the meeting on a downbeat note. There are always many danger spots. The world, in terms of the long view, is a safer place than it was four years ago. It is not in the nature of men to love one another; but that doesn't mean they need to fight one another. My greatest goal in the next four years is to make the world even more safe than it is now.

Toasts and speeches are all froth. "We need to get more body to this beer." We cannot bug out on our responsibilities.

The President concluded the meeting by thanking the members of the Council for their advice and their time. He walked around the Cabinet table and shook hands personally with each of the Trustees. The meeting concluded at 12:30 p.m.

14. Editorial Note

General Secretary of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union Leonid I. Brezhnev arrived in the United States on June 16, 1973, for a summit meeting with President Richard Nixon. The two leaders en-

gaged in a series of talks June 16–23 in Washington; Camp David, Maryland; and San Clemente, California. Records of these conversations are printed in *Foreign Relations*, 1969–1976, volume XV, Soviet Union, June 1972–August 1974, Documents 123–127 and 131–132. During a June 18 private conversation with Brezhnev, Nixon commented: “We, we both—we must recognize, the two of us, that I for 3½ more years in this office and the General Secretary, I hope, for that long or longer, we head the two most powerful nations and, while we will naturally in negotiations have some differences, it is essential that those two nations, where possible, work together. And the key really is in the relationship between Mr. Brezhnev and myself. If we decide to work together, we can change the world. That’s what—that’s my attitude as we enter these talks.” The full record of this conversation is *ibid.*, Document 123.

During the summit, Nixon and Brezhnev signed 11 agreements, including an agreement on the prevention of nuclear war and an agreement on basic principles of negotiations on the limitation of strategic arms (*Ibid.*, Document 129). The texts of these agreements are printed in Department of State *Bulletin*, July 23, 1973, pages 158–175. In a June 7 letter to Brezhnev, Nixon foresaw the importance of these forthcoming agreements: “Altogether, the agreements which will be concluded during your visit due to the serious and constructive preparatory work that has been done under direction by our representatives, will add new momentum to our relations. They will ensure that your visit will have both symbolic importance and real substantive significance.” (*Foreign Relations*, 1969–1976, volume XV, Soviet Union, June 1972–August 1974, Document 120)

Throughout the summit, Assistant to the President for National Security Affairs Henry Kissinger held several news conferences. During one on June 22, the day that Nixon and Brezhnev signed the agreement on the prevention of nuclear war, Kissinger remarked: “The principal goal of the foreign policy of this administration ever since 1969 has been to set up what the President has called a structure of peace, by which we mean an international system less geared to the management of crises, less conscious of constant eruptions of conflict, in which the principal participants operate with a consciousness of stability and permanence.” (Department of State *Bulletin*, July 23, 1973, page 141)

The agreement, he concluded, “could mark a landmark on the road toward the structure of peace of which the President has been speaking and can be seen as a step toward a new era of cooperation in the relations of all nations and of lifting from them increasingly the fear of nuclear war and of war in general.” (*Ibid.*, page 142)

In response to multiple queries as to the viability of such an agreement, Kissinger stated:

"If either of the two signatories wants to find an excuse to go to war, it will find an excuse to go to war. This has been the history of the postwar period. We are talking here of restraint on significant military actions; and what endangers international peace and security is not determined by the unilateral declaration of the country going to war but also by the reactions of other members of the international system, because this is what produces the threat to international peace and security." (Ibid., page 144)

Kissinger, during his final summit press conference in San Clemente on June 25, responded to comments intimating that the nuclear war agreement was nonbinding and not self-enforcing. Kissinger underscored the reality that a successful agreement depended upon the willingness of both parties to observe and enforce the terms, asserting:

"This agreement is no different from any other agreement in that respect. When great powers make an agreement with each other, they of course have the capability of not observing it unless the other side is prepared to draw extreme consequences. But the violation of this agreement would have serious consequences for the whole context of U.S.-Soviet relations, and conversely the observance of this agreement can mark, as I said on Friday [June 22], a milestone in the achievement of self-restraint by the major countries, a self-restraint which is by definition the essence of peace and which we intend to observe, which we expect the Soviet Union to observe, and which can therefore provide the foundation for a new international relationship.

"Of course history is replete with changes of course and we must be vigilant and prepared for such an occurrence; but it is the belief of the President that this period has a unique opportunity to create a new and more peaceful system. It is an opportunity that has come about partly as a result of the enormity of the weapons that would be used in case of a conflict, partly by the depth of human aspiration toward peace, partly as a result of the complexities of a world in which the ideological expectations of any side have not been fully met.

"But whatever the reasons, we consider the summit as a further advance along that road, that as these meetings become a regular feature of international life and as we come to take them more and more for granted, the results will follow paths that will come to seem more and more natural, and we would consider that one of the best signs that a peaceful world is coming into being." (Ibid., page 149)

15. Memorandum of Conversation¹

Washington, August 3, 1973, 12:30 p.m.

PARTICIPANTS

Dr. Henry A. Kissinger, Assistant to the President for National Security Affairs
PFIAB

Brent Scowcroft, Deputy Assistant to the President for National Security Affairs

Kissinger: Jack Anderson² writes implying that not everything the Board does goes to the President. Every report of the Board does go to the President. Don't judge your influence by the frequency of meeting with us.

I think what is going on is an unmitigated disaster in foreign policy. In April our foreign policy was in excellent shape. The Chinese-Soviet triangle was operating for us. Everyone wanted to be associated with us. Now people are holding off. It is nothing bad yet, but sometimes someone will make a run at us. We have established a reputation for hard and unpredictable action.

There are two choices—use force or don't. If we use it, use enough to succeed. In the India crisis, we moved things—carriers—around so people would say "If they do this over Bangladesh, what would they do over the Middle East?"

In 1970 we were to the brink of war over Jordan without a complaint from Congress.

It's in this way that Watergate is a disaster. Everything is a little harder now and takes a little longer now—Europe, China, etc. All but the USSR. It is a national obligation to get Watergate behind us so we can be seen as an operating government. Nothing yet has really gone wrong—I am talking about the potential.

We must get over Watergate. I speak without prejudice to the facts of it.

Internationally, the big fact is the Sino-Soviet involvement. We have so far pushed the Chinese as a sentimental thing, but let's not kid ourselves: China wants us as a counterweight to the Soviet Union. It is a pleasure to do business with them. They are tough, they're our best NATO ally! But if they think we are going through our cultural revolution, they won't even run the ideological risk of being tied up with us. They are not sentimental.

¹ Source: National Archives, Nixon Presidential Materials, NSC Files, Box 1027, Presidential/HAK MemCons, MemCons April–Nov 1973 HAK & Presidential [3 of 5]. Secret; Nodis. All blank underscores are omissions in the original. The luncheon conversation took place aboard the Presidential yacht *Sequoia*.

² Syndicated newspaper columnist.

A successful Soviet attack on China would overturn the world balance of power. If it is a disarming attack to which we don't respond, if they couple it with seizing Manchuria, the effect on Europe and Japan would be disastrous. We will try to avert this.

It is alleged we have antagonized Japan by neglect, etc. It would be easy if that were so, because we could correct it. They are hard to deal with. They leak everything. You must assume that a country which (through intelligence) fears the most diabolical things of others, must be capable of diabolical things themselves. The Japanese are a potentially corrosive role internationally. Take energy. They are international scavengers. It is narrow, cold-blooded, etc. But they are tuned to survival, so as long as the international structure is favorable, they are okay. Only if things go wrong will they desert.

Europe: They accuse us of condominium, of hegemony, of weakening the deterrent, of asking for their buildup.

The danger is that relations with adversaries become easy and those with friends acrimonious.

Also the emergence of the EC is creating some problems. There is a danger they'll push themselves into confrontation with the US.

The Middle East: Israel is so much stronger that the dilemma is on the Arabs. Right now Israel is asking for their immediate surrender, and the Arabs are asking for a miracle. We want to help, but we will not put out a plan for both to shoot at. We are trying to get both sides, or one side, to put out something which will get negotiations going.

A____:³ What is the Soviet attitude toward China?

Land: If we are out, would Japan jump to the Soviet Union or to China?

Kissinger: A year ago I would have said China, now perhaps the Soviet Union. It depends on the timing.

Teller: What will happen after August 15?⁴

Kissinger: We had a negotiation going. The Chinese and Sihanouk must be as upset with the bombing halt as we are. (Gave pitch on the situation.)

I came out in January thinking we had won the war. In June, it was very different. We only had to keep Cambodia confused, so nothing could crystallize.

If China does nothing after a Soviet surgical strike, China is irrelevant; if they attack Russia, they will lose several armies.

³ Presumably George Anderson, Chairman of President's Foreign Intelligence Advisory Board.

⁴ The Case-Church amendment to the Department of State authorization bill required the cessation of bombing in Cambodia after August 15.

I have given you the problems we face. On the other hand, we can make it tough on the Soviet Union and make them hesitate on China. We are pushing them in the Middle East; in Europe there may be confrontation but it will come out all right.

A____: Why has Europe not supported us in the Middle East?

Kissinger: The maximum we can get out of Israel will be less than the radical Arabs want, so we should make Syria sign it. Don't bring Saudi Arabia in.

16. Editorial Note

President Richard Nixon announced the resignation of Secretary of State William P. Rogers during an August 22, 1973, news conference at the Western White House in San Clemente, California. After praising Rogers as one of the "major architects" of his administration's foreign policy, Nixon said that he intended to nominate Assistant to the President for National Security Affairs Henry Kissinger as Secretary. The President explained that Kissinger would retain his position as Assistant:

"The purpose of this arrangement is to have a closer coordination between the White House and the departments, and in this case, between the White House, the national security affairs, the NSC, and the State Department, which carries a major load in this area." (*Public Papers: Nixon, 1973*, page 711)

On August 23, Kissinger, who was with Nixon in San Clemente, held a press conference to discuss his nomination. Kissinger referenced the foreign policy successes of Nixon's first administration:

"In the first term of the President, many important and some revolutionary changes were made. These required, to considerable extent, secret diplomacy, and they were conducted on a rather restricted basis. But now we are in a different phase. The foundations that have been laid must now lead to the building of a more permanent structure. What has been started is still very tender."

The Secretary-designate intended to capitalize upon these accomplishments:

"So what we are going to try to do is to solidify what has been started, to put more emphasis on our relationship with Europe and with Japan, and to conclude during the term of the President the building of a structure that we can pass on to succeeding administra-

tions so that the world will be a safer place when they take over.” (Department of State *Bulletin*, September 17, 1973, page 368)

Following the August congressional recess, Kissinger testified before the Senate Foreign Relations Committee September 7–17. The confirmation hearings were chaired by Senator J. William Fulbright (D–Arkansas) and were dominated by questions about illegal wiretapping. In his opening remarks, Kissinger underscored the interconnectedness between foreign and domestic policy:

“Mr. Chairman, we have come to experience in recent years that peace at home and peace abroad are closely related. How well we perform in foreign policy depends importantly on how purposeful we are at home. America has passed through a decade of domestic turbulence which has deepened divisions and even shaken our national self-confidence in some measure. At the same time, profound changes have occurred in the world around us a generation after World War II. Our era is marked by both the anxieties of a transitional period and the opportunities of fresh creation.

“These challenges, though they appear as practical issues, cannot be solved in technical terms; they closely reflect our view of ourselves. They require a sense of identity and purpose as much as a sense of policy. Throughout our history we have thought of what we did as growing out of deeper moral values. America was not true to itself unless it had a meaning beyond itself. In this spiritual sense, America was never isolationist.

“This must remain our attitude.” (Ibid., October 1, 1973, page 425)

Kissinger then asserted that greater domestic consensus would allow the United States to project an image of “steadiness.” Cooperation among the three branches of government and a new partnership between the American public and the Federal government informed the administration’s new approach. Kissinger concluded his statement by remarking:

“A few years before he died, one of our most distinguished Secretaries of State, Dean Acheson, entitled his memoirs ‘Present at the Creation.’ He chose that title because he was one of the leading participants in the creation of the postwar international system. The challenge before our country now is whether our generation has the vision—as Dean Acheson’s did more than two decades ago—to turn into dynamic reality the hopeful beginnings we have made toward a more durable peace and a more benevolent planet.” (Ibid., page 428)

The Senate confirmed Kissinger on September 21 by a 78–7 vote. Chief Justice of the U.S. Supreme Court Warren E. Burger administered the oath of office to Kissinger at the White House on September 22. For Nixon and Kissinger’s remarks at the White House ceremony, see *Public Papers: Nixon*, 1973, pages 815–817. For additional documenta-

tion on Kissinger's confirmation hearings, see *Congress and the Nation*, volume IV, 1973–1976, pages 854–856. Kissinger also provides details of his nomination and appointment in *Years of Upheaval*, pages 3–5 and 423–432.

17. Address by Secretary of State Kissinger¹

New York, September 24, 1973.

A Just Consensus, A Stable Order, A Durable Peace

I come before you today—confirmed in office but two days ago—as probably the world's most junior Foreign Minister. That President Nixon should ask me as my first official act to speak here for the United States reaffirms the importance that my country attaches to the values and ideals of the United Nations.

It would be idle to deny that the American people, like many others, have sometimes been disappointed because this organization has not been more successful in translating the hopes for universal peace of its architects into concrete accomplishments.

But despite our disappointments, my country remains committed to the goal of a world community. We will continue to work in this Parliament of Man to make it a reality.

Two centuries ago, the philosopher Kant predicted that perpetual peace would come eventually—either as the creation of man's moral aspirations or as the consequence of physical necessity. What seemed utopian then looms as tomorrow's reality; soon there will be no alternative. Our only choice is whether the world envisaged in the charter will come about as the result of our vision or of a catastrophe invited by our shortsightedness.

The United States has made its choice. My country seeks true peace, not simply an armistice. We strive for a world in which the rule of law governs and fundamental human rights are the birthright of all. Beyond the bilateral diplomacy, the pragmatic agreements, and dra-

¹ Source: Department of State *Bulletin*, October 15, 1973, pp. 469–473. Kissinger spoke before the opening plenary session of the United Nations General Assembly. Drafts of Kissinger's address are in the National Archives, Nixon Presidential Materials, NSC Files, Kissinger Office Files, Box 12, HAK Administrative and Staff Files, HAK Confirmation Material [1 of 4].

matic steps of recent years, we envisage a comprehensive, institutionalized peace—a peace which this organization is uniquely situated to foster and to anchor in the hearts of men.²

This will be the spirit of American foreign policy.

This attitude will guide our work in this organization.

We start from a bedrock of solid progress. Many of the crises that haunted past General Assemblies have been put behind us. Agreement has been reached on Berlin; there is a cease-fire in the Middle East; the Viet-Nam war has been ended. The rigid confrontation that has dominated international life and weakened this organization for a quarter of a century has been softened.

The United States and the Soviet Union have perceived a commonality of interest in avoiding nuclear holocaust and in establishing a broad web of constructive relationships. Talks on strategic arms limitation have already produced historic accords aimed at slowing the arms race and insuring strategic stability; we have, today, resumed negotiations on this subject. The positive results we hope for will enhance the security of all mankind.

Two decades of estrangement between the United States and the People's Republic of China have given way to constructive dialogue and productive exchanges. President Nixon has met with the leaders of that nation; we have agreed to a historic communiqué that honestly sets forth both our differences and our common principles;³ and we have each opened a Liaison Office in the capital of the other.

Many other countries have seized the initiative and contributed—in substance and spirit—to the relaxation of tensions. The nations of Europe and North America are engaged in a conference to further security and cooperation. The two German states have taken their place in this Assembly. India, Pakistan, and Bangladesh have begun to move toward a welcome reconciliation. North and South Korea are at last engaged in a dialogue which we hope will lead to a new era of peace and security.

Yet these achievements, solid as they are, have only made less precarious the dangers and divisions inherited from the postwar era. We have ended many of the confrontations of the cold war; yet, even in this room, the vocabulary of suspicion persists. Relaxation of tensions is justified by some as merely a tactical interlude before renewed

² During remarks made at a September 26 news conference in New York, Kissinger clarified the nature of the administration's global strategy: "So for the President's second term, our agenda is to try to create an international consensus to international order that is seen to be just by all or at least the greatest number—something that embodies humane and progressive ideas." (Department of State *Bulletin*, October 15, 1973, p. 475)

³ See footnote 5, Document 3.

struggle. Others suspect the emergence of a two-power condominium. And as tension between the two original blocs has eased, a third grouping increasingly assumes the characteristics of a bloc of its own—the alignment of the non-aligned.

So the world is uneasily suspended between old slogans and new realities, between a view of peace as but a pause in an unending struggle and a vision of peace as a promise of global cooperation.

From Détente to Cooperation

In 1946 James Byrnes, the first Secretary of State to address this Assembly, spoke of how the United Nations could help break down habits of thinking in national isolation and move toward universal understanding and tolerance among all peoples.

The United States will never be satisfied with a world of uneasy truces, of offsetting blocs, of accommodations of convenience. We know that power can enforce a resigned passivity, but only a sense of justice can enlist consensus. We strive for a peace whose stability rests not merely on a balance of forces, but on shared aspirations. We are convinced that a structure which ignores humane values will prove cold and empty and unfulfilling to most of mankind.

The United States deeply believes:

- That justice cannot be confined by national frontiers.
- That truth is universal and not the peculiar possession of a single people or group or ideology.
- That compassion and humanity must ennoble all our endeavors.

In this spirit we ask the Assembly to move with us from détente to cooperation, from coexistence to community.

Moving Toward Greater Stability

Our journey must begin with the world as it is and with the issues now before us. The United States will spare no effort to ease tensions further and to move toward greater stability:

—We shall continue, in the spirit of the Shanghai communiqué, our search for a new relationship with the People's Republic of China.

—We shall work to promote positive trends elsewhere in Asia. The uncertain peace in Indochina must be strengthened; the world community cannot afford, or permit, a relapse into war in that region.

—We shall continue to pursue vigorously the building of constructive relations with the Soviet Union.

—We shall strive to promote conciliation in Europe. In the negotiations beginning next month we shall seek a reduction of the military forces that have faced each other for so long across that divided continent.

—We shall give new vigor to our policy of partnership in the Western Hemisphere.

—We shall honor our pledge to promote self-determination, economic development, and human dignity across the continent of Africa.

—We shall press on with strategic arms limitation talks. We consider them crucial for security and stability in this period.

—We shall search for solutions to the worldwide problem of conventional weapons, which drain our resources and fuel the fires of local conflict.

In these efforts, the United States will be guided by fundamental principles:

—We have no desire for domination. We will oppose—as we have consistently opposed throughout this century—any nation that chooses this path. We have not been asked to participate in a condominium; we would reject such an appeal if it were made.

—We will never abandon our allies or our friends. The strengthening of our traditional ties is the essential foundation for the development of new relationships with old adversaries.

—We will work for peace through the United Nations as well as through bilateral relationships.

We recognize our special obligation, as a permanent member of the Security Council, to assist in the search for just solutions in those parts of the world now torn by strife, such as the Middle East. While we cannot substitute for the efforts of those most directly involved, we are prepared to use our influence to generate a spirit of accommodation and to encourage the parties toward practical progress.

The Quality of Life

But progress on the traditional agenda is not enough. The more we succeed in solving political problems, the more other and perhaps deeper challenges emerge. As the world grows more stable, we must confront the question of the ends of détente. As the threat of war recedes, the problem of the quality of life takes on more urgent significance.

We are, in fact, members of a community drawn by modern science, technology, and new forms of communication into a proximity for which we are still politically unprepared. Technology daily outstrips the ability of our institutions to cope with its fruits. Our political imagination must catch up with our scientific vision. This is at the same time the greatest challenge and the greatest opportunity of this organization:

—The pollution of the skies, the seas, and the land is a global problem.

—The increased consumption of cereals and protein has reduced world food reserves to dangerously low levels.

—The demand for energy is outrunning supply, and the need for technological innovation is urgent.

—The growth of the world's economy is inhibited by restrictive trading blocs and an insufficiently flexible international monetary system.

—The exploitation of the resources of the ocean beds, which is essential for the needs of burgeoning populations, requires global cooperation lest it degenerate into global contention.

Challenges of this magnitude cannot be solved by a world fragmented into self-contained nation-states or rigid blocs.

Areas of Common Action

I do not intend today to cover the whole agenda of international cooperation. Rather, I shall speak briefly of some illustrative areas of common action. I pledge the readiness of the United States to solve these problems cooperatively and to submit proposals aimed at their resolution.

1. A world community requires the curbing of conflict.

The United Nations, in its 28-year history, has not always been idle in this sphere. In Indonesia, the Indian Subcontinent, the Middle East, the Congo, and in Cyprus, it has shown its ability for effective fact-finding, mediation, and peacekeeping missions. This central aspect of the U.N.'s work must be strengthened. On a small planet, so bound together by technology and so interdependent economically, we can no longer afford the constant eruption of conflict and the danger of its spread.

Yet, in recent years we have found ourselves locked in fruitless debates about the inauguration of peacekeeping operations and over the degree of control the Security Council would exercise over peacekeeping machinery—an impasse which insured only that permanent peacekeeping machinery would not come into being. Each peacekeeping unit we have formed to cope with an emergency has been an improvisation growing out of argument and controversy.

We should delay no longer. The time has come to agree on peacekeeping guidelines so that this organization can act swiftly, confidently, and effectively in future crises. To break the deadlock, the United States is prepared to consider how the Security Council can play a more central role in the conduct of peacekeeping operations. If all countries concerned approach this problem with a desire to achieve a cooperative solution, the United Nations can achieve a major step forward during this session.

2. *A world community must have the widest possible membership.*

The exclusion of any qualified state denies representation not only to governments but to peoples. Membership in this body should be a step toward reconciliation, not a source of conflict. The time has come for North and South Korea to be offered their rightful places here, without prejudice to a future evolution toward unification.

In this spirit also, we support the permanent membership of Japan in the Security Council.

3. *A world community must assure that all its people are fed.*

The growing threat to the world's food supply deserves the urgent attention of this Assembly. Since 1969, global consumption of cereals has risen more rapidly than production; stocks are at the lowest levels in years. We now face the prospect that—even with bumper crops—the world may not rebuild its seriously depleted reserves in this decade.

No one country can cope with this problem. The United States therefore proposes:

—That a World Food Conference be organized under United Nations auspices in 1974⁴ to discuss ways to maintain adequate food supplies, and to harness the efforts of all nations to meet the hunger and malnutrition resulting from natural disasters.

—That nations in a position to do so offer technical assistance in the conservation of food. The United States is ready to join with others in providing such assistance.

4. *A world community cannot remain divided between the permanently rich and the permanently poor.*

Let us therefore resolve that this Assembly, this year, initiate a search—drawing on the world's best minds—for new and imaginative solutions to the problems of development. Our search must be candid and realistic, but it must also be free of peremptory demands, antagonistic propositions, ideological confrontation, or propagandistic rhetoric—or we will surely fail.

The United States is prepared to join in this new search, providing freely of the experience gained over two decades. We have learned not to exaggerate our capacity to transform nations—but we have also learned much about what progress is possible.

We will participate without preconditions, with a conciliatory attitude and a cooperative commitment. We ask only that others adopt the same approach.

⁴ The World Food Conference was held in Rome November 5–16, 1974. See Document 47.

In this spirit the United States is willing to examine seriously the proposal by the distinguished President of Mexico for a Charter of the Economic Rights and Duties of States.⁵ Such a document will make a significant and historic contribution if it reflects the true aspirations of all nations; if it is turned into an indictment of one group of countries by another, it will accomplish nothing. To command general support—and to be implemented—the proposed rights and duties must be defined equitably and take into account the concerns of industrialized as well as of developing countries. The United States stands ready to define its responsibilities in a humane and cooperative spirit.

5. Finally, a world community must harness science and technology for the benefit of all.

We must begin to match our remarkable technological skills with our equally remarkable technological needs. We must find the means for the cooperative and judicious development of our energy resources. We must responsibly confront the problems of population growth, which are fast pushing humanity toward the limits of what our earth can sustain. We must embark on a new scientific revolution to increase agricultural productivity in all lands. No field of human endeavor is so dependent upon an open world for its advancement; no field is so in need of international cooperation to cope with its potential dangers.

Mr. President, fellow delegates: Are we prepared to accept the imperatives of a global society and infuse our labors with a new vision? Or shall we content ourselves with a temporary pause in the turmoil that has wracked our century? Shall we proceed with one-sided demands and sterile confrontations? Or shall we proceed in a spirit of compromise produced by a sense of common destiny? We must move from hesitant cooperation born of necessity to genuine collective effort based on common purpose.

It is a choice no country can make alone. We can repeat old slogans or strive for new hope. We can fill the record of our proceedings with acrimony, or we can dedicate ourselves to dealing with man's deepest needs. The ideal of a world community may be decried as unrealistic—but great constructions have always been ideals before they can become realities. Let us dedicate ourselves to this noblest of all possible goals and achieve at last what has so long eluded us: true understanding and tolerance among mankind.

⁵ Echeverría first proposed the Charter at the April–May 1972 session of the U.N. Conference on Trade and Development (UNCTAD). See *Yearbook of the United Nations*, 1972, pp. 273–274.

18. Paper Prepared in the Bureau of Inter-American Affairs¹

Washington, October 6, 1973.

LATIN AMERICA: U.S. POLICY AND
MAJOR OPERATIONAL PROBLEMS

I. U.S.-Latin American Relations: The Need For A New Conceptual Framework

A. The Historical and Present Concept: Pan Americanism

The concept of Pan Americanism has guided U.S. policy towards the countries of Latin America for over a century. The notion has been of a community of republics, with a common history—a struggle to be independent of Europe—and a common ideal—representative democracy—which would cooperate to build a new order in the Western Hemisphere. Until recently this conceptual framework served us and the Latin Americans well. It provided a philosophical rationale as well as a juridical basis for what was in fact a hegemonic power system with the U.S. at its head.

By and large the Latin Americans acquiesced in having the United States shape the Inter-American System. This attitude reflected their own weakness, but also their perception that it was in their interests to have the United States bound to them in a formal system in which they could attempt to inhibit the unilateral use of U.S. power or turn it to their own advantage.

Today we are in a very different world, and the changes have combined to render an Inter-American System led by and dependent upon the United States unacceptable to Latin America and, indeed, to us as well.

While this situation was recognized as early as 1969, we have thus far been unable to establish a satisfactory new kind of relationship to replace the old one. The result in the multilateral framework has been to create a vacuum which some Latin American regimes highly critical of U.S. policy have exploited.

¹ Source: National Archives, RG 59, Records of Henry A. Kissinger, 1973–77, Lot 91D414, Box 3, NODIS Letters HAK [Henry A. Kissinger], 1973–77. Secret; Nodis. Kubisch forwarded the 17-page paper to Kissinger under cover of an October 6 briefing memorandum. According to Kubisch's briefing memorandum, Kissinger had requested such a study at his September 27 staff meeting. No record of the September 27 meeting has been found. During an October 5 luncheon in New York for Latin American delegates to the United Nations, Kissinger announced the beginning of a "new dialogue with our friends in the Americas," commenting that any new policy "should be a policy designed by all of Latin America for the Americas." For the text of Kissinger's remarks, see Department of State *Bulletin*, October 29, 1973, pp. 542–543. The complete paper is scheduled for publication in *Foreign Relations, 1969–1976*, volume E-11, Documents on American Republics, 1973–1976.

The sharp deterioration in multilateral relations has not been paralleled in the bilateral area, our bilateral relations with the majority of Latin American countries being quite satisfactory. Nevertheless, the two kinds of relationship—multilateral and bilateral—obviously interact. The Inter-American System provides individual Latin American states with a sounding board for their attacks on us in the case of bilateral conflict. Otherwise friendly states are forced to take sides. The present multilateral relationship also is a vehicle for all the states in the region to press for non-reciprocal U.S. concessions which they could not expect to obtain in a bilateral context.

If we continue to operate with the old multilateral relationship, however, our bilateral relations will suffer. We will be increasingly subjected to a multilateralization of bilateral grievances. We will be increasingly embarrassed because our rhetoric about Pan Americanism will be belied by reality. Failing to see any response to their demands for unilateral U.S. concessions, the Latin Americans will be encouraged to unite around extreme Third-World positions in global forums and to participate in economic arrangements inimical to our interests. We will be unable to manage our bilateral relations in isolation from these multilateral developments, and the result will be a spreading political alienation of the countries of the Hemisphere.

B. The Main Outlines of a New Conceptual Approach

Latin America and the United States must draw back from their outmoded relationship in order to lay the basis for a more realistic interlocking once the region is stronger and more highly developed.

The shift from a bipolar to a multipolar world can only be transitional as political structures must eventually be adapted to the growing interdependence of nations. In the meantime, states which by themselves are unable to compete with the great powers—the two military superpowers plus China and Japan—must seek to form blocs with other states in a similar position and with whom they have ties of culture, history, or geography.

Farthest along in Europe, the regional bloc concept is taking hold in Latin America as well. The Latins' attempt in the 1960s to slavishly imitate Europe and form a common market failed to fulfill the high hopes held out for it because the economies of the area were too fragile and were competitive rather than complementary.

More modest attempts at regional collaboration have been more successful. Subregional efforts at economic union, such as the Andean Pact, the Central American Common Market, and the Caribbean Free Trade Area, have been able to make progress. Perhaps as significant in the long run, the Latins have shown themselves increasingly capable of acting in unison in international politics. The Latin American bloc in international forums is now a regular fixture. The Latins' custom of cau-

cluding to form a common front vis-à-vis the United States has been institutionalized in CECLA.

The United States attitude toward Latin American regionalism has been ambivalent. We have given economic assistance to the subregional economic groupings. On the other hand, we have expressed misgivings about Latin American political collaboration—e.g., CECLA—because it has been so obviously designed to strengthen the Latins' hands in dealing with us. We have opposed proposals that a Latin American bloc be institutionalized in the Inter-American System.

If we accept the proposition, however, that some such “dumb-bell”—always latent in the U.S.-Latin American relationship—is inevitable and, indeed, responds to the deep psychological need of the Latin nations to assert their independence of the U.S., we might wish to make a virtue of necessity. Regionalism of Latin America, and subregionalism within Latin America, could serve as the new conceptual basis for relations in the Western Hemisphere.

This “new regionalism” would differ from the old regionalism—Pan Americanism—in that the United States would stand somewhat apart from it—supporting it when possible, dealing with it in a new juridical framework, differing with it on specific issues—but not as a participant on an equal footing with all of the other countries. There would be “linkage” but not 100% membership. The new relationship would not be unlike the one we are seeking to establish with Western Europe.

Such a conceptual framework should afford the United States a number of advantages:

1. The present *de facto* situation in which confrontations between the United States and the Latin American nations stem from a different perception of interests would be rationalized—would become in a sense *de jure*. While we would be confronted, as we now are, with a regional, Latin American position on a number of issues, it would be understood that neither we nor the Latin Americans had the obligation to conform our policies. There would be less grounds for recrimination that we were not living up to our obligations under Pan Americanism.

2. We would gain greater flexibility in the conduct of our relations with the rest of the Hemisphere. We would have less inhibitions about discriminating among the nations of the Hemisphere on the basis of their relative size, development, proximity, and interests. Instead of striving to achieve one lowest-common-denominator type policy for “Latin America”, we would have a more realistic web of policies—bilateral, sub-regional, and regional.

3. We would have a firmer basis for demanding greater reciprocity in our relationships with the other nations of the Hemisphere. It should be clearer that an end to the hegemony and paternalism that was associated with Pan Americanism also means the end to a system in which

only the United States had “obligations” and “commitments” and all the others had “rights.”

In the long run, such a system should strengthen the nations of Latin America and the Caribbean by fostering self-reliance and a sense of a destiny. Before the end of this century we should see another regional center of political and economic strength in the world, one with which, like Europe, we would deal as equals and have close political and economic ties, and which would be a constructive force for world order.

[Omitted here are Part II: “A New Set of Relationships”; Part III: “New Policy Initiatives”; and Part IV: “Major Operational Problems: The Next Six Months.”]

19. Address by Secretary of State Kissinger¹

Washington, October 8, 1973.

Moral Purposes and Policy Choices

This is an important anniversary. A year ago today, on October 8, came the breakthrough in the Paris negotiations which led soon afterward to the end of American military involvement in Viet-Nam. It is strangely difficult now to recapture the emotion of that moment of hope and uncertainty when suddenly years of suffering and division were giving way to new possibilities for reconciliation.

We meet, too, at a time when renewed conflict in the Middle East² reminds us that international stability is always precarious and never to be taken for granted. *Pacem in Terris* remains regrettably elusive. However well we contain this crisis, as we have contained others, we must still ask ourselves what we seek beyond the management of conflict.

The need for a dialogue about national purposes has never been more urgent, and no assembly is better suited for such a discussion than those gathered here tonight.

¹ Source: Department of State *Bulletin*, October 29, 1973, pp. 525–531. Kissinger delivered his address at the Sheraton Park Hotel before the Third *Pacem in Terris* Conference, sponsored by the Center for the Study of Democratic Institutions. The conference's title is in reference to Pope John XXIII's 1963 papal encyclical.

² On October 6, fighting broke out in the Middle East. Egyptian and Syrian forces mounted a surprise attack against Israel by crossing the cease-fire lines into the Sinai Peninsula and Golan Heights, areas held by Israel since the 1967 Arab-Israeli war.

Dramatic changes in recent years have transformed America's position and role in the world:

—For most of the postwar period America enjoyed predominance in physical resources and political power. Now, like most other nations in history, we find that our most difficult task is how to apply limited means to the accomplishment of carefully defined ends. We can no longer overwhelm our problems; we must master them with imagination, understanding, and patience.

—For a generation our preoccupation was to prevent the cold war from degenerating into a hot war. Today, when the danger of global conflict has diminished, we face the more profound problem of defining what we mean by peace and determining the ultimate purpose of improved international relations.

—For two decades the solidarity of our alliances seemed as constant as the threats to our security. Now our allies have regained strength and self-confidence, and relations with adversaries have improved. All this has given rise to uncertainties over the sharing of burdens with friends and the impact of reduced tensions on the cohesion of alliances.

—Thus, even as we have mastered the art of containing crises, our concern with the nature of a more permanent international order has grown. Questions once obscured by more insistent needs now demand our attention: What is true national interest? To what end stability? What is the relationship of peace to justice?

It is characteristic of periods of upheaval that to those who live through them they appear as a series of haphazard events. Symptoms obscure basic issues and historical trends. The urgent tends to dominate the important. Too often goals are presented as abstract utopias, safe havens from pressing events.

But a debate, to be fruitful, must define what can reasonably be asked of foreign policy and at what pace progress can be achieved. Otherwise it turns into competing catalogues of the desirable rather than informed comparisons of the possible. Dialogue degenerates into tactical skirmishing.

The current public discussion reflects some interesting and significant shifts in perspective:

—A foreign policy once considered excessively moralistic is now looked upon by some as excessively pragmatic.

—The government was criticized in 1969 for holding back East-West trade with certain countries until there was progress in their foreign policies. Now we are criticized for not holding back East-West trade until there are changes in those same countries' domestic policies.

—The administration's foreign policy, once decried as too cold war oriented, is now attacked as too insensitive to the profound moral antagonism between communism and freedom.

One consequence of this intellectual shift is a gap between conception and performance on some major issues of policy:

—The desirability of peace and détente is affirmed, but both the inducements to progress and the penalties to confrontation are restricted by legislation.

—Expressions of concern for human values in other countries are coupled with failure to support the very programs designed to help developing areas improve their economic and social conditions.

—The declared objective of maintaining a responsible American international role clashes with nationalistic pressures in trade and monetary negotiations and with calls for unilateral withdrawal from alliance obligations.

It is clear that we face genuine moral dilemmas and important policy choices. But it is also clear that we need to define the framework of our dialogue more perceptively and understandingly.

The Competing Elements of Foreign Policy

Foreign policy must begin with the understanding that it involves relationships between sovereign countries. Sovereignty has been defined as a will uncontrolled by others; that is what gives foreign policy its contingent and ever-incomplete character.

For disagreements among sovereign states can be settled only by negotiation or by power, by compromise or by imposition. Which of these methods prevails depends on the values, the strengths, and the domestic systems of the countries involved. A nation's values define what is just; its strength determines what is possible; its domestic structure decides what policies can in fact be implemented and sustained.

Thus foreign policy involves two partially conflicting endeavors: defining the interests, purposes, and values of a society and relating them to the interests, purposes, and values of others.

The policymaker therefore must strike a balance between what is desirable and what is possible. Progress will always be measured in partial steps and in the relative satisfaction of alternative goals. Tension is unavoidable between values, which are invariably cast in maximum terms, and efforts to promote them, which of necessity involve compromise. Foreign policy is explained domestically in terms of justice. But what is defined as justice at home becomes the subject of negotiation abroad. It is thus no accident that many nations, including our own, view the international arena as a forum in which virtue is thwarted by the clever practice of foreigners.

In a community of sovereign states, the quest for peace involves a paradox: The attempt to impose absolute justice by one side will be seen as absolute injustice by all others; the quest for total security for some turns into total insecurity for the remainder. Stability depends on the relative satisfaction and therefore also the relative dissatisfaction of the various states. The pursuit of peace must therefore begin with the pragmatic concept of coexistence—especially in a period of ideological conflict.

We must, of course, avoid becoming obsessed with stability. An excessively pragmatic policy will be empty of vision and humanity. It will lack not only direction but also roots and heart. General de Gaulle wrote in his memoirs that “France cannot be France without greatness.” By the same token, America cannot be true to itself without moral purpose. This country has always had a sense of mission. Americans have always held the view that America stood for something above and beyond its material achievements. A purely pragmatic policy provides no criteria for other nations to assess our performance and no standards to which the American people can rally.

But when policy becomes excessively moralistic it may turn quixotic or dangerous. A presumed monopoly on truth obstructs negotiation and accommodation. Good results may be given up in the quest for ever-elusive ideal solutions. Policy may fall prey to ineffectual posturing or adventuristic crusades.

The prerequisite for a fruitful national debate is that the policy-makers and critics appreciate each other’s perspectives and respect each other’s purposes. The policymaker must understand that the critic is obliged to stress imperfections in order to challenge assumptions and to goad actions. But equally the critic should acknowledge the complexity and inherent ambiguity of the policymaker’s choices. The policymaker must be concerned with the best that can be achieved, not just the best that can be imagined. He has to act in a fog of incomplete knowledge without the information that will be available later to the analyst. He knows—or should know—that he is responsible for the consequences of disaster as well as for the benefits of success. He may have to qualify some goals, not because they would be undesirable if reached but because the risks of failure outweigh potential gains. He must often settle for the gradual, much as he might prefer the immediate. He must compromise with others, and this means to some extent compromising with himself.

The outsider demonstrates his morality by the precision of his perceptions and the loftiness of his ideals. The policymaker expresses his morality by implementing a sequence of imperfections and partial solutions in pursuit of *his* ideals.

There must be understanding, as well, of the crucial importance of timing. Opportunities cannot be hoarded; once past, they are usually irretrievable. New relationships in a fluid transitional period—such as today—are delicate and vulnerable; they must be nurtured if they are to thrive. We cannot pull up young shoots periodically to see whether the roots are still there or whether there is some marginally better location for them.

We are now at such a time of tenuous beginnings. Western Europe and Japan have joined us in an effort to reinvigorate our relationships. The Soviet Union has begun to practice foreign policy, at least partially, as a relationship between states rather than as international civil war. The People's Republic of China has emerged from two decades of isolation. The developing countries are impatient for economic and social change. A new dimension of unprecedented challenges—in food, oceans, energy, environment—demands global cooperation.

We are at one of those rare moments where through a combination of fortuitous circumstances and design man seems in a position to shape his future. What we need is the confidence to discuss issues without bitter strife, the wisdom to define together the nature of our world, as well as the vision to chart together a more just future.

Détente With the Soviet Union

Nothing demonstrates this need more urgently than our relationship with the Soviet Union.

This administration has never had any illusions about the Soviet system. We have always insisted that progress in technical fields, such as trade, had to follow—and reflect—progress toward more stable international relations. We have maintained a strong military balance and a flexible defense posture as a buttress to stability. We have insisted that disarmament had to be mutual. We have judged movement in our relations with the Soviet Union not by atmospherics but by how well concrete problems are resolved and by whether there is responsible international conduct.

Coexistence, to us, continues to have a very precise meaning:

—We will oppose the attempt by any country to achieve a position of predominance either globally or regionally.

—We will resist any attempt to exploit a policy of détente to weaken our alliances.

—We will react if relaxation of tensions is used as a cover to exacerbate conflicts in international trouble spots.

The Soviet Union cannot disregard these principles in any area of the world without imperiling its entire relationship with the United States.

On this basis we have succeeded in transforming U.S.-Soviet relations in many important ways. Our two countries have concluded a historic accord to limit strategic arms. We have substantially reduced the risk of direct U.S.-Soviet confrontation in crisis areas. The problem of Berlin has been resolved by negotiation. We and our allies have engaged the Soviet Union in negotiations on major issues of European security, including a reduction of military forces in central Europe. We have reached a series of bilateral agreements on cooperation—health, environment, space, science and technology, as well as trade. These accords are designed to create a vested interest in cooperation and restraint.

Until recently the goals of *détente* were not an issue. The necessity of shifting from confrontation toward negotiation seemed so overwhelming that goals beyond the settlement of international disputes were never raised. But now progress has been made—and already taken for granted. We are engaged in an intense debate on whether we should make changes in Soviet society a precondition for further progress or indeed for following through on commitments already made. The cutting edge of this problem is the congressional effort to condition most-favored-nation (MFN) trade status for other countries on changes in their domestic systems.³

This is a genuine moral dilemma. There are genuine moral concerns on both sides of the argument. So let us not address this as a debate between those who are morally sensitive and those who are not, between those who care for justice and those who are oblivious to humane values. The attitude of the American people and government has been made emphatically clear on countless occasions in ways that have produced effective results. The exit tax on emigration is not being collected, and we have received assurances that it will not be reapplied; hardship cases submitted to the Soviet Government are being given specific attention; the rate of Jewish emigration has been in the tens of

³ During the spring of 1973, the House Ways and Means Committee initiated hearings and markup sessions on the administration's trade bill (see footnote 1, Document 5). The House version of the legislation (H.R. 10710) contained an amendment introduced by Representative Charles Vanik (D-Ohio), which linked the extension of MFN status for Soviet exports to the Soviet Union's Jewish emigration policies. Senator Henry "Scoop" Jackson (D-Washington) introduced a similar amendment in the Senate. Soviet Foreign Minister Andrei Gromyko and Ambassador Anatoly Dobrynin raised concerns over the Jackson-Vanik proposal with Kissinger during a dinner meeting in New York on September 24. Gromyko noted that the "present situation does not inspire us." Kissinger responded: "I think it's a temporary phenomenon. We will fight it publicly. I will make a speech in Washington October 8. Although it is supposed to be philosophical, I will speak about US-Soviet relations in a positive sense." (Ford Library, National Security Adviser, Kissinger/Scowcroft West Wing Office Files, Box 32, USSR—Gromyko File (10) 9/24/73-10/18/73)

thousands, where it was once a trickle. We will continue our vigorous efforts on these matters.

But the real debate goes far beyond this: Should we now tie demands which were never raised during negotiations to agreements that have already been concluded? Should we require as a formal condition internal changes that we heretofore sought to foster in an evolutionary manner?

Let us remember what the MFN question specifically involves. The very term “most favored nation” is misleading in its implication of preferential treatment. What we are talking about is whether to allow *normal* economic relations to develop—of the kind we now have with over 100 other countries and which the Soviet Union enjoyed until 1951. The issue is whether to abolish discriminatory trade restrictions that were imposed at the height of the cold war. Indeed, at that time the Soviet Government discouraged commerce because it feared the domestic impact of normal trading relations with the West on its society.

The demand that Moscow modify its domestic policy as a precondition for MFN or détente was never made while we were negotiating; now it is inserted after both sides have carefully shaped an overall mosaic. Thus it raises questions about our entire bilateral relationship.

Finally, the issue affects not only our relationship with the Soviet Union but also with many other countries whose internal structures we find incompatible with our own. Conditions imposed on one country could inhibit expanding relations with others, such as the People’s Republic of China.

We shall never condone the suppression of fundamental liberties. We shall urge humane principles and use our influence to promote justice. But the issue comes down to the limits of such efforts. How hard can we press without provoking the Soviet leadership into returning to practices in its foreign policy that increase international tensions? Are we ready to face the crises and increased defense budgets that a return to cold war conditions would spawn? And will this encourage full emigration or enhance the well-being or nourish the hope for liberty of the peoples of Eastern Europe and the Soviet Union? Is it détente that has prompted repression—or is it détente that has generated the ferment and the demand for openness which we are now witnessing?

For half a century we have objected to Communist efforts to alter the domestic structures of other countries. For a generation of cold war we sought to ease the risks produced by competing ideologies. Are we now to come full circle and insist on domestic compatibility as a condition of progress?

These questions have no easy answers. The government may underestimate the margin of concessions available to us. But a fair debate

must admit that they are genuine questions, the answers to which could affect the fate of all of us.

Our policy with respect to détente is clear: We shall resist aggressive foreign policies. Détente cannot survive irresponsibility in any area, including the Middle East. As for the internal policies of closed systems, the United States will never forget that the antagonism between freedom and its enemies is part of the reality of the modern age. We are not neutral in that struggle. As long as we remain powerful, we will use our influence to promote freedom, as we always have. But in the nuclear age we are obliged to recognize that the issue of war and peace also involves human lives and that the attainment of peace is a profound moral concern.

The World as It Is and the World We Seek

Addressing the United Nations General Assembly two weeks ago,⁴ I described our goal as a world where power blocs and balances are no longer relevant; where justice, not stability, can be our overriding preoccupation; where countries consider cooperation in the world interest to be in their national interest.

But we cannot move toward the world of the future without first maintaining peace in the world as it is. These very days we are vividly reminded that this requires vigilance and a continuing commitment.

So our journey must start from where we are now. This is a time of lessened tension, of greater equilibrium, of diffused power. But if the world is better than our earlier fears, it still falls far short of our hopes. To deal with the present does not mean that we are content with it.

The most striking feature of the contemporary period, the feature that gives complexity as well as hope, is the radical transformation in the nature of power. Throughout history power has generally been homogeneous. Military, economic, and political potential were closely related. To be powerful, a nation had to be strong in all categories. Today the vocabulary of strength is more complex. Military muscle does not guarantee political influence. Economic giants can be militarily weak, and military strength may not be able to obscure economic weakness. Countries can exert political influence even when they have neither military nor economic strength.

It is wrong to speak of only one balance of power, for there are several, which have to be related to each other. In the military sphere, there are two superpowers. In economic terms, there are at least five major groupings. Politically, many more centers of influence have emerged;

⁴ Document 17.

some 80 new nations have come into being since the end of World War II, and regional groups are assuming ever-increasing importance.

Above all, whatever the measure of power, its political utility has changed. Throughout history increases in military power, however slight, could be turned into specific political advantage. With the overwhelming arsenals of the nuclear age, however, the pursuit of marginal advantage is both pointless and potentially suicidal. Once sufficiency is reached, additional increments of power do not translate into usable political strength, and attempts to achieve tactical gains can lead to cataclysm.

This environment both puts a premium on stability and makes it difficult to maintain. Today's striving for equilibrium should not be compared to the balance of power of previous periods. The very notion of "operating" a classical balance of power disintegrates when the change required to upset the balance is so large that it cannot be achieved by limited means.

More specifically, there is no parallel with the 19th century. Then the principal countries shared essentially similar concepts of legitimacy and accepted the basic structure of the existing international order. Small adjustments in strength were significant. The "balance" operated in a relatively confined geographic area. None of these factors obtain today.

Nor when we talk of equilibrium do we mean a simplistic mechanical model devoid of purpose. The constantly shifting alliances that maintained equilibrium in previous centuries are neither appropriate nor possible in our time. In an age of ideological schism the distinction between friends and adversaries is an objective reality. We share ideals as well as interests with our friends, and we know that the strength of our friendships is crucial to the lowering of tensions with our opponents.

When we refer to five or six or seven major centers of power, the point being made is not that others are excluded but that a few short years ago everyone agreed that there were only two. The diminishing tensions and the emergence of new centers of power have meant greater freedom of action and greater importance for all other nations.

In this setting, our immediate aim has been to build a stable network of relationships that offers hope of sparing mankind the scourges of war. An interdependent world community cannot tolerate either big-power confrontations or recurrent regional crises.

But peace must be more than the absence of conflict. We perceive stability as the bridge to the realization of human aspirations, not an end in itself. We have learned much about containing crises, but we have not removed their roots. We have begun to accommodate our dif-

ferences, but we have not affirmed our commonality. We may have improved the mastery of equilibrium, but we have not yet attained justice.

In the encyclical for which this conference is named, Pope John sketched a greater vision. He foresaw “that no political community is able to pursue its own interests and develop itself in isolation” for “there is a growing awareness of all human beings that they are members of a world community.”

The opportunities of mankind now transcend nationalism and can only be dealt with by nations acting in concert:

—For the first time in generations mankind is in a position to shape a new and peaceful international order. But do we have the imagination and determination to carry forward this still-fragile task of creation?

—For the first time in history we may have the technical knowledge to satisfy man’s basic needs. The imperatives of the modern world respect no national borders and must inevitably open all societies to the world around them. But do we have the political will to join together to accomplish this great end?

If this vision is to be realized, America’s active involvement is inescapable. History will judge us by our deeds, not by our good intentions.

But it cannot be the work of any one country. And it cannot be the undertaking of any one administration or one branch of government or one party. To build truly is to chart a course that will be carried on by future leaders because it has the enduring support of the American people.

So let us search for a fresh consensus. Let us restore a spirit of understanding between the legislative and the executive, between the government and the press, between the people and their public servants. Let us learn once again to debate our methods and not our motives, to focus on our destiny and not on our divisions. Let us all contribute our different views and perspectives, but let us once again see ourselves as engaged in a common enterprise. If we are to shape a world community we must first restore community at home.

With Americans working together, America can work with others toward man’s eternal goal of a *Pacem in Terris*—peace abroad, peace at home, and peace within ourselves.

20. Minutes of a Cabinet Meeting¹

Washington, October 18, 1973.

Shultz: Brezhnev and Kosygin were genuinely puzzled about things going on in the United States.² They seemed genuinely sincere about détente. Brezhnev asked me: “Is the problem really about Jewish emigration, or does the United States want to go back to the Cold War.”³ They seemed to be saying that if this is the way people think Jews will get out of the Soviet Union, they are mistaken.

President: The significant thing is that Brezhnev has staked his leadership on better relations with the United States. He needs us for European détente, for trade, and to keep the United States from tilting toward the Chinese. This puts the Middle East into perspective—what will they do. Last May—in May of ’72—they didn’t chuck us for the mining of Haiphong. Of course they must support their clients, but the question is whether they will do it at the jeopardy to all the other fish they have to fry. Henry, you expand.

Kissinger: In 1969, the President announced the concept that came to be known as linkage—the idea that there was a connection between their behavior in Vietnam, Berlin, the Caribbean and general policy. We were violently attacked for this idea. We were told that trade was beneficial in itself and shouldn’t be linked to the political sphere. We were accused of an outmoded Cold War policy. It took us two years to get the Soviet Union to look at things this way. Then we had simultaneous crises in 1970 on the autobahn, in the Caribbean, and in Jordan. Since then the Soviet Union has delivered on every political condition and on lend-lease and we have done nothing. The wheat deal had nothing to

¹ Source: Library of Congress, Manuscript Division, Kissinger Papers, Box CL 280, Memoranda of Conversations, Presidential File, Sep.–Dec. 1973. Secret. All brackets are in the original. According to the President’s Daily Diary, the meeting took place in the Cabinet Room from 3:09 to 5:02 p.m. In attendance were Vice President-designate Ford, Kissinger, Shultz, Clements, Richardson, Morton, Dent, Brennan, Weinberger, Lynn, Brinegar, Ash, Armstrong, Harlow, Laird, Scali, Bush, Scowcroft, Under Secretary of Agriculture J. Phil Campbell, Flanigan, Executive Director of the Domestic Council Kenneth Cole, Jr., Director of the Cost of Living Council John Dunlop, CEA member Gary Seevers, OMB Deputy Director Fred Malek, Under Secretary of Labor Richard Schubert, Haig, Ziegler, Love, Price, and Nixon’s Special Assistants William Baroody, David Gergen, David Parker, Stanley Scott, and Ford’s Special Assistant Robert Hartmann. (National Archives, Nixon Presidential Materials, White House Central Files) Also printed in *Foreign Relations*, 1969–1976, volume XXV, Arab-Israeli Crisis and War, 1973, Document 201, and *ibid.*, volume XXXI, Foreign Economic Policy, 1973–1976, Document 191.

² Shultz, Dent, and Casey were in Moscow September 30–October 3.

³ See footnote 3, Document 19.

do with détente—we thought that was a good deal.⁴ They have given assurances on the Jews and we keep raising the ante. It must be looked on by them as a deliberate attempt to scuttle détente. One of the riskiest things is to try to play around with the domestic structure of a revolutionary government.

Last week I talked to Dobrynin about détente. He says he understands our domestic policy, but in Moscow they are saying that they are being attacked here more than before there was détente. The Europeans are saying to them: “The U.S. is unreliable; trade with us.” If this Soviet leadership fails, it may be years before we can reestablish a dialogue. This frivolous monkeying around with the domestic policy of the Soviet Union can have the most serious consequences. This is one of the most important foreign policy issues of our times.

President: If détente goes down the drain, I will have to ask for \$25 billion more for defense.

Ford: The bill is coming up on Halloween. There are hearings on the rule next week and the rule will probably open up the issue of the credits. Henry’s statements need to get to the House.

President: I have serious doubts I will sign a trade bill with Vanik; if credits are denied, it will be vetoed. That is a public statement.

Ford: I will need Henry’s help on it.

Shultz: [Discussed the Nairobi Conference]⁵

President: While the people in this country support aid to the Israelis, they are against American involvement. But aid has no constituency. We must continue to act responsibly, but we must recognize that we have neo-isolationism in this country and there is no support for aid.

Excluding food and energy from the CPI, we would have inflation of only 3½ percent.

I am totally committed to expanded world trade, toward an international monetary system to avoid crises—but I will veto the trade bill with Vanik and [limit on] credits and I will seriously consider it with Vanik even without the credit restrictions.

We can’t negotiate with other countries if a minority can determine the foreign policy of the United States. No minority is going to do it while I am President.

⁴ Reference is the U.S.-Soviet agreement of July 8, 1972, a 3-year agreement that provided for Soviet purchase of a total of \$750 million in U.S. grains, the largest Soviet purchase of U.S. grain to date. (Department of State *Bulletin*, July 31, 1972, pp. 144–145)

⁵ The Boards of Governors of the International Monetary Fund and the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development held their annual meetings in Nairobi, Kenya, September 24–28. Shultz represented the United States.

Brennan: [Gives Labor Department report.]

President: Henry will brief you now on the Middle East. This is for guidance, not quotation.

Kissinger: First, let me talk about the situation before the war, then the military situation, then our negotiating strategy. There is a story going around that we held Israel back from a preemptive attack. All our intelligence said there would be no attack. Why did Israel not figure there would be an attack? Because we for four years had been telling them they had to make diplomatic moves. Therefore they developed the posture that there was no need to move, there was no threat, the Arabs are too weak, so they interpreted the intelligence this way. We did the same, but we figured that because they were so good, the Arabs wouldn't dare to attack.

The war showed that Israeli tactics are out of date. The fact is that Israel can no longer score victories like they did in 1967. Their strategy has been to fight on one front at a time. This time they couldn't do it, so we are in a war of attrition. That is very serious for Israel.

President: Before this war Israel felt it had no incentive to negotiate; now they have to make an agonizing reappraisal of that position. They can't take another war.

Kissinger: Now Israel has to consider how they can enhance their position by diplomacy, not just by military means.

We are in a position now where if we can keep the war from escalating and from turning into a confrontation with the Arabs, we have the best chance for settlement.

At the President's very first Cabinet meeting, he said that the greatest danger in the Middle East would be that local powers would draw the superpowers in, as happened in World War I. We have resisted letting the local clients dictate the pace of events. Both the U.S. and the Soviet Union have friends to support. The test is whether we can support them and still retain our balance with each other.

We could have grandstanded. A Security Council resolution would just have lined people up and brought acrimony. We are trying to get a consensus before we move. When you ask whether the Soviet Union is snookering us, you have to ask what we haven't done which we would otherwise have done. In practice we have been extremely tough—in massing a great airlift, with no bases except for the Azores from the Portuguese—whom we have kicked around.

President: No more.

Kissinger: We have told the Soviet Union this is a test of détente, but we have not thrown down the gauntlet. We have our communication lines out to the Arabs. The President met with them yesterday. We

are trying to use diplomacy as a bridge to a decent settlement. We will make our case to the public after the diplomacy has concluded.

What you should know is we are trying to conclude in a way to lead to a settlement; we responded to the challenge of the Soviet airlift. Soviet behavior is ambiguous. We are not trying to confront them; we believe they will be working something out.

President: The Soviet Union has a problem with the Arabs. They have done well and don't want to negotiate except on terms Israel can never buy. We are working on a cease fire with a connection to 242.⁶

Kissinger: 242 is not a new proposal. It is very dangerous to speculate about any particular formula. The major problem now is to get the parties into a negotiation with a formula so vague that each party can save face.

Clements: The military services have performed magnificently. It is a complex, beautiful operation.

President: The key point is to try to keep the Soviet Union from sending in their own personnel. Do we want to push the Soviet Union—this is what I hear from the “new hawks”—so far that they do this and confront us with a terrible choice?

Kissinger: We are taking tough action but speaking softly. We should not escalate until we see how the diplomacy can work out. We are being very quiet and we have put in massive material, with only a modest reaction from the Arabs.

⁶ Security Council Resolution 242 (U.N. doc. S/RES/242 (S/8247)), adopted on November 22, 1967, set forth principles for the establishment of a just and lasting peace in the Middle East.

21. Editorial Note

The problem of energy dependence confronted the Nixon administration in the aftermath of the October 1973 Arab-Israeli war. Earlier, President Richard Nixon, in an April 18 special message to Congress on energy policy, outlined steps the Federal government, private business, and the public should take in conserving energy and developing domestic resources. Nixon additionally placed resource consumption in an international context:

“I believe the energy challenge provides an important opportunity for nations to pursue vital objectives through peaceful cooperation. No

chance should be lost to strengthen the structure of peace we are seeking to build in the world, and few issues provide us with as good an opportunity to demonstrate that there is more to be gained in pursuing our national interests through mutual cooperation than through destructive competition or dangerous confrontation." (*Public Papers: Nixon, 1973*, page 317) Nixon supplemented this message with a June 29 statement outlining additional conservation measures. (*Ibid.*, pages 623–630)

On October 18, the Organization of Petroleum Exporting Countries imposed an oil embargo on the United States in light of U.S. support for Israel in the Middle East war. The embargo was later extended to Western Europe and Japan. The embargo underscored the extent of U.S. dependence on foreign fuels, as Nixon explained in a November 7 address to the nation: "Now, even before war broke out in the Middle East, these prospective shortages were the subject of intensive discussions among members of my Administration, leaders of the Congress, Governors, mayors, and other groups. From these discussions has emerged a broad agreement that we, as a nation, must now set upon a new course." Nixon called this "new course" "Project Independence," inspired by the technical successes of both the Manhattan Project and the Apollo space mission. As the President explained: "Today the challenge is to regain the strength that we had earlier in this century, the strength of self-sufficiency. Our ability to meet our own energy needs is directly limited to our continued ability to act decisively and independently at home and abroad in the service of peace, not only for America but for all nations in the world." He predicted that the United States could achieve energy self-reliance by 1980. Accordingly, the President announced several austerity measures ranging from lowering highway speed limits to reducing the supply of heating oil for homes and businesses. (*Ibid.*, pages 916–922)

In response to criticism that the country had not adequately prepared or planned for an energy crisis, Nixon noted during a November 17 news conference:

"I saw this thing coming. And you know why I saw it coming? Not because of the Mideast or the Alaska pipeline and the rest, but because this world with all of its problems is getting richer. Oh, I don't mean there aren't a lot of hungry people not only in America, too many here, but if you want to see hungry people, go to India or go to some of the countries in Latin America or upper Brazil, et cetera, et cetera. But generally, as the world gets richer, there is more air-conditioning, there is more need for power, and there is more need for energy. And that is why I sent the message 2 years ago and asked at that time that the Congress consider a program so that the United States should become self-sufficient in energy. All right, I followed that up this year in April

before we even knew there might be or had any idea that—of the Mid-east crisis, which made a serious problem, a serious crisis. I asked them for seven pieces of legislation to deal with energy. One has reached my desk, the Alaska pipeline. I signed it. The other six—I hope they act before they go home for Christmas.” (Ibid., page 960)

22. Minutes of a Bipartisan Leadership Meeting¹

Washington, November 27, 1973, 8:30 a.m.

President Nixon: Henry will give you a review of the Middle East.

Secretary Kissinger: I will summarize what the President tried to do during the war, where we hope to go over the next few months, and a few words on the oil embargo.

During the war there were two objectives: (1), a rapid ceasefire, and (2), to put the U.S. in a position to have a major influence in a settlement.² Therefore, we had to do many things which leaned to one side: First, the airlift. If we had allowed a victory of Soviet arms over American arms, the whole balance of power would have shifted. Secondly, the President maintained a personal contact with the Arabs. With the Soviet Union we used our relationship to moderate the conflict and worked with them to bring it to a newer stage.

Let me explain what our view is of détente. We want a relationship with the Soviet Union not because the domestic structures of the United States and the Soviet Union are coming closer. Not because they have changed their goals. Détente is necessary because of the vast strategic arsenals of nuclear weapons on both sides. It is an imperative of our policy to prevent a nuclear war.

Obviously détente does not prevent incompatible actions in many areas. Nor does it mean that we acquiesce in the policies of severe repression in the Soviet Union.

¹ Source: National Archives, Nixon Presidential Materials, NSC Files, Box 1027, Presidential/HAK MemCons, MemCons April–Nov 1973 HAK & Presidential [1 of 5]. Confidential. The meeting took place in the White House Roosevelt Room. According to the President’s Daily Diary, the meeting lasted from 8:38 until 10:16 a.m. (Ibid., White House Central Files) A list of attendees is *ibid.* Also printed in *Foreign Relations*, 1969–1976, volume XXV, Arab-Israeli Crisis and War, 1973, Document 360.

² During his October 25 press conference, Kissinger noted that Nixon “was convinced that we had two major problems: first, to end hostilities as quickly as possible—but secondly, to end hostilities in a manner that would enable us to make a major contribution to removing the conditions that have produced four wars between Arabs and Israelis in the last 25 years.” (Department of State *Bulletin*, November 12, 1973, p. 585)

When I went on the trip to the Middle East, first, we faced the Arab demand for a return of Israeli forces to the 22 October lines. Second, we had to get a negotiating process started. Third, I told the Arabs that only the United States could bring them negotiations and territory. I told Sadat he had an historic opportunity. He could argue about the ceasefire line or he could work for a conference which could bring about a true peace. Sadat is a wise man. As a result, we negotiated the 6-point plan to consolidate the ceasefire and begin the negotiating process.³

The negotiations are now being organized. This week the Soviet Union and the United States will appeal to the parties to convene a conference.⁴

The reason for doing this under U.S.-Soviet auspices is that a wider forum would widen the quarrel as much as the parties. The Chinese and Soviets would quarrel and the British and French would quarrel with us.

Our forum is not yet fully put together but I think it will be this week. Israel can't do much before January. The first portion will probably be devoted to separation of forces—hopefully to inject some UN forces so that the subsequent negotiation can be freer from the prospect of fighting.

The second phase is the difficult issue of Israel's border, security arrangements between Israel and the Arabs, and outside guarantees. We don't want guarantees such that the United States and Soviet Union are automatically charmed into every little dispute.

Our impression is there is more disposition in the Arabs for moderate discussion than at any time since World War II. Nevertheless, there is severe pressure from the rich radical states—Iraq and Libya. Potentially also from the Soviet Union, although not yet. Also regretfully, the British, French, and Japanese, who take positions near those of the radical Arabs. (The EC made a demand for the October 22 line just after Sadat had given it up, making his position tough.)

The prospects are bright, but it will be difficult.

There will be some painful time for Israel, who will have to withdraw from some territories. But Israel can't want to keep on with these debilitating wars.

³ Kissinger traveled to the Middle East and Asia November 5–16. He visited Morocco, Tunisia, Egypt, Jordan, Saudi Arabia, Iran, Pakistan, the PRC, Japan, and South Korea. On November 9, Kissinger sent a letter to U.N. Secretary General Kurt Waldheim noting that Egypt and Israel would accept a 6-point agreement implementing Article I of the U.N. Security Council Resolutions 338 and 339. For documentation, including records of Kissinger's meetings during his trip and the text of his letter to Waldheim, see *Foreign Relations*, 1969–1976, volume XXV, Arab-Israeli Crisis and War, 1973.

⁴ The Middle East Peace Conference convened in Geneva December 21–22.

Let me talk about the oil embargo.⁵ It is very important that we not make public statements on this.

I had an extensive conversation with King Faisal.⁶ He is a religious fanatic, a conservative, a friend of the United States. But he is between Iraq and South Yemen. He therefore tried to leapfrog the radicals and appear as the leader of the Arab cause. Their public views are always fierce, but privately I think they are looking for a way out of it.

How do we get out of it?

The Europeans and Japan have gone to the Arabs and said “What do you want us to do?” This is intolerable. If we give in to this: (1) It encourages the radical elements. (2) It gives an opportunity to the Europeans to escalate the proposal. (3) It gives an opportunity to the Soviet Union to escalate the proposal. For example, the Africans are now proposing to keep the embargo until the United States stops its racist policies. We could be faced by blackmail from all raw material producers.

We will talk with the producers, but not under blackmail. There is some chance they will back off the embargo and give negotiations a chance.

The Israeli problem is traumatic. They have relied totally on military supremacy and now know they can’t do that.

Let me add a word on the Soviet Union. People say that if détente is so great, how come these confrontations? If we didn’t have problems with the Soviet Union, we wouldn’t need détente.

There were some things the Soviet Union did we didn’t like, but in some other ways they were restrained. They gave no encouragement to terrorists. There was never a day when the President and Brezhnev were not in contact. They made a crisis about the Third Army and the President took strong action in order to forestall the introduction of Soviet troops. Once the action was taken, our communications were able to move us quickly to a settlement.

This is the meaning of détente and on the whole it has worked. If we keep our nerves and pursue our goals, we have a good chance for a real peace.

President: Could you spell out some dates, Henry?

Kissinger: I hope the conference will start by the middle of December.

President: Let’s talk candidly. We want the embargo lifted, but don’t say anything which would make it hard for the Arabs.

⁵ See Document 21.

⁶ See *Foreign Relations*, 1969–1976, volume XXV, Arab-Israeli Crisis and War, 1973, Document 332.

Kissinger: If you want to say personally that our task is not made easier by oil threats . . .

Ford: Can we talk about the conference participants?

Kissinger: No. Make it an internal Arab problem.

Question: What is Syria's hang up?

Kissinger: There isn't that much hang up. They have sought contact with us. Their problem is Iraq and the Baathist parties. We don't have relations with Syria so the Soviet Union has to bring them to the conference.

President: Syria is geographically closer to the Soviet Union.

Fulbright: What happens if the Israeli elections are postponed?

Kissinger: We can't wait past December 31. We can stall til then on organizational details but not after.

Fulbright: What can we do to help Israel realize they must rely on guarantees as well as military strength? What sort of guarantee can we give?

Kissinger: Before the war, Israel thought that any conflict would be a repetition of 1967. Israel thought they couldn't be in a better position, and there was no real pressure to make them change.

Now things are different—the war, and their diplomatic isolation. Basing their policy on automatic U.S.-Soviet hostility on every issue is risky. Of course they put faith in their ability in the U.S. to mobilize strength. We must make clear that we are committed to Israeli security, but it must be sought in other than purely military ways.

I think territorial belts of security are better than guarantees. The only guarantee Israel would take seriously would be a U.S. guarantee. A European-U.S. or a UN guarantee they would laugh at. The Soviet Union could guarantee the Arabs.

Fulbright: How about joint, for both sides?

Kissinger: Okay, as long as it could be implemented individually, with no veto.

Fulbright: How about Jerusalem?

Kissinger: There are two non-military aspects: Jerusalem and the Palestinians.

On the Palestinians and Gaza there is a possibility. Jerusalem is a tough problem. A way must be found to remove the Arab holy places from Israeli control. Egypt doesn't care much about Jerusalem; Faisal is obsessed by it, but doesn't care much about the Sinai.

Intellectually, Jerusalem is solvable with a Vatican-type setup.

Scott: Are the Israelis more or less intransigent than American Jews?

Kissinger: Less. Israel's problem now is the election campaign. Since October 22, Israel's position has evolved and they are willing to talk about things. But the American Jews are so tough and tend to hypo [hype?] the Israelis and give them illusions.

Fulbright: Isn't that an illusion?

President: It is in this Administration.

Fulbright: Not in Congress.

Kissinger: Let's make clear: We are trying to preserve Israel's security. We have no intentions of sacrificing Israel, and some day they will thank us.

Albert: Why do the Europeans think the destruction of Israel would end the blackmail?

Kissinger: This is a sad chapter in the history of Europe. There is no good answer.

Mailliard: Are you going to Europe?

Kissinger: I am going to the NATO meeting⁷ and the President has told me to lay it out cold. There will be screaming.

Scott: Do the American Jews know the extent of Israeli losses?

Kissinger: We will be working with the American Jews. The President is the best friend Israel ever had. In time they will realize that. Israel can't go on with military solutions. They cannot win a war of attrition.

Stennis: How much is this conference our conference and what are our stakes?

Kissinger: The answer is delicate. It is in our interest to involve the Soviet Union so they don't take an extreme position, but we also must make it clear to the Arabs that a settlement can come only through American influence. This is a narrow course to follow. We do it to bolster the moderate Arabs and demonstrate that the extremists won't get the Arabs anywhere. We will therefore fight radical proposals but move to force Israeli acceptance of moderate proposals.

Young: How important is opening the Canal?

Kissinger: That would be part of any military withdrawals. Don't worry about Canal opening the Indian Ocean to the Soviet Navy. We can watch them in the Indian Ocean and elsewhere.

Stratton: What is the significance now of Resolution 242?⁸

⁷ Kissinger headed the U.S. delegation to the regular Ministerial meeting of the North Atlantic Council at Brussels December 10–11. Documentation on the meeting is scheduled for publication in *Foreign Relations, 1969–1976*, volume E–15, part 2, Documents on Western Europe, 1973–1976.

⁸ See footnote 6, Document 20.

Kissinger: In the family—242 doesn't mean a thing.

President: It means 1967 for the Arabs and for Israel it means what they have plus ten percent.

Kissinger: We want to distinguish between demilitarized belts and frontiers. Sadat seems to understand the security belt idea.

Fulbright: It is not right to say 242 doesn't mean anything.

President: It means different things to different people. To us it means what is negotiated.

Let me sum up:

We are for Israel's security and we are against any effort to impinge on that. We demonstrated it twice in this conflict—by the airlift and by the alert. The Israeli hawks have to talk this way. But Israel has no friends. They are totally dependent on the United States. As long as we provide the weapons, Israel can lick the Arabs for twenty-five years, but they can't keep the Soviet Union at bay. What they must ask themselves is what we would do if the Soviets call our hands. This last time we did.

—There is no *détente* with regard to philosophy; the same with China.

—We and the Soviet Union disagree on China; our interests in Europe are opposed. But we no more have yearly crises on the autobahn. And in the Middle East. In Southeast Asia, their interests were never so involved that they might get involved. That is true in only three areas: China, Europe, and perhaps in the Middle East. This time, in the Middle East, they decided that relations with us were more important than the Middle East.

—Everyone here is for Israeli survival. But it can survive only if it has American support in the face of possible Soviet moves in the Middle East.

The American people will be moved by our friends in Congress for weapons but they will back off if they see American forces going into the Middle East against the Soviet Union.

Israel can't base its policy on military security. We need that supplemental⁹ so they don't think we are blackmailing them. A settlement has to cost Israel some territory. That is why we are for 242. It avoids our having to come down on one side or the other.

The U.S. is committed to movement on peace. In that case, only the U.S. and the Soviet Union matter and that is why the Soviet Union must play a role.

⁹ The administration had requested \$2.2 billion in supplemental aid for Israel. Congress approved it in December.

The third thing, the United States now has good relations with virtually all of the Arabs.

We can work with all of them for a settlement. We don't want to embarrass the Soviet Union.

Kissinger: We want to give the moderate Arabs an incentive to work with us.

O'Neill: 'Til 1972 Egypt had Soviet troops there and kicked them out. What happened?

Kissinger: The President said in 1970 we didn't like the Soviets in Egypt. Sadat was dissatisfied with progress with the Soviet Union there, so he threw them out. They were dissatisfied with the situation after they threw them out and started a war. I must admit the prospects are more favorable than if the war hadn't happened.

Mansfield: Do Egypt and Israel have the capability to make nuclear weapons?

Kissinger: Israel has the capability to make small numbers. Not Egypt. And we don't think the Soviets have put them in. Should Israel brandish nuclear weapons, the Soviets would counter it and it would be very dangerous for Israel.

McClellan: What incentive do the Arabs have for a peace? Israel has no friends; they have the oil.

Kissinger: The Arabs have learned that in their lifetime they cannot win a war, though they can bleed Israel. The radical Arabs certainly want Israel's destruction. The moderate Arabs, though, fear that the cost of belligerency jeopardizes the stability of their regimes.

I can make a case that Israel is more secure with a border near the 1967 border and a security zone than with the present borders and their forces in contact. With a security zone, the Arabs must move from under their SAM belt. Not all the Arabs will seek peace, but peace would break the unity of the Arabs because they have different motivations.

President: There is another reason. All Arabs are nationalists. The United States has faults, but no one thinks that relations with the United States infringe their independence. That is not true with the Soviet Union and the Arabs know that. That may be partly responsible for Egypt's throwing out the Soviets in 1972. I think the moderate Arabs would prefer the United States to play a role in a settlement than to be beholden to the Soviet Union.

McClellan: As long as there are respites, there is hope, but I am not optimistic on the prospects for a durable peace.

President: You are realistic, but we have no other choices and we must play a role with both sides. Who wants a showdown with the Soviet Union? Only the columnists.

Mansfield: Mr. President, you and Kissinger are to be commended.

23. Memorandum of Conversation¹

Washington, November 28, 1973, 3 p.m.

SUBJECT

US-European Relations

PARTICIPANTS

Dean Rusk
Douglas Dillon
David Rockefeller
McGeorge Bundy
Cyrus Vance
John J. McCloy

The Secretary
Assistant Secretary Stoessel
Mr. Sonnenfeldt

The Secretary said he wanted to exchange views on Europe with the assembled group which was made up of persons as dedicated to the Atlantic Alliance as we are in the Department. We are faced with a perplexing and disquieting situation and he wanted those present to know what we have attempted to do; if we have gone wrong or if anyone thinks we have been mistaken, he hoped everyone present would be frank in saying so.

The overwhelming complaint we receive from the Europeans concerns the lack of consultation. The Secretary therefore wished to go over various subjects to illustrate the problem of consultation and then get the judgement of the group.

The Year of Europe

The first time this phrase had been used was in the Secretary's press conference in December 1972, when he said that relations with the Soviet Union were not our paramount goal and that soon after the Viet-Nam conflict was over we would undertake a major reappraisal with regard to Western Europe.

In December of 1972, when the Secretary was in Paris for Viet-Nam talks, he had seen Pompidou for 1½ hours and had explained to him what we planned to do in connection with Europe and that we wanted to do this in the closest cooperation with France. The Secretary saw

¹ Source: National Archives, Nixon Presidential Materials, NSC Files, Box 1027, Presidential/HAK MemCons, MemCons April–Nov 1973 HAK & Presidential [1 of 5]. Secret; Nodis. Drafted by Stoessel. The conversation took place in the Secretary's office.

Pompidou again in January 1973 and never received any negative comment from him. Pompidou gave James Reston an interview about that time in which Pompidou's comments about US-European relations substantially paralleled our own.²

At the end of January 1973, Heath had been in Washington and had spent a whole day with the President and Dr. Kissinger at Camp David, during which the conversation had all been about the "Year of Europe". The Agreement to Prevent Nuclear War³ had also been discussed.

The Secretary had also talked with Egon Bahr concerning the "Year of Europe".

Subsequent to the April 23 speech,⁴ everyone complained that they had only received twenty-four hours notice of the actual text. This was necessary because of our own bureaucratic requirements. Perhaps some phrases in the speech should have been changed, but that is not the heart of the issue.

The Secretary went on to describe what we were attempting to accomplish through the approach outlined in his April 23 speech in terms of revitalizing the Atlantic Alliance in the light of changed circumstances. He described in detail the reaction of some of our Allies to the proposals in the speech. Brandt had warmly welcomed the speech and had told the President he objected to the word "charter" but had no objection to the content suggested for a declaration. The British had strongly welcomed the speech and Heath had proposed a steering committee of the major Allies to work on an appropriate response. The British Foreign Office, which was concerned about the exclusion of Italy from such a committee, suggested that a reply could be prepared by a meeting of Deputy Foreign Ministers of the NATO countries. There never was a suggestion that the U.S. should deal with Europe as a bloc.

When the Secretary saw Jobert, he opposed the whole idea and said it was an attempt to establish U.S. hegemony. Jobert warned that if we tried to get Europe as a group involved in the exercise this would lead to a break. He said we were putting up Davignon in an effort to get the Nine involved. The French proposal was for a series of bilateral consultations between the major countries (not including Italy) after which there should be a Deputy Foreign Ministers' meeting.

² Reference is to James "Scotty" Reston, syndicated newspaper columnist. Reston reported the interview in "Pompidou Favors U.S.-Europe Talks," *New York Times*, December 14, 1972, p. 1.

³ See Document 14.

⁴ Document 8.

The Secretary met three more times with Jobert, with Burke Trend of the U.K., with the Italians, and with FRG Foreign Minister Scheel. All saw the President and promised that their versions of the Atlantic Declaration would be better than anything we could produce.⁵ At the same time, there was an amazing incongruity between these remarks and stories which were being fed daily to the press in the countries concerned relating how the foreign officials were facing the President down and also alleging that the U.S. was attempting to globalize issues and denigrate the “Year of Europe”.

At the end of July, after we had accepted every proposal made to us by the Europeans, they announced to us that they planned to get together as the Nine to prepare their response and that in the meantime they would not communicate with the U.S. We would hear from the Danish Foreign Minister who would come to us as an instructed representative. We were to know nothing about the drafting process.

This started something which the Secretary found extraordinarily worrisome. The declaration itself is not so important; we will finish it in a tolerable way and we won’t invest great capital resolving the outstanding questions. But the Nine won’t discuss with us until they have made their decision and we are faced with the situation where the countries who can negotiate with us won’t talk and those who can talk with us can’t negotiate.

We agreed that meetings with the Nine would be at the Assistant Secretary level to work on the declaration and the U.S. has been represented by Mr. Stoessel and Mr. Sonnenfeldt. The negotiations had hardly been normal, however; there is no real negotiation, since the Europeans state their position, then we state ours, and then the Europeans go away to work out their response, after which the whole process is repeated. Thus, whereas we hoped that the Common Market would lead to better relations with the U.S., we now are forced into a type of consultation which is worse than we have with any other country.

We had proposed that the declaration include Japan and had suggested a trilateral declaration. The Europeans have resisted this. Recently they sent a note to the Japanese with no advance notice to us sug-

⁵ Reference is to U.S. and European versions of a declaration on relations between the United States and Europe, a “new Atlantic Charter,” as Kissinger had proposed in his April 23 speech. During an October 12 news conference, Kissinger explained that the declaration concerned “economic relationships and those political relationships impinging on economic relationships, and between the United States and all its other 14 partners in NATO in a multilateral forum about the future direction of NATO policy.” See Department of State *Bulletin*, October 29, 1973, p. 536. See also footnote 3, Document 24. Documentation is scheduled for publication in *Foreign Relations, 1969–1976*, volume E–15, part 2, Documents on Western Europe, 1973–1976.

gesting bilateral negotiations between the EC and Japan. The last paragraph of the note said that any declaration which included the U.S. would have to be vague and general but that a declaration confined to the EC and Japan could be concrete. The Secretary asked what our presence would do to make such a declaration vague.

We therefore have both substantive and procedural objections to the approach to Japan; we feel that this action is really extraordinary for friendly countries. Japan is the last nation in the world which should be exposed to the temptation of a competition as to which power can offer more. Like Germany in Adenauer's day, Japan needs to be firmly involved in a structured relationship and the separate approach of the EC goes against this.

The EC has also approached Canada separately, with a view to excluding the U.S. The EC has never told us about this but we learned about it from the Canadians.

The EC made a declaration on the Middle East early in November with no advance warning to us. It was published the day the Secretary arrived in Cairo⁶ and proved highly embarrassing to Sadat, particularly on the point of returning to the October 22 cease-fire lines.

Leaving aside procedural points, we have reached a situation where, under French leadership and with the acquiescence of the British, the Europeans are seeking their identity in opposition to the U.S.

This has reached such a point that a few days ago a French official, in talking to a member of our Embassy in Paris, accused us of clearing the EC Middle East declaration in advance with the Dutch.

All of this forms a very worrisome pattern. Our transgressions can be fixed. But the European approach is organically imbedded in the structure which they have created.

The emotional content has been drained from the declaration exercise. The Europeans refuse to use the word "partnership". They allege that we have no consultations with them but at the same time they reject the idea that new conditions require new forms of consultations. They assert that they want an undiminished commitment of the U.S. to go to war to defend Europe but at the same time they refuse to sign a declaration at the head-of-government level. The Secretary felt that we shouldn't waste too much time on all this but in fact the malaise is going deeper all the time.

In response to a question from Mr. Vance about the French attitude, the Secretary said it is clear that the French made a decision early

⁶ November 6.

this year basically to oppose the U.S. The President really is pro-Gaullist; the Secretary said he himself had written articles in the past favorable to the Gaullist point of view (he now felt these were probably wrong). We have not counterattacked the French and we are being criticized for not doing so by many in Europe. Nevertheless the French escalate their attacks on our policy.

Mr. Rusk asked if the French want our troops out of Europe. The Secretary said they did not. The French say it is in our interest to have the troops there. When we say that NATO can no longer be based entirely on defense considerations, the French say this is a subterfuge for pressing U.S. hegemony.

The Secretary said the British had made a decision in June to earn their spurs as Europeans by supporting the French. The British have provided expertise and legitimacy. They have not led the charge against us, but they have been only one step behind. At the same time, we hear constant appeals from the European countries to understand their situation and their inability to counter the French position.

Mr. Rusk asked about Sir Alec Douglas-Home. The Secretary said he felt Heath really has no emotional commitment to the U.S. He has an intellectual commitment, but not an emotional one. He is really more inclined toward the French. Sir Alec perhaps has more emotional commitment to our side. When the Secretary had seen Sir Alec in October, Sir Alec had said he hoped the Secretary would make a strong speech in London countering the French views. It seemed odd that the Secretary was asked to say this in London when the British would not.

The Secretary said the British situation is particularly painful to us. Before, we did not treat the British as a foreign government. We have relied on them as a bridge to Europe. This year we consulted constantly with Burke Trend and showed him all our work papers. We understand that the British do not want to repeat the mistake they feel they made in Nassau with Macmillan. However, the British are very doctrinaire about Europe. They are milking us for intelligence information but they are making no input on their own.

In response to a question, the Secretary said that Lord Cromer is of no help, although he is well meaning. We know what the British are doing in Cairo. We saw Cromer constantly and gave him information; our information is being used as much in Cairo to support a separate U.K. position as it is to support a common position.

Previously, there was a constant exchange of leaders at the highest level with the British. This does not take place now, and it is at their initiative.

The Secretary said the French lead the charge against us in the Nine while the U.K. does the same in NATO.

Détente

The Secretary said there are bound to be problems in the Alliance when the senior partner is seen to be dealing intensively with the Soviet Union. However, practically every Allied leader asked us to do this; they wanted us to push CSCE, MBFR, SALT, and they themselves signed their own declarations with the Soviet Union before we conceived of our own.

All of this presents particular problems in connection with consultation, and we recognize this. So far as SALT is concerned, we have made a real effort on consultation and this has been successful; it is a matter of contention now.

Last fall, the U.K. led the charge against us in NATO on MBFR. They made a big fuss about the fact that we had set a date to begin MBFR talks with the Soviets. This is something all the Foreign Ministers had wanted to fix and it is true that when the Secretary was in Moscow he talked with the Soviets and we agreed on a date. This episode left some feeling of acrimony.

What really hurt was the argument about Hungary being in the MBFR talks. We were accused of sacrificing the security of Central Europe by dropping Hungary as a direct participant. The U.K. wanted Hungary in and the Soviets said that if Hungary were in then Italy should be in. We wanted to keep both Hungary and Italy out. It was really a nothing issue. We didn't want Italy in because this would involve the Sixth Fleet and could also bring Greece and Turkey in, which in turn would lead to bringing in Bulgaria and Romania. We felt it would be best for the Western countries to go for a common ceiling which would exclude Soviet forces in Hungary. If these forces were excluded then Soviet reductions under the Western plan would amount to a ratio of 3 to 1; with the forces in Hungary included, the ratio would be 6 to 1. We couldn't ask for this and therefore felt that the NATO guideline area was the only possible basis. If we looked at cuts from a percentage standpoint, it also did not make sense to include the forces in Hungary.

The Secretary repeated that this was not really a policy issue. However, the British raised it twice to the presidential level and several times to the Secretary of State. This can only be ascribed to a British desire to be a spokesman in NATO against the U.S.

Even more worrisome has been the debate about the Agreement on Prevention of Nuclear War. The folklore in Europe is that this was sprung without any warning and that the agreement leaves the Europeans to the mercy of the Soviets. Jobert says this constantly and no one else in Europe contradicts him.

Actually, the Soviets originally proposed a treaty which would have to be ratified and which specified agreement on no first use of nuclear weapons between the Soviet Union and the U.S. If we had agreed to this sort of thing, it could have had the consequences which the French say the present agreement has.

We informed the British, French, and Germans of our talks with the Soviets on this subject even before we informed the State Department. (This might seem a strange way to proceed but the situation has now been rectified.) The Germans generally favored the project. The British and ourselves held extensive consultations and concluded that, if we could change the agreement so as to state objectives and could phrase it so that it would be aimed at avoiding any war, rather than just nuclear war, and could apply not only to the U.S. and the Soviet Union but also to any third country and could exempt existing alliances—then it would be a good thing. It would place an obligation on the Soviets to state that the way to avoid nuclear war is to avoid any war and could counter the Soviet effort to differentiate between nuclear and other types of war.

In fact, the final agreement was drafted 90 per cent by Sir Thomas Brimelow. The British, French, and Germans were kept informed at all stages of negotiations. Nothing was done that they did not know about. It is true that the French were not enthusiastic but they never said what they are now saying. They claimed only that the agreement could promote the illusion of *détente*; they never said anything about the agreement leaving Europe undefended.

With all this background, it was shocking that, when the agreement was raised in NATO, the representatives of the U.K., France, and Germany did nothing to help and only asked questions which had already been asked and answered before in our consultations. This was a cynical performance.

Jobert, in a recent speech to the National Assembly has cited the agreement as the reason why Europeans must create a defense community and why Europe must at all costs be independent of the U.S.

We are not against European identity or even a European defense community. But we are concerned that this not be on an anti-American basis.

It is true that some of the smaller countries have more reason to complain about lack of consultation. We relied on the U.K. and the Germans to be our spokesmen.

So far as the SALT principles are concerned, the Europeans were actively engaged in drafting them with the U.S. There is no problem about this.

You can't put everything before the NATO Council. We therefore, have had a tendency to confine our consultations to the U.K., France, and Germany. Maybe this was a mistake, but it is correctable.

[Omitted here is discussion of the Middle East.]

Oil

The Secretary said that, of course, the question of oil is of utmost gravity to Europe and to the U.S. The best guarantee for a resumption of oil shipments is the speedy resolution of a peace settlement.⁷ This depends on Israeli withdrawal and a modicum of restraint on the Arab side so that the whole thing doesn't turn into a surrender operation.

We must demonstrate to the Arabs the limits of what is obtainable. But this is very difficult when the Europeans are attempting to ingratiate themselves with the Arabs on a short-term basis.

What we want to do is set up a peace conference and get some progress at it. Then we will tell the Arabs that further progress depends on an easing of the oil threat. We can't get into a negotiation with Faisal linking the peace terms with the oil supplies; this would be very dangerous.

In general, the whole idea of blackmail by raw material producing countries is very dangerous. The OAU countries are now thinking about this.

Our strategy with the Arabs is not working badly. The Saudis have a good idea of what the Europeans can deliver.

Mr. Rusk asked if Libya and Iraq are sending oil to Europe "under the rug". The Secretary said that Iraq has special arrangements with the French. He remarked that, when one sees intelligence reports of what the U.K. and the French are saying to the Arabs, it is worse than it was in the thirties. [*2½ lines not declassified*]

The Secretary said that he considered Atlantic relations central to our foreign policy. If we cannot restore some vitality to this relationship, then it is hard to see where either side will go. The problem is very profound and certainly is not explainable by a lack of consultation. The real problem is that some Europeans want to organize unity against the U.S. Perhaps this is based on the idea that they must oppose some one in order to achieve this unity.

Mr. Rusk asked about consultations with Japan. The Secretary said that the Japanese have done many of the things the Europeans have done. But they have acted out of despair, not on the basis of strategy. Tanaka is in a difficult situation. If the Japanese could get the oil they need, then there would be no problem. The Japanese are desperate.

⁷ See Document 21. The embargo was not ended until March 1974.

Mr. Rusk said that, over all, relations with Japan seemed on a better track. The Secretary agreed, saying that, if it were not for the oil crisis, relations with Japan would be better than they have ever been. We are saying as little as possible in a critical sense about Japan.

Mr. Vance asked about Germany.

The Secretary said there is no strong leadership in either party. The CDU is developing new leadership but hasn't found a new orientation as yet. The Socialists are split between the increasingly radical leftist group and the traditional group. Leber is the only reliable Atlanticist in the Socialist Party. Schmidt is also an Atlanticist, but he has been ill and he is maneuvering for political position which means that he must pay attention to the Left. Scheel is not too strong a personality, but basically he is all right. However, he has been overruled about the relationship with the U.S. Bahr has said publicly that he could envisage the abolition of NATO.

Mr. Rusk asked about Carstens. The Secretary said he was very good but that he does not have much influence. Brandt basically is weak. He makes big speeches but there is little follow-through. Mr. Rusk said that Kiep is a good person, and the Secretary said that he wanted to see him during his visit to Washington.

Mr. McCloy said the Germans are very worried and they are a little ashamed of their attitude. He was nervous about Bahr and Wehner. The Secretary said that Wehner seems to have reverted to his attitude of the fifties. Mr. McCloy said that the acute problem in Germany was not Ostpolitik but Westpolitik, both for the SPD and the CDU.

Mr. McCloy said that Kiep recommended that what was needed was another statement by the Secretary reiterating attachment to the unity of Europe. We should say that we are steadfast but we should also stress the idea of partnership with the U.S. Otherwise the Alliance will not work. The Secretary said that he was planning to give a speech to the Pilgrim Society in which he would speak about partnership. However, the Allies don't want to accept this.

Mr. Stoessel said that they made a distinction between relationships in NATO, where partnership seemed acceptable, and relationships between the U.S. and the nine members of the Community, where partnership was apparently not acceptable.

Mr. Bundy thought this was understandable. He expressed the view that, if the Secretary was going to make a tough statement about relations with the Allies, he should make it in the U.S. and not in Europe.

Mr. Rusk said he was against a speech of recrimination. He thought there was value in private candor but he doubted the utility of going public.

There was some discussion of Heath's attitude. Mr. McCloy noted that, when he had seen Heath recently, there had seemed to be something wrong in Heath's views about the U.S. He seemed to be in a state of pique about something. The Secretary said he didn't know what was bothering him. He thought he might ask Heath about what he should say in his speech.⁸

Mr. Bundy asked if the Administration as a whole and especially the President felt it was necessary to speak out publicly at this stage. After all, there is nothing particularly new about the present situation involving French opposition. However, he acknowledged that the U.K. factor is different and it is disturbing.

The Secretary said this was true. Also, the Germans are weaker than they have been. The President feels we should not pretend to the Europeans that everything is okay or act on the pretense that everything in the Alliance is all right.

There was some discussion emphasizing that there was a difference between what was said publicly at a speech to the Pilgrims and what was said privately.

Mr. Rusk commented that there were three nightmares about the Middle East which were important to the Europeans. The first was the possibility of a significant Soviet presence in the area which would be more dangerous to Europe than the U.S. The second was the development of an imbalance of forces which would threaten the annihilation of Israel. This would bring about the possibility of use of nuclear weapons which the world could not face. The third was the prospect of no peace at all but a continuation of periodic fighting. This would involve the Arabs adopting a suicidal attitude on oil at the cost of Europe and Japan.

Mr. Rusk said there was the old problem of how to persuade the Israelis to make concessions. He felt that people in the Jewish community in the U.S. were misleading Israel about this matter. He could say that in the boondocks, away from Washington, there was no sentiment of all-out support of Israel. He wondered if it might indeed not be a good idea to let the Europeans go ahead under pressure from the Arabs and tell the Israelis they had to withdraw. He did not feel it was for us to contribute to the crescendo of public recrimination against the Atlantic Allies.

Mr. Rusk continued that he felt our European friends do not adequately recognize the growing mood of withdrawal from world affairs

⁸ Reference is to Kissinger's speech to the Pilgrims of Great Britain. See Document 24.

held by many in the U.S. If people knew about the lack of consultation, the formation of European unity against us and the problems of burdensharing, they would see that our troops were withdrawn from Europe very quickly. The Europeans have a stake in all this and they should realize it.

The Secretary said that we can eliminate public recrimination at this time. He had felt it was a good idea in October to give the Europeans a shot across the bow in order to counter charges of a lack of consultation. The Pilgrim speech could either be cancelled or he could make it non-recriminatory in nature. The problem is how to turn the present trends around.

Mr. Dillon asked what the French really want. Of course they have always been difficult and their present stance is no surprise.

The Secretary said that the Europeans are conducting a domestic but not a foreign policy. De Gaulle had a foreign policy. Pompidou, however, has an economic policy but not a foreign policy. The Quai is very Gaullist and nasty. Perhaps they have no concept other than getting the U.S. out of Europe and working for European unity under our protection. It is strange, but Jobert always is very conciliatory when he sees the Secretary, but when he gets home he is mean and critical.

Mr. Dillon thought it would be important to talk with other people in France, such as Chaban-Delmas. They might be more moderate and might be influential in the future.

The Secretary repeated that he did not plan to engage in recrimination. However, the Europeans must understand what they are doing. They view the U.S. as being inexhaustably pro-Atlantic. But there are limits to our store of good will. The Europeans should consider the list of possible presidential candidates for the next election in the U.S. No one shows up as very pro-European. They should reflect on this and understand that the present Administration is more strongly Atlantic-minded than future Administrations are likely to be.

Mr. Rockefeller noted that the oil problem will have a seminal effect on all relations over a period of time. He also felt the financial implications were most important, particularly having in mind the large Arab balances in the West. They could use these for another war if they wanted it. Speaking of the trilateral grouping of the U.S., Europe, and Japan, he said the only hope seems to be to work together and not separately.

The Secretary said he would make this point at NATO. Until now, the Europeans have refused to get together themselves. This has been true even in the OECD energy committee. The Secretary felt that the energy problem is of long-range importance to all consumer countries and he would tell the Europeans this. We are prepared to discuss with

them a common policy covering research and other matters. Mr. Donaldson⁹ will be ready to carry on such consultations directly with the Europeans.

Mr. Rockefeller said he felt the monetary aspects of the oil crisis were almost more important than the oil itself.

The Secretary said we must avoid a situation in which the Europeans are milking us on everything important for them but are against us on everything else.

Mr. Rockefeller said that, in the long term, the Arab pressures are more important for the Europeans than they are for ourselves. The Secretary commented that actually we are in a better position with the Arabs than the Europeans. At least, the Arabs take us seriously. He thought we would settle our oil problem with the Arabs as soon as the Europeans did, if not before.

The Secretary said that the Europeans complain about being excluded from the Middle East negotiations. However, the Europeans are too one-sided to serve as mediator and they are too separated from us to have any influence on us. If the Europeans are excluded, this is something that they did to themselves.

Mr. McCloy hoped we would see the present crisis as an opportunity, not as a situation of despair. Joint action is essential to solve the Arab-Israeli situation and the oil situation. He recognized that we can't do much about helping Europe on oil, since we have no surplus.

The Secretary said we must do something for the Dutch.

Mr. McCloy hoped the Secretary would see Jerry Wagner of Shell. He is Dutch and has some good ideas. Mr. McCloy urged the Secretary to be firm but not recriminatory. He hoped he could be as forthcoming as possible. The Secretary agreed that we have an opportunity to bring the Europeans to recognize the abyss before which they stand. We need to put constructive things before them. He agreed this could best be done privately rather than publicly. At the same time, we must show clearly what the attitude of the U.S. is and that they can't get things from us for free. There must be reciprocity in the relationship. They must tell us what they are doing in the Middle East.

Mr. Rusk wondered if it was really possible for us to develop a common policy on Europe, given the domestic problem we have at

⁹ Presumable reference to Under Secretary of State for Security Assistance William H. Donaldson. During his October 12 news conference, Kissinger announced Donaldson's nomination, noting that Donaldson would be responsible for the "energy aspects of foreign policy" in conjunction with his other duties. See Department of State *Bulletin*, October 29, 1973, p. 532.

home. Mr. Bundy said that, when the Secretary is ready, it should be possible to mobilize pressures in the U.S. to get Israel to implement the 1967 Resolution. The Jewish community knows this is coming. Mr. Vance and Mr. McCloy agreed.

With regard to the NATO meeting, the Secretary said he had tentatively decided, if the French make any accusations against us—such as to say that we had exposed Europe to attack because of our policies toward the Soviet Union—we would react with extreme sharpness. We would point out some of the consequences of the course they are now embarked on.

Mr. Vance questioned how sharply we should respond and Mr. Bundy said we should do so only if we are clearly and unmistakably criticized. In that event, we might rally support of others.

Mr. Rusk said the energy problem is in no sense limited to the Arab-Israeli conflict. With regard to the Alliance, any alliance of course tends to erode with success. He was inclined to drop the struggle about the word “partnership” and try to find something else. He doubted if it was all that important. He thought it would be desirable if we could propose—perhaps in the OECD—a joint R and D program concerning all forms of energy. We could make some suggestions about financing, perhaps on the UN pattern, and make an initial contribution ourselves. This sort of thing might bring people together and seize their imagination.

Mr. Bundy thought the timing for such an idea would not be good now. It might give the impression of ganging up on the Arabs.

The Secretary said that in principle he would approve a program of the type Dean Rusk had mentioned. He wondered what the French would say. They seem to be telling the others that all they needed to do was to kick the U.S. around and we would give them everything.

On the NATO meeting, Mr. Rusk thought it would be good for Luns to have a private session where the Secretary could make the last speech. Perhaps he could tease the others a bit, with a light touch, asking them where they thought they were going. This could avoid personal offense. Ridicule and irony are also weapons.

Mr. McCloy regretted that the President had stressed the concept of self-sufficiency so much in his energy speech. He had hoped that there could be some word of sympathy in the speech for the European problems and that we were disposed to help.

Mr. Rockefeller said that the idea of self-sufficiency for the U.S. by 1980 is quite unrealistic.

The Secretary said that the U.S. is prepared to work out a program in the spirit of the suggestion by Dean Rusk. We would be having a meeting later this week about it. However, to do something of this kind

after a year of the type we have just had might seem to support the French argument that you can get everything you want from the U.S. by kicking the U.S. around.

Mr. Bundy thought a lot of the things mentioned were relatively marginal. He regretted that we had gotten into a drafting war on the declarations. The Secretary said we had not.

Mr. Dillon thought it would be a good idea for us to develop our own energy program for the future and give the Europeans an opportunity to join in if they wished to do so.

Mr. Rusk suggested it might be useful if someone in the Department could do a war game exercise which would show how all of this had looked from the European point of view. In that way, we might get a better fix on the mistakes we had made. The Secretary agreed and asked that Mr. Springsteen undertake such a study.

Mr. Vance said that, if the energy plan is really a good one, then it shouldn't matter whether the Europeans feel they are getting a free ride or not.

Mr. Bundy remarked that the Europeans have felt ever since 1962 that they are getting a free ride and that there is no threat. In general, they have underestimated the dangers of *détente* and overestimated the worth of *détente*.

Mr. McCloy and Mr. Dillon thought there actually was quite a bit of uneasiness in Europe about present trends. They hoped we would not take the initiative in attacking but would only counterattack.

The Secretary said the Europeans find it so astonishing that they can even get themselves together to make a reply that they ignore the substance. Then they send a note to the Japanese and make an approach to the Arabs but still don't focus on the substance and the meaning of what they are doing. Perhaps it's because they don't have a Foreign Office to tell them they should consult first.

Mr. Bundy wondered if we would really be hurt if the EC establishes contacts with the Japanese. The Secretary thought that this sort of thing was dangerous, particularly with the Japanese.

Mr. McCloy said that no European wants the annihilation of Israel. Also, the Arabs don't want the Soviets in the Middle East. In this situation, if we don't get any cooperation from the Europeans then this is the heart of the problem.

Mr. Rusk recalled that in 1948 the Europeans felt that they could go along with any solution in the Middle East agreeable to the Jews and the Arabs. He thought we should tell the Europeans to get busy and work on this policy in the Middle East.

Mr. Bundy said he didn't mind our going to DEFCON 3.¹⁰ If it hadn't been for the U.S. and Henry Kissinger, the situation would have been worse. He felt we shouldn't get too disturbed about the French. They have always been like that.

Mr. Rush wondered if it would be useful for someone to write a good article in *Foreign Affairs* about Europe, but several others thought the publication schedule would not permit such an article to appear in time to be useful.

The Secretary noted that we were heading into a difficult period domestically with the Jewish community. There was general discussion about this, with several expressing the view that some influential leaders in the Jewish community were beginning to say that all-out support for Israel was not necessarily the best policy.

Mr. Rockefeller raised the problem of Senator Jackson's attitude of MFN for the Soviet Union.¹¹ The Secretary said Jackson is playing a difficult game. He wants to get as tough a version as possible in the House, thus forcing us to negotiate with him in the Senate.

There was some discussion of attitudes in Israel toward a peace settlement. Both Mr. Rusk and Mr. Bundy thought there were doves in Israel in various places. Mr. Bundy mentioned Saphir. They will talk to unofficial American friends but not to our Ambassador. Mr. McCloy thought that Golda Meir and Dayan were in political trouble.

The Secretary said he hoped he could meet with the group again before going to NATO and the Middle East. It was tentatively agreed that there would be another meeting in Washington December 5.

The meeting terminated at 5:15 p.m.

¹⁰ The National Security Council, in a meeting the night of October 24–25, raised the U.S. defense readiness level at the prospect of Soviet troops moving into the Middle East. See *Foreign Relations, 1969–1976*, volume XXV, Arab-Israeli Crisis and War, 1973, Document 269.

¹¹ See footnote 3, Document 19.

24. Address by Secretary of State Kissinger¹

London, December 12, 1973.

The United States and a Unifying Europe:
The Necessity for Partnership

I am grateful for the opportunity to speak to you this evening because, like most Americans, I am seized by a mixture of pride and terror when invited to appear before a British audience. In my particular case, and without any reflection on this distinguished assemblage, it is probably more terror than pride; for there is no blinking the fact—it is there for all to hear—that my forebears missed the Mayflower by some 300 years.

Our two peoples have been more closely associated than any other two nations in modern history—in culture and economics, in peace and in war. We have sometimes disagreed. But the dominant theme of our relationship in this century has been intimate alliance and mighty creations.

In 1950, while the Atlantic alliance was considering a continuing political body, my great predecessor Dean Acheson spoke to this society. Describing the travails of creation, Acheson noted that a “strange and confusing dissonance has crowded the trans-Atlantic frequencies.” But he added that this “dissonance flows from the very awareness that difficult decisions must be made and is a part of the process of making them.”

Again today America and Western Europe find themselves at a moment of great promise and evident difficulty, of renewed efforts to unite and old problems which divide. It is a time of both hope and concern for all of us who value the partnership we have built together. Today, as in 1950, we and Europe face the necessity, the opportunity, and the dilemma of fundamental choice.

The Year of Europe

Because we have a historical and intimate relationship, I want to speak tonight frankly of what has been called the “Year of Europe”—of the difficulties of 1973 and the possibilities of 1974 and beyond.

¹ Source: Department of State *Bulletin*, December 31, 1973, pp. 777–782. Brackets are in the original. Kissinger delivered his speech to a gathering of the Pilgrims of Great Britain held at the Europa Hotel. Another copy of Kissinger’s address is in the National Archives, RG 59, Policy Planning Council (S/PC), Policy Planning Staff (S/P), Director’s Files (Winston Lord) 1969–77, Lot 77D112, Box 346, DEC 1973.

Last April the President asked me to propose that Europe and the United States strive together to reinvigorate our partnership.² He did so because it was obvious that the assumptions on which the alliance was founded have been outstripped by events:

—Europe's economic strength, political cohesion, and new confidence—the monumental achievements of Western unity—have radically altered a relationship that was originally shaped in an era of European weakness and American predominance.

—American nuclear monopoly has given way to nuclear parity, raising wholly new problems of defense and deterrence—problems which demand a broad reexamination of the requirements of our security and the relative contribution to it of the United States and its allies.

—The lessening of confrontation between East and West has offered new hope for a relaxation of tensions and new opportunities for creative diplomacy.

—It has become starkly apparent that the great industrialized democracies of Japan, Europe, and North America could pursue divergent paths only at the cost of their prosperity and their partnership.

These historic changes were occurring in a profoundly changed psychological climate in the West. The next generation of leaders in Europe, Canada, and America will have neither the personal memory nor the emotional commitment to the Atlantic alliance or its founders. Even today, a majority on both sides of the Atlantic did not experience the threat that produced the alliance's creation or the sense of achievement associated with its growth. Even today, in the United States over 40 Senators consistently vote to make massive unilateral reductions of American forces in Europe. Even today, some Europeans have come to believe that their identity should be measured by its distance from the United States. On both sides of the Atlantic we are faced with the anomalous—and dangerous—situation in which the public mind identifies foreign policy success increasingly with relations with adversaries while relations with allies seem to be characterized by bickering and drift.

There exists, then, a real danger of a gradual erosion of the Atlantic community which for 25 years has insured peace to its nations and brought prosperity to its peoples. A major effort to renew Atlantic relations and to anchor our friendship in a fresh act of creation seemed essential. We hoped that the drama of the great democracies engaging themselves once again in defining a common future would infuse our Atlantic partnership with new emotional and intellectual excitement.

² See Document 8.

This was the origin of the initiative which came to be called the “Year of Europe.”

Let me lay to rest certain misconceptions about American intentions:

—The President’s initiative was launched after careful preparation. In all of our conversations with many European leaders during the winter and spring of 1972–73 there was agreement that Atlantic relations required urgent attention to arrest the potential for growing suspicion and alienation between Europe and America.

—We do not accept the proposition that the strengthening of Atlantic unity and the defining of a European personality are incompatible. The two processes have reinforced each other from the outset and can continue to do so now. The United States has repeatedly and explicitly welcomed the European decision to create an independent identity in all dimensions, political and economic. Indeed, we have long—and more consistently than many Europeans—supported the goal of political cohesion.

—We have no intention of restricting Europe’s international role to regional matters. From our perspective, European unification should enable Europe to take on broader responsibilities for global peace that ultimately can only contribute to the common interest. The American initiative was meant to mark Europe’s new preeminence on the world scene as well as within the North Atlantic community.

A comprehensive reexamination of all aspects of our relationship, economic, political, and military, is imperative. It is a fact that our troops are in Europe as a vital component of mutual defense. It is also a fact—indeed, a truism—that political, military, and economic factors are each part of our relationship. In our view, the affirmation of the pervasive nature of our interdependence is not a device for blackmail. On the contrary, it is the justification for conciliatory solutions. For the specialized concerns of experts and technicians have a life of their own and a narrow national or sectarian bias. The purpose of our initiative was to override these divisive attitudes by committing the highest authority in each country to the principle that our common and paramount interest is in broadly conceived cooperation.

The European Identity

Since last April Europe has made great strides toward unity—particularly in political coordination. The United States strongly supports that process. But as an old friend we are also sensitive to what this process does to traditional ties that, in our view, remain essential to the common interest.

Europe’s unity must not be at the expense of Atlantic community, or both sides of the Atlantic will suffer. It is not that we are impatient

with the cumbersome machinery of the emerging Europe. It is rather the tendency to highlight division rather than unity with us which concerns us.

I would be less than frank were I to conceal our uneasiness about some of the recent practices of the European Community in the political field. To present the decisions of a unifying Europe to us as faits accomplis not subject to effective discussion is alien to the tradition of U.S.-European relations.

This may seem a strange complaint from a country repeatedly accused of acting itself without adequately consulting with its allies. There is no doubt that the United States has sometimes not consulted enough or adequately—especially in rapidly moving situations. But this is not a preference; it is a deviation from official policy and established practice—usually under pressure of necessity. The attitude of the unifying Europe, by contrast, seems to attempt to elevate refusal to consult into a principle defining European identity. To judge from recent experience, consultation with us before a decision is precluded, and consultation after the fact has been drained of content. For then Europe appoints a spokesman who is empowered to inform us of the decisions taken but who has no authority to negotiate.³

We do not object to a single spokesman, but we do believe that as an old ally the United States should be given an opportunity to express its concerns before final decisions affecting its interests are taken. And bilateral channels of discussion and negotiation should not be permitted to atrophy—at least until European political unity is fully realized. To replace the natural dialogue with extremely formalistic procedures would be to shatter abruptly close and intangible ties of trust and communication that took decades to develop and that have served our common purposes well.

The United States recognizes the problems of a transitional period as Europe moves toward unity. We understand the difficulty of the first

³ Reference is to Danish Foreign Minister Knud Borge Andersen. The same day the U.N. General Assembly opened its 28th session on September 24, the *New York Times* printed the text of the European Economic Community's joint declaration on relations between the Common Market and the United States. ("Text of the European Economic Community's Proposal on Relations With U.S." and "Kissinger Speaks at U.N. Today, Marking Entry Into the 'Club'," *New York Times*, September 24, 1973, pp. 16 and 12, respectively) During a September 25 meeting among Kissinger, Andersen, and U.S. and Danish officials, Kissinger expressed his admiration for European unity but criticized the EEC for its response to the "Year of Europe" speech and its formulation of principles without prior consultation with the United States. (National Archives, Nixon Presidential Materials, NSC Files, Box 1027, Presidential/HAK MemCons, MemCons April–Nov 1973 HAK & Presidential [2 of 5]) The full memorandum of conversation is scheduled for publication in *Foreign Relations, 1969–1976*, volume E–15, part 2, Documents on Western Europe, 1973–1976. Kissinger recalled his frustration with formulating an Atlantic Declaration in *Years of Upheaval*, pp. 171–192.

hesitant steps of political coordination. But we cannot be indifferent to the tendency to justify European identity as facilitating separateness from the United States; European unity, in our view, is not contradictory to Atlantic unity.

For our part, we will spare no effort to strengthen cooperative relationships with a unifying Europe, to affirm the community of our ideals, and to revitalize the Atlantic relationship. That was the purpose of our initiative last April. It remains the central goal of our foreign policy.

The Common Challenge

The leaders of the European Community meet this week.⁴ They will consider the nature of European identity; no doubt they will adopt common policies and positions. In the light of this important meeting, let me outline the position of the United States:

—Détente is an imperative. In a world shadowed by the danger of nuclear holocaust, there is no rational alternative to the pursuit of relaxation of tensions. But we must take care that the pursuit of détente not undermine the friendships which made détente possible.

—Common defense is a necessity. We must be prepared to adjust it to changing conditions and share burdens equally. We need a definition of security that our peoples can support and that our adversaries will respect in a period of lessened tensions.

—European unity is a reality. The United States welcomes and supports it in all its dimensions, political as well as economic. We believe it must be made irreversible and that it must strengthen transatlantic ties.

—Economic interdependence is a fact. We must resolve the paradox of growing mutual dependence and burgeoning national and regional identities.

We are determined to continue constructive dialogue with Western Europe. We have offered no final answers; we welcome Europe's wisdom. We believe that this opportunity will not come soon again.

So let us rededicate ourselves to finishing the task of renewing the Atlantic community.

First, let us complete the work before us; let us agree on a set of declarations equal to the occasion so that they may serve as an agenda for our governments and as an example and inspiration for our peoples.

⁴ The EC summit meeting was held in Copenhagen December 14–15.

Second, let us then transform these declarations into practical and perceptible progress. We will restore mutual confidence if our policies begin to reinforce rather than work against our common objectives. And let us move quickly to improve the process of consultation in both directions. The U.S. Government made concrete suggestions in this regard at the recent meeting of the Foreign Ministers in the North Atlantic Council.

But let us also remember that even the best consultative machinery cannot substitute for common vision and shared goals; it cannot replace the whole network of intangible connections that have been the real sinews of the transatlantic and especially the Anglo-American relationship. We must take care lest in defining European unity in too legalistic a manner we lose what has made our alliance unique: that in the deepest sense Europe and America do not think of each other as foreign entities conducting traditional diplomacy, but as members of a larger community engaged, sometimes painfully but ultimately always cooperatively, in a common enterprise. The meeting to which the Foreign Ministers of the Community were courteous enough to invite me marks a significant step forward in restoring the intangibles of the transatlantic dialogue.⁵

Let us put false suspicions behind us. The President did not fight so hard in Congress for our troops in Europe, for strong defenses, for a conciliatory trade bill, for support for allies around the world; he did not strive so continually to consult on SALT [Strategic Arms Limitation Talks] and develop common positions on MBFR [mutual and balanced force reductions]; he did not stand up so firmly to challenges in crises around the world—suddenly to sacrifice Western Europe's security on the altar of condominium. Our destiny, as well as the full strength of our military power, is inextricably linked with yours.

As we look into the future we can perceive challenges compared to which our recent disputes are trivial. A new international system is replacing the structure of the immediate postwar years. The external policies of China and the Soviet Union are in periods of transition. Western Europe is unifying. New nations seek identity and an appropriate role. Even now, economic relationships are changing more rapidly than the structures which nurtured them. We—Europe, Canada, and America—have only two choices: creativity together or irrelevance apart.

The Middle East and Energy

The Middle East crisis illustrates the importance of distinguishing the long-range from the ephemeral. The differences of recent months resulted not so much from lack of consultation as from a different per-

⁵ Kissinger met with the EC Foreign Ministers on December 11 in Brussels.

ception of three key issues: Was the war primarily a local conflict, or did it have wider significance? Has the energy crisis been caused primarily by the war, or does it have deeper causes? Can our common energy crisis be solved by anything but collective action?

As for the nature of the Middle East conflict, it is fair to state—as many Europeans including your Foreign Secretary have—that the United States did not do all that it might have done before the war to promote a permanent settlement in the Middle East. Once the war began, the United States demonstrated great restraint until the Soviet effort reached the point of massive intervention. Once that happened, it became a question of whether the West would retain any influence to help shape the political future of an area upon which Europe is even more vitally dependent than the United States. We involved ourselves in a resupply effort not to take sides in the conflict but to protect the possibility of pursuing after the war the objective of a just, permanent settlement which some of our allies have urged on us ever since 1967.

At the same time, we must bear in mind the deeper causes of the energy crisis: It is not simply a product of the Arab-Israeli war; it is the inevitable consequence of the explosive growth of worldwide demand outrunning the incentives for supply. The Middle East war made a chronic crisis acute, but a crisis was coming in any event. Even when prewar production levels are resumed, the problem of matching the level of oil that the world produces to the level which it consumes will remain.

The only long-term solution is a massive effort to provide producers an incentive to increase their supply, to encourage consumers to use existing supplies more rationally, and to develop alternate energy sources.

This is a challenge which the United States could solve alone with great difficulty and that Europe cannot solve in isolation at all. We strongly prefer, and Europe requires, a common enterprise.

To this end, the United States proposes that the nations of Europe, North America, and Japan establish an Energy Action Group of senior and prestigious individuals with a mandate to develop within three months an initial action program for collaboration in all areas of the energy problem. We would leave it to the members of the Nine whether they prefer to participate as the European Community.

The Group would have as its goal the assurance of required energy supplies at reasonable cost. It would define broad principles of cooperation, and it would initiate action in specific areas:

- To conserve energy through more rational utilization of existing supplies;

- To encourage the discovery and development of new sources of energy;

—To give producers an incentive to increase supply; and

—To coordinate an international program of research to develop new technologies that use energy more efficiently and provide alternatives to petroleum. The United States would be willing to contribute our particular skills in such areas as the development of the deep seabed.

The Energy Action Group should not be an exclusive organization of consumers. The producing nations should be invited to join it from the very beginning with respect to any matters of common interest. The problem of finding adequate opportunity for development, and the investment of the proceeds from the sale of energy sources, would appear to be a particularly important area for consumer-producer cooperation.

As an example of a task for the Energy Action Group, I would cite the field of enriching uranium for use in nuclear power reactors. We know that our need for this raw material will be great in the 1980's. We know that electric utilities will wish to assure their supply at the least possible cost. We know that European countries and Japan will wish to have their own facilities to produce at least part of their needs for enriched uranium. Such plants require huge capital investment. What could be more sensible than that we plan together to assure that scarce resources are not wasted by needless duplication?

The United States is prepared to make a very major financial and intellectual contribution to the objective of solving the energy problem on a common basis. There is no technological problem that the great democracies do not have the capacity to solve together—if they can muster the will and the imagination. The energy crisis of 1973 can become the economic equivalent of the sputnik challenge of 1957. The outcome can be the same. Only this time, the giant step for mankind will be one that America and its closest partners take together for the benefit of all mankind.

We have every reason of duty and self-interest to preserve the most successful partnership in history. The United States is committed to making the Atlantic community a vital positive force for the future as it was for the past. What has recently been taken for granted must now be renewed. This is not an American challenge to Europe; it is history's challenge to us all.

The United Kingdom, we believe, is in a unique position. We welcome your membership in the European Community—though the loosening of some of our old ties has been painful at times. But you can make another historic contribution in helping develop between the United States and a unifying Europe the same special confidence and intimacy that benefited our two nations for decades. We are prepared to offer a unifying Europe a "special relationship," for we believe that

the unity of the Western world is essential for the well-being of all its parts.

In his memoirs Secretary Acheson described the events of his visit to London in the spring of 1950.⁶ He described the need of his time for an “act of will, a decision to do something” at a crucial juncture.

We require another act of will—a determination to surmount tactical squabbles and legalistic preoccupations and to become the master of our destinies. We in this room are heirs to a rich heritage of trust and friendship. If we are true to ourselves, we have it in our power to extend it to a united Europe and to pass it on, further enriched and ennobled, to succeeding generations.

⁶ Reference is to *Present at the Creation: My Years at the State Department* (New York: Norton, 1969).

25. Memorandum of Conversation¹

San Clemente, California, January 2, 1974, 8:30 a.m.

PARTICIPANTS

Robert Pierpoint, CBS-TV
Bernard Kalb, CBS-TV
Thomas Brokaw, NBC-TV
R.W. Apple, Jr., *New York Times*
Dean Fisher, *Time*
Robert Toth, *Los Angeles Times*

Dr. Henry A. Kissinger, Secretary of State
Peter W. Rodman, NSC Staff

Kissinger: This is on background. I'll give a news conference Thursday² afternoon.

¹ Source: Library of Congress, Manuscript Division, Kissinger Papers, Box CL 426, Subject File, Media, Briefings, Background, Jan. 1972–Mar 1974. No classification marking. Drafted by Rodman. The conversation took place in the dining room at the San Clemente Inn. Kissinger was in San Clemente to discuss with Nixon the upcoming State of the Union address, the Geneva Conference, and developments in the Middle East.

² During his January 3 news conference, Kissinger responded to questions concerning the Arab oil embargo, his discussions with Le Duc Tho, the energy crisis, impeachment, European relations, and Soviet détente. For the transcript of Kissinger's news conference, see Department of State *Bulletin*, January 28, 1974, pp. 77–86.

Pierpoint: What is your judgment of the effect of the [Israeli]³ election outcome?

Kissinger: It strengthens the hand of the religious party, which cares much about the West Bank and Jerusalem. So those issues, which are difficult anyway, will become intractable.

Toth: The first stage of the negotiations will be unaffected?

Kissinger: Yes. Dayan is coming to the U.S. We will announce it Friday.

Pierpoint: Why?

Kissinger: We agreed in Jerusalem that they would send as high-level an official as possible to Washington for discussions on disengagement.

Apple: It implies he's still in the Cabinet?

Kissinger: It gives that impression. He is more useful now to her;⁴ he is no longer a rival Prime Minister.

Toth: What is your prognosis on the disengagement talks⁵ now?

Kissinger: The Israeli Government has to make a decision—if they want to make the decision. My prognosis of the disengagement talks is they will not be significantly affected, I think.

Toth: What about oil? I don't want to speculate.

Kissinger: There is obviously some relationship. There is a good chance of progress, I mean mostly agreed, or agreed.

Pierpoint: When would they begin disengagement?

Kissinger: I can't tell how long that would take technically. It's a separation of forces, not a return to the 1967 lines.

Toth: It sets the stage for settlement.

Kissinger: This is deep background: It will start a process, but they don't necessarily commit themselves to ultimate frontiers. It also avoids a discussion of final borders and the more intractable issues. Conceptually it is doable. The Israelis started it at Kilometer 101. It creates a framework in which resumption of hostilities is at least technically more difficult.

Pierpoint: Will the oil embargo be lifted?

³ Brackets are in the original.

⁴ Golda Meir.

⁵ During his statement before the opening session of the Middle East Peace Conference, held in Geneva December 21–22, 1973, Kissinger noted that although progress had been made in effecting a cease-fire in the Middle East, an early agreement on the separation of military forces was necessary to consolidate the cease-fire. (Department of State *Bulletin*, January 14, 1974, pp. 21–24) Nixon later announced Egyptian-Israeli agreement on disengagement of forces on January 17. (*Public Papers: Nixon*, 1974, pp. 11–12)

Kissinger: There are two problems. There would have been a shortage anyway. Then there came the cut in production. Lifting the embargo by itself doesn't help us if the production level isn't raised. So the production level increase helped us. We hope it will be lifted—but I will not speculate on it.

Brokaw: The timing of the talks is affected by the need to put together a new government?

Kissinger: I think they can do disengagement without a government, but no further than that.

Pierpoint: She says she might call a new election.

Kissinger: Really? But there is not a clear-cut mandate against negotiations.

Kalb: Disengagement would be visible?

Kissinger: It is conceivable that the Egyptians would remain on the East Bank but the Israelis would cross to the East Bank. It would be visible separation.

Pierpoint: What is the Egyptian Government attitude?

Kissinger: Egypt is flexible, as shown by its giving up on the October 22 lines.

Fisher: What is the Soviet attitude?

Kissinger: Since the alert, and up to now, it has been constructive. They haven't done anything—but there has been no obstruction. I don't think the Soviets knew the Syrians wouldn't go to the Conference until I was there.

Pierpoint: They can't control their clients!

Kissinger: They are not their clients.

About oil. We don't want to establish the relationship directly, because we don't want to be a principal party to the negotiations. On the other hand, our situation has been eased since we started our activity.

Toth: Is it the Egyptian strategy to keep Israel mobilized?

Kissinger: Whether it is their strategy, I don't know. But the war was a dramatic blow to Israel. While they won a victory, it was not as politically useful—it was not a crushing supremacy—and it didn't solve their military problem. It brought about a worldwide coalition against them, and it set in train military events by which they can be bled. These are the analytical facts. It has nothing to do with our pressures or recommendations.

Apple: It was a tactical victory, but a strategic defeat.

Kissinger: There is a cliché that we do better with our enemies. With Europe we could do the declarations overnight if we wanted. NATO did okay. What bothers us on the EC one is that they want an indivisible defense but won't use the word "partnership". Is this be-

cause they are democracies or because of some more fundamental difficulty? There is some organic problem.

Fisher: What organic problems?

Kissinger: On deep background—they are weak governments, with a left to placate. They like to dissociate themselves from us; on the other hand they like our military protection. In the long run this is untenable. You get these Common Market meetings under the French leadership with no opposition.

We could finish respectable declarations. Where the declaration got off the rails was when the Common Market started dealing with itself exclusively. We wanted some symbolic creative act. The Shanghai Communiqué⁶ looks great but it doesn't say much. Read my April speech;⁷ we offered a common détente policy. But they're torn—they want European unity.

On the energy proposal,⁸ I think something will happen on it. Read the Marshall Plan speech—it is not a great speech, but it was made a great event by enthusiasm and participation. We spent more time with the Europeans this year than any other. It is time-consuming. But on the declarations, we want to see whether we can get something more substantial.

Pierpoint: It seems that a meaningful declaration is further away than ever.

Kissinger: A meaningful declaration is here; but a meaningful policy is hard. I think the difficulty is theirs. We have offered them co-operation. What pressures are we putting on them? None.

Pierpoint: We are trying to include Japan.

Kissinger: No, Japan is a fact. It is inconceivable to have a structure created that doesn't include Japan. It doesn't have to be the same declaration. But the Europeans want bilateral declarations. But it is very dangerous to set up competition between Europe and the U.S. for Japan—and the Japanese don't want it.

Apple: Are you saying that the Europeans need a little more time to sort out what they want to do and be?

Kissinger: It may turn out.

Kalb: Do we want a common policy?

Kissinger: A common discussion. Let's discuss détente, military questions. The issues JFK raised in 1962 are still not solved. The NATO

⁶ See footnote 5, Document 3.

⁷ Document 8.

⁸ See Document 24.

troop deployment guards the most beautiful scenery; 90 days' supply is imaginary. We didn't invent this.

On economics, it is imperative to work out a strategy to replace a strategy originated when the preoccupation was the gap. Take the energy crisis—it creates a totally new situation. Do we deal competitively or cooperatively? It is a common problem. All we mean is to discuss the range of individual action. We might disagree, but we haven't even got to the discussions.

Toth: What about the President's trip?

Kissinger: We could have a trip within any four-week period. But we didn't want a trip until we got something. My estimate is it could be at the latest by mid-April.

Apple: He would go then?

Kissinger: I could get them in shape by February if the President wanted. There is no date set.

Toth: Then you would go on to Japan?

Kissinger: It is conceivable but it has not been formally considered.

Pierpoint: What about Congress?

Kissinger: The former doves may shift to the right on troop cuts. Mansfield will stick to his position. But my instinct is it will be easier to beat than ever. The moderate Democrats (Humphrey, Kennedy, etc.) will move closer to the Jackson position.

I had a study of the editorials on East-West trade for four and one-half years. We were always attacked for going too slow on East-West trade and for attaching political conditions!

Toth: Will there be progress on MBFR and SALT in time for the Summit?

Kissinger: It makes no difference to Mansfield. In my press conference last week⁹—I found that I can't be as analytical as Secretary of State. My remarks were misinterpreted. I think there can be progress on SALT for the Summit. MBFR can't be at the Summit because it is a NATO-Warsaw Pact exercise. In negotiations, the opening positions are absurd because they take account of one's own side's necessities. But gradually you discover the other's real positions. Then you need a breakthrough like May 1971 in SALT. We are at this stage in SALT II. We need a conceptual breakthrough to decide what is going to happen. Then the technical details come up—but they can be done fast. For example, in January 1972 there was a discussion of silo dimensions; the substantive issues were settled in six weeks. Within two months, we can get a conceptual breakthrough. If we do this, then we can get sub-

⁹ December 27, 1973. See Department of State *Bulletin*, January 21, 1974, pp. 45–56.

stantial progress by the Summit—an agreement or part of an agreement.

Pierpoint: When will it be?

Kissinger: It is not set.

Toth: Can the President travel abroad when there is the prospect of impeachment?

Kissinger: While he is President he should act as President.

Toth: But after the House votes?

Pierpoint: We could have a vote by April 1.

Kissinger: Take the NATO declaration. If I am any judge, no one would say the President had no legitimacy to commit the U.S. to close Atlantic ties. If it were a divisive issue, that would be different.

Pierpoint: What about SALT?

Kissinger: There is this strange realignment going on. You tell me what we gave up in SALT-I that we didn't already give up.

Brokaw: What impact would impeachment proceedings have on this diplomacy?

Kissinger: None. Maybe down the road. But none now.

Kalb: You expect a trip by April?

Kissinger: The chances are three out of five that he might. There is no planning. But the chances are a little better than fifty-fifty.

Fisher: What about the trip to the Soviet Union?

Kissinger: He *will* go to the Soviet Union. Japan might be—but we had not thought of it. To Europe—the chances are better than 50–50 he will go by the end of April.

Pierpoint: Is there any chance Chou might come here? Or is Taiwan blocking it?

Kissinger: No. He has a very complex domestic situation. No one knows who is the target of the 1974 anti-Confucian campaign.

The Taiwan question is no obstacle to the US–PRC relations at this moment.

Kalb: What about Vietnam?

Kissinger: There is slightly less than a fifty-fifty chance they will start an attack. I used to think the chances were more than fifty-fifty.

Toth: How about Thieu's blast at the elections?

Kissinger: I think both sides have given up on the political agreement.

Toth: This would imply a political struggle.

Kissinger: Or partition, *de facto*.

If there were an offensive in April or May, I wouldn't be astonished.

Fisher: Has your relationship changed with the President since you became Secretary of State?

Kissinger: The *modus operandi* is almost exactly the same, but it is more visible.

Pierpoint: Some in the White House said you didn't communicate as often as before, on this trip.

Kissinger: Who told you that? Only Haig and Scowcroft know. I sent a full report every day. I see him automatically every day for a half hour, usually more. Before the trip we consult; we know where I'm going. On the way I don't need detailed instructions. I talk to Haig and get the Presidential mood of things—what he's worried about—and operational things with Scowcroft. These stories are totally wrong.

Toth: You have less input now in the DOD budget because you are traveling.

Kissinger: Over the years, the military systematically attempted to undercut any outside inputs. This year I have had more conceptual input by meeting with Schlesinger for breakfast, and Moorer and Colby. These are less formal meetings, but the formal meetings degenerated into idiot briefings. There is more input now, but we haven't solved how we can get a real strategic doctrine for the United States. Looking at the costs, the pressures in the military for weapons of increased technological flexibility. This is the big problem.

Toth: The President had two meetings with the JCS, and Schlesinger, without you.

Kissinger: Scowcroft was there.

Toth: But that is different.

Kissinger: I talked with the President Monday.¹⁰

¹⁰ December 31, 1973.

26. Minutes of a National Security Council Meeting¹

Washington, January 24, 1974, 3:00–5:30 p.m.

SUBJECT

SALT

PARTICIPANTS

Principals

President Nixon
 Vice President Ford
 Secretary of Defense Schlesinger
 Deputy Secretary of State Rush
 JCS Acting Chairman Admiral
 Zumwalt
 Director of Central Intelligence
 Colby
 Director, Arms Control and Dis-
 armament Agency Ikle
 Chairman, SALT Delegation, Am-
 bassador U. Johnson

State

Mr. Helmut Sonnenfeldt
 Mr. William Hyland

Defense

Deputy Secretary Clements
 Mr. Paul Nitze (SALT Delegation)

JCS

Lt. Gen. Rowney (SALT
 Delegation)

CIA

Mr. Carl Duckett

ACDA

Mr. Sidney Graybeal, Chairman,
 SALT Consultative
 Committee

White House

Assistant to the President
 Kissinger

Mr. Melvin Laird
 Mr. Bryce Harlow

NSC

Maj. Gen. Brent Scowcroft
 Mr. Jan M. Lodai

President Nixon: This is the first National Security Council meeting of the new year. For your planning purposes, I would like to plan on a formal NSC meeting once every thirty days. Of course, I will carry out all kinds of consultation—with Henry, Schlesinger, and others—which will affect policy in addition to the formal meetings. But we have an NSC system which we're proud of and which I intend to use. In this light, I would like you to note that although he is Secretary of State, Henry is sitting in this meeting as Assistant to the President. So at this meeting, Ken (Rush) will have to speak for State.

I want these monthly meetings because there is a need for regularity. Last year we were not as regular as perhaps we should have

¹ Source: National Archives, Nixon Presidential Materials, NSC Files, NSC Institutional Files (H-Files), Box H-110, NSC Meeting Minutes, NSC Minutes Originals 1971 thru 6-20-1974. Top Secret; Sensitive. The meeting took place in the Cabinet Room. The complete minutes are scheduled for publication in *Foreign Relations*, 1969–1976, volume XXXIII, SALT II, 1972–1979.

been. In the first year or two we were setting basic policy—considering NSSM's and meeting on other topics. Now we are more in the process of executing policy. Nonetheless, there are a number of areas we have to take a look at—Latin America, Africa, Europe. Of course, there are limits to how much time we can devote to some of these. Mike Mansfield said to me this morning that he hoped I would mention Latin America in my State of the Union Message.² There are so many topics to talk about I would never get through if I covered them all in detail. Nevertheless, I believe it is very important, particularly in the second term of an administration, not to be like an exhausted volcano—there's a continual need to re-evaluate policy and positions.

In my first term our major foreign policy accomplishment was certainly the Vietnam War. Not that it would not have ended eventually in any event—it had to end. But we had to take many tough decisions—Cambodia, Laos, May 8, December 18. History might record that our opening to China was the most important accomplishment, or perhaps our opening to the Soviet Union. Yet, had we not done Southeast Asia properly, the others would not have been possible.

When you have ideas I want you to throw them in. This applies to the Deputies as well; I consider you as much a part of this group as the Principals. I heard a good idea today from my daughter, Julie. Julie is a good friend of former Agriculture Secretary Hardin. Secretary Hardin said, "He who holds the oil of the world, holds the world by the tail." Julie also made a point of her own, that food is tremendously important. Whoever can feed himself will be in an excellent position. Food can be even more important than energy, and if there's anything we're good at, it's agriculture. Secretary Butz was just telling me about the excellent crops we're going to have. As you might expect, the lure of \$5 wheat leads to tremendous plantings and will be leading to surpluses once again. Back to foreign affairs, our role will not be limited only to the U.S., but also to what we can contribute to the rest of the world.

I remember an incident in Latin America many years ago. All the leaders I met then have either died or have been assassinated by now, so I can't remember the names. But whoever I was speaking to was the head of Peru at that time. I told him we could send our experts to improve his agricultural technology. But he said, "That's not our problem—our problem is that 45 percent of our food spoils on its way to market." That's what is so great about the United States—we not only have the agricultural technology, but we know how to store and transport and market the food we produce.

² Nixon delivered his State of the Union address on January 30. See *Public Papers: Nixon, 1974*, pp. 56–100.

Another example is Brazil. Brazil is an unbelievably rich country. When Kubitschek put the capital out there in Brazilia,³ I thought he was a damn fool. But he was brilliant; the heart of Latin America is in its center.

Domestically, Jerry,⁴ we must never go back to scarcity again. In our foreign policy, I don't want to export our farmers, but one of the most important exports we have is know-how—not just planting and growing, but transporting and marketing also.

Having started in so idealistically, which I'm not sure you'll pay much attention to in any event, I will now turn to other topics.

Jerry, since this is your first meeting, I would like to say a little bit about how we operate. We do not make decisions here. I have to make the decisions, and I make them after the meeting. Sometimes I change my mind, so please don't hold me to any comments I might make here. I want to emphasize once again the importance of the NSC operation here in the White House. It's important to understand that when you talk to Henry or Scowcroft, you're talking to me. We have big plays left to make. It's like Joe DiMaggio—I remember his marvelous plays. He nearly busted his ankle every time, but he would always catch the ball. He was expected to make big plays. It's expected now that we make big plays. And even if there might not be many big plays left to make, there are certainly big mistakes which can be made. Therefore, we have to use this process. What happens here in this room is still more important than what happens anywhere else in the world. Not because of the personalities involved, but because of the richness of our country, and because we have power and have shown our willingness to use power. When we sneeze, everyone else gets pneumonia, and that's the way it's going to be for a while—unless we decide to give up our power and retreat into ourselves.

That's the end of my introductory remarks for this first meeting. Let me say once again that if you think our policies are wrong, please say so. Of course, if you think the policies are right, say it publicly! We've met today to talk about SALT, and I hope these meetings can be essentially one-topic meetings. My understanding is that there is a wide difference of opinion on SALT around town, which just goes to show that the more things change, the more they stay the same. Let's start now with a briefing from CIA.

³ During former Brazilian President Juscelino Kubitschek de Oliveira's tenure (1956–1961), the capital moved from Rio de Janeiro to Brasilia.

⁴ Appointed on October 12, 1973, Ford was confirmed as Vice President on December 6.

[Omitted here is discussion of SALT.]

President Nixon: This is certainly more complex than SALT I. It is also true that they have a better bargaining position than we do. We talk as if we can have an agreement or not, but within this room, we shouldn't fool ourselves—we probably aren't fooling them either.

Suppose Brezhnev wants to agree, but his military does not. Their military may decide to go like hell. The U.S. might also wish to agree, and our military, while supporting an agreement, might think that a particular agreement is lousy. But we have to look at the political situation. Despite the fact that we could steam the country up in the absence of agreement, and tell them that we are in an all-out arms race, it is far more likely that the Soviets will move ahead more rapidly than we will.

Amb. Johnson: But the Soviets must account for the unpredictability of our reaction. They cannot assume we will do nothing.

President Nixon: That is right. We could turn hard right. Even some of the extreme peaceniks who two years ago said that we must have détente at any price are for political reasons now saying that détente is bad. But I don't mind Jackson and Mondale rattling around like they do. In the back of their minds the Soviets know that we might turn to the right.

But we should look at the hard facts. We are putting in a bigger Defense budget, and maybe we'll get it; but it may be substantially cut. What we have to figure on here is this—we talk about essential equivalence and other such gobbledegook, but suppose we can't get it. Looking at the two countries, lacking an agreement, and having an all-out arms race. We just might not get the new programs from Congress. Especially when 56 percent of our budget is spent on personnel versus 26 percent of theirs.

I don't mean to be telling our chief negotiator that we are in a weak position. We have got to go all out to get the agreement. But when you have your Verification Panel and when we make these decisions, we have got to realize that an all-out arms race may not be to our advantage.

Let me raise another strategic concept. We talk about the Soviet Union and the U.S., but by 1980 the Soviet Union will face Britain and France, who don't have much, and potentially a very substantial China. For the U.S., we talk about planning for a two-ocean war or a one-ocean war. But at present, the threat from the Chinese is obviously considerably less. And Western Europe is no threat to us. For the Soviet Union it is not as easy—they have to worry about the U.S. first, but also Western Europe, which may matter at some point in the future, and the Chinese. Thus, central to our policy is what happens in China. Suppose there

were a Soviet-Chinese détente or alliance. Dr. Judd⁵ was unhappy with our opening to China and I was not terribly happy about what it did to our friends in Taiwan. Also, we can't forget that it was not an anti-Soviet move—at least that is what we say; we see good relations with both sides.

And without that, the U.S. ten years from now would be in a very dangerous position. Within ten years, as Brezhnev says, or within twenty to twenty-five years, it will happen—the Chinese will be very strong.

Dr. Kissinger: Both you and Brezhnev may be right at the same time. They could be a significant threat to the Soviets within ten years, although it might be twenty years before they were a threat to the U.S.

President Nixon: That is a good point, Henry.

Carl Duckett: [*3½ lines not declassified*]

President Nixon: I remember when we were in Moscow for SALT—I must say I never went through such a week—our Russian friends do their business after midnight, right, Henry? During the Middle East negotiations at the last summit, Henry, as you remember, most of our conversations were between midnight and 3:00 a.m. In SALT I, everything was after midnight and went on all night long—at least that is what you said you were doing (laughter).

In a group of experts like this, this probably sounds poor, but I think we have to keep asking ourselves—why do we have it? What is it going to be worth ten years from now?

Brezhnev—he showers love and kisses on the U.S.—and bear hugs—he is a very physical man. But, when I saw him alone both here and at San Clemente, all he talked about was China. It might be an act, but it could be very real. If it is an act, he is the best actor in the world.

Dr. Kissinger: And so are the Chinese.

President Nixon: The Soviets are looking at this not in terms of SALT II, but ten years from now. They are thinking, as they always do, in historical terms. They know that the Chinese and the U.S., while not friends, are not opponents. So, in the long term, they have to think in terms of a much larger force. Today it is just the Soviet Union versus the U.S., but their worry is 1985. Alex, what do they say about the Chinese question?

Amb. Johnson: The word “China” has never been used in my conversations, although they frequently talk about “third powers.”

⁵ Reference is to former Representative Dr. Walter H. Judd (R-Minnesota). Prior to serving in the House, Judd worked as a medical missionary in China during the 1920s and 1930s. Defeated for his seat in 1962 as a result of redistricting, Judd eventually assumed the chairmanship of the Committee for a Free China.

President Nixon: Yes, they refer to “those powers,” but they clearly aren’t interested in India or Ceylon—they mean the Chinese.

Vice President Ford: If there is no agreement, we clearly have the resources and the know-how, but perhaps not the political will. I assume they have the will and the know-how, but do they have the resources?

President Nixon: Sure. We always have underestimated them—they have plenty of resources.

Director Colby: However, they do have an incentive to agree. Brezhnev has his entire reputation tied up in this, and also there are others behind him who are looking at the economic advantages of détente.

President Nixon: Yes, Brezhnev has staked a great deal on agreements with the U.S. Stalin killed everyone off, perhaps for pretty good reason, since they were out to get him—but we should remember, in the final analysis, because of the authoritarian character of their system, that it is in our interest to have a government in the Soviet Union as peaceful as Brezhnev seems to be now, even though they are being very tough in these negotiations. It could be a lot worse.

Secretary Schlesinger: I agree as Bill Colby has pointed out that Brezhnev has an interest in agreement. Therefore, I think we can arrive at least at “formal” equality which will allow us to build up to a level equal to theirs. We might not get the funds to do it, but I think it is important for appearance’s sake to have formal equality. We might have to accept their level of forces. But then, the pressure is on Congress to provide the essential equivalence they insist we must have. Today we spend only \$8 billion on strategic forces—we probably spend that much on food stamps.

President Nixon: A lousy program.

Secretary Schlesinger: We could go up easily. They have an incentive to avoid a U.S. build-up.

President Nixon: Don’t misunderstand me. Our public position will have to be that we have the will, and will undertake the necessary programs. We don’t need agreement if they don’t want it. But in this room, we have to look realistically at a world where we go up and up. It is not clear such a world is in our interest. I don’t mind sounding like a peacenik here in this room—but I hope it doesn’t get outside.

Vice President Ford: Jim, are you saying we only spend about 10 percent of our budget on strategic forces?

Secretary Schlesinger: About 10 to 15 percent. We are spending less now than we were in 1964 in constant dollar terms. And with about \$2 billion a year more we could undertake significant new programs.

Admiral Zumwalt: Two billion dollars would buy two more submarines a year.

Secretary Kissinger: Zumwalt will prove that to you no matter how a naval battle comes out—you would have been better off with more ships (laughter)!

Mr. Clements: The point is, it is relatively cheap to go up if we have to.

President Nixon: We will try to do it if we have to, but hopefully we will be able to get agreement with the Soviets. Thank you very much, gentlemen.

27. Editorial Note

The severity of the global energy crisis in late 1973 prompted the Nixon administration to engage other nations in a search for solutions. Secretary of State Henry Kissinger used his December 12, 1973, speech to the Society of Pilgrims in London (Document 24) to propose the establishment of an Energy Action Group, with members comprised of oil-consuming and oil-producing countries. Concerned that the energy situation jeopardized global political and economic stability, Nixon invited all major industrial consumer and producer nations to meet at the Foreign Minister level in Washington during the second week of February 1974 to analyze the current situation and develop a consumer action program. For the text of Nixon's January 9 letters to the heads of OPEC member states and the oil-consuming nations comprising the High Level Oil Committee of the Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development, see Department of State *Bulletin*, February 4, 1974, pages 123–124. See also *Foreign Relations*, 1969–1976, volume XXXVI, Energy Crisis, 1969–1974, Document 280.

On January 10, Kissinger and Administrator of the Federal Energy Office William Simon held a joint press conference at the Department of State to discuss the foreign and domestic implications of the energy crisis. Kissinger sketched out the parameters of the upcoming meeting and added: "The basic conviction of the President and of his associates is that it is a problem of truly global significance in which selfish advantages cannot be attained, or if attained, cannot be sustained, either among consuming nations or between consuming and producing nations. It is in this spirit that the United States will make its proposals, first at the meeting on February 11, and at the subsequent meetings that will, we hope, flow from that. And it will be in a spirit that we are con-

structing a solution for all of mankind, and not of particular benefit to any one segment of it, that the President has addressed both the consuming and the producing nations to start a process which we hope will provide long-term answers to the problem of supply as well as to the problems of the economy.” (Department of State *Bulletin*, February 4, 1974, page 111)

Nixon subsequently used his January 19 radio address to review the energy conservation measures undertaken by Americans during the 1973 Arab oil embargo and to highlight the administration’s efforts in pursuing international accommodation on oil supplies and prices. Reiterating the severity of the crisis, Nixon commented: “The burden of energy conservation, of cutbacks and inconvenience, of occasional discomfort, continued concern is not, I can assure you, an artificial one. It is real. During the Second World War, Winston Churchill was once asked why England was fighting Hitler. He answered, ‘If we stop, you will find out.’” (*Public Papers: Nixon*, 1974, page 15)

Four days later, on January 23, Nixon submitted to Congress his first legislative message of 1974, which delineated the administration’s short-term and long-term legislative proposals concerning the energy crisis. For the text of this message, see *ibid.*, pages 17–32. The President also devoted a portion of his State of the Union message to underscoring the importance of these legislative initiatives and the necessity for cooperation at the upcoming Washington Energy Conference: “As we seek to act domestically to increase fuel supplies, we will act internationally in an effort to obtain oil at reasonable prices. Unreasonable increases in the cost of so vital a commodity as oil poses a threat to the entire structure of international economic relations. Not only U.S. jobs, prices and incomes are at stake, but the general pattern of international cooperation is at stake as well. It is our hope that we can work out cooperative efforts with our friends abroad so that we can all meet our energy needs without disrupting our economies and without disrupting our economic relationships.” (*Ibid.*, page 58)

The Washington Energy Conference commenced on February 11. In his opening remarks to conference delegates, Kissinger asserted: “The United States has called this conference for one central purpose: to move urgently to resolve the energy problem on the basis of cooperation among *all* nations. Failure to do so would threaten the world with a vicious cycle of competition, autarky, rivalry, and depression such as led to the collapse of the world order in the thirties. Fortunately, the problem is still manageable multilaterally: National policies are still evolving, practical solutions to the energy problem are technically achievable, and cooperation with the producing countries is still politically open to us.” After outlining seven potential areas of collaboration, including promulgation of a “new energy ethic,” development of alter-

native energy sources, funding of energy research and development, institution of a multilateral energy sharing program, increased international financial cooperation, consideration of the needs of developing nations, and improved consumer-producer relations, Kissinger ended his remarks, stating:

“As we look toward the end of this century, we know that the energy crisis indicates the birth pains of global interdependence. Our response could well determine our capacity to deal with the international agenda of the future.

“We confront a fundamental decision. Will we consume ourselves in nationalistic rivalry which the realities of interdependence make suicidal? Or will we acknowledge our interdependence and shape cooperative solutions?”

“Our choice is clear, our responsibility compelling: We must demonstrate to future generations that our vision was equal to our challenge.” (Department of State *Bulletin*, March 4, 1974, pages 201–206)

That evening, Nixon delivered prepared remarks at a working dinner for conference delegates. Preferring to place the energy crisis in a broader context of global politics, Nixon commented that the United States and other nations had reached a watershed in world history. New challenges, such as energy dependence, confronted the world’s leaders, leading Nixon to pose the question as to how the assembled leaders could secure peace in order to build an “era of progress for all of our people, the people of the free nations and, for that matter, of the Communist nations of the world.” The President referenced the insular sentiment within the United States, not simply relating to security matters but also to trade and international monetary policy. He asserted that his administration would not disengage from the world: “We reject it [withdrawal], for example, in the field of trade. We believe that it is vitally important to go forward with the great trade initiatives that have been undertaken, as Secretary Shultz has often stated in his meetings with his counterparts represented here at this meeting.

“We believe it is vitally important in the field of monetary affairs that the United States play a responsible role with other nations in the free world in developing a more stable system, one that will not be affected by the shocks that have so often, over the past 10 years, shaken the world monetary institutions to their very foundations.”

“We also believe this in terms of security, as I have already indicated, where we oppose the idea that the United States, because we have entered into a period of peace which we long wanted, now can reduce its forces unilaterally without having a compensatory reduction among others or where the United States will turn away from the treaty commitments that it has, whether it is in Europe or in Asia.” (*Public Papers: Nixon, 1974*, pages 151–152)

At the conclusion of the conference on February 13, the invited leaders issued a communiqué outlining additional steps to be taken in resolving the current energy situation. For the text of the communiqué, see Department of State *Bulletin*, March 4, 1974, pages 220–222. See also *Foreign Relations*, 1969–1976, volume XXXVI, Energy Crisis, 1969–1974, Documents 318–322.

28. Address by Secretary of State Kissinger¹

Mexico City, February 21, 1974.

We owe our host country and its leaders a profound debt of gratitude for sponsoring this meeting. Personally, I have spent many happy days in this great country. And I have had the privilege of the advice, wisdom, and on occasion the tenacious opposition of your President and Foreign Minister. I look forward to an equally frank, friendly, intense, but constructive dialogue at this conference.

On a plaque in Mexico's imposing Museum of Anthropology are etched phrases which carry special meaning for this occasion:

Nations find courage and confidence to face the future looking to the greatness of their past. Mexican, seek yourself in the mirror of this greatness. Stranger, confirm here the unity of human destiny. Civilizations pass; but we will always reflect the glory of the struggle to build them.

We assemble in the splendid shadows of history's monuments. They remind us of what can be achieved by inspiration and of what can be lost when peoples miss their opportunity. We in the Americas now have a great opportunity to vindicate our old dream of building a new

¹ Source: Department of State *Bulletin*, March 18, 1974, pp. 257–262. Kissinger delivered his address at the Conference of Tlatelolco. The conference, held February 18–23, brought together the Foreign Ministers of 25 Western Hemisphere nations to discuss the outlines of a “New Dialogue” that Kissinger had proposed at the United Nations in October 1973 (see footnote 1, Document 18). Kissinger sent a February 20 information memorandum to Nixon which outlined the American goals for Tlatelolco, couched in the form of an “Agenda for the Americas.” (National Archives, Nixon Presidential Materials, NSC Files, Box 788, Country Files—Latin America, Mexico, Vol. IV (1973) [1 of 3]) Additional documentation is *ibid.*, Kissinger Office Files, Box 48, HAK Trip Files, HAK Trip Mexico Feb 20–24, 1974 State Msgs, Memos, Misc.; and Library of Congress, Manuscript Division, Kissinger Papers, Box CL 175, Geopolitical File, Latin America, Inter-American Conference of Tlatelolco, Memoranda to the President and Kissinger.

world of justice and peace, to assure the well-being of our peoples, and to leave what we achieve as a monument to our striving.

Our common impulse in meeting here is to fulfill the promise of America as the continent which beckoned men to fulfill what was best in them. Our common reality is the recognition of our diversity. Our common determination is to derive strength from that diversity. Our common task is to forge our historical and geographical links into shared purpose and endeavor.

In this spirit the United States offered a new dialogue last October. In this spirit the countries of the Americas responded in Bogotá last November.²

We meet here as equals—representatives of our individual modes of life, but united by one aspiration: to build a new community.

We have a historic foundation on which to build. We live in a world that gives our enterprise a special meaning and urgency.

On behalf of President Nixon, I commit the United States to undertake this venture with dedication and energy.

The U.S. Commitment

One concern has dominated all others as I have met privately with some of my colleagues in this room. Does the United States really care? Is this another exercise of high-sounding declarations followed by long periods of neglect? What is new in this dialogue?

These questions—not unrelated to historical experience—define our task. On behalf of my colleagues and myself, let me stress that we are here to give effect to a new attitude and to help shape a new policy. The presence of so many distinguished leaders from the U.S. Congress underlines the depth of the U.S. concern for its neighbors and the determination of our government to implement our agreements through a partnership between the executive and legislative branches.

The time has come to infuse the Western Hemisphere relationships with a new spirit. In the 19th and early 20th centuries, the United States declared what those outside this hemisphere should not do within it. In the 1930's we stipulated what the United States would not do. Later we were prone to set standards for the political, economic, and social structures of our sister republics.

² The Foreign Ministers and special representatives of 23 Latin American countries met in Bogotá November 14–16, 1973, and proposed that the Tlatelolco Conference focus on development cooperation, economic coercion measures, restructuring of the Inter-American system, settlement of the Panama Canal question, the structure of international trade and the international monetary system, transnational enterprises, technology transfers, and the general outlook of the relations between Latin America and the United States. The text of the agenda, as approved by the Foreign Ministers on November 16, is attached to Kissinger's February 20 information memorandum to Nixon. See footnote 1 above.

Today we meet on the basis of your agenda and our common needs. We agree with one of my distinguished colleagues who said on arrival that the time had come to meet as brothers, not as sons. Today, together, we can begin giving expression to our common aspirations and start shaping our common future.

In my view, our fundamental task at this meeting, more important even than the specifics of our agenda, is to set a common direction and infuse our efforts with new purpose. Let us therefore avoid both condescension and confrontation. If the United States is not to presume to supply all the answers, neither should it be asked to bear all the responsibilities. Let us together bring about a new commitment to the inter-American community. Let us use the specific issues we discuss here as a roadmap for the future.

Let us not be satisfied with proclamations but chart a program of work worthy of the challenge before us.

Let us create a new spirit in our relations—the spirit of Tlatelolco.

An Interdependent World

A century ago a U.S. President described to the Congress the difficulties facing the country: “It is a condition which confronts us—not a theory.” The condition we confront today is a world where interdependence is a fact, not a choice.

The products of man’s technical genius—weapons of incalculable power, a global economic system, instantaneous communications, a technology that consumes finite resources at an ever-expanding rate—have compressed this planet and multiplied our mutual dependence. The problems of peace, of justice, of human dignity, of hunger and inflation and pollution, of the scarcity of physical materials and the surplus of spiritual despair, cannot be resolved on a national basis. All are now caught up in the tides of world events—consumers and producers, the affluent and the poor, the free and the oppressed, the mighty and the weak.

The world and this hemisphere can respond in one of two ways:

There is the path of autarky. Each nation can try to exploit its particular advantages in resources and skills and bargain bilaterally for what it needs. Each nation can try to look after itself and shrug its shoulders at the plight of those less well endowed. But history tells us that this leads to ever more vicious competition, the waste of resources, the stunting of technological advance, and most fundamentally, growing political tensions which unravel the fabric of global stability. If we take this route, we and our children will pay a terrible price.

Or we can take the path of collaboration. Nations can recognize that only in working with others can they most effectively work for

themselves. A cooperative world reflects the imperatives of technical and economic necessity but, above all, the sweep of human aspirations.

The United States is pledged to this second course. We believe that we of the Americas should undertake it together.

This hemisphere is a reflection of mankind. Its diversity reflects the diversity of the globe. It knows the afflictions and frustrations of the impoverished. At the same time many of its members are leaders among modernizing societies. Much has been done to overcome high mortality rates, widespread illiteracy, and grinding poverty. This hemisphere uniquely includes the perceptions of the postindustrial societies, of those who are only beginning to sample the benefits of modernization, and of those who are in mid-passage.

The Americas reach out to other constellations as well. The nations of Latin America and the Caribbean share much of the stirrings of the Third World. The United States is engaged in the maintenance of peace on a global basis. Pursuing our separate ways narrowly, we could drift apart toward different poles. Working together, we can reinforce our well-being and strengthen the prospects for global cooperation.

So let us begin here in this hemisphere. If we here in this room fail to grasp the consequences of interdependence, if we cannot make the multiplicity of our ties a source of unity and strength, then the prospects for success elsewhere are dim indeed. The world community which we seek to build should have a Western Hemisphere community as one of its central pillars.

President Echeverría foresaw the gathering force of interdependence in 1972 when he set forth his Charter of the Economic Rights and Duties of States³ as a guide for the conduct of relations among countries at different levels of economic development. Last September before the U.N. General Assembly I endorsed that concept.⁴ At first, some were concerned because they saw the charter as a set of unilateral demands; it has since become clear that it is a farsighted concept of mutual obligations. In the emerging world of interdependence, the weak as well as the strong have responsibilities, and the world's interest is each nation's interest.

We can start by making the concept of the charter a reality in the Western Hemisphere.

The U.S. View of the American Community

The United States will do its full part to see that our enterprise succeeds. We can make a major contribution, but it would be in nobody's

³ See footnote 5, Document 17.

⁴ See Document 17.

interest if we raised impossible expectations, leaving our peoples frustrated and our community empty. We will promise only what we can deliver. We will make what we can deliver count.

I have carefully studied the agenda for this meeting you prepared in Bogotá. I will respond in detail to its specifics in our private sessions. But I will say here that I have come to a greater understanding of the deeply felt motivations behind the phrases. You are concerned:

—That the United States has put aside its special commitment to the hemisphere.

—That we will allow old issues to go unresolved while new ones are created.

—That we seek not community but dominance.

—That our relationship does not adequately contribute to human welfare in the hemisphere, that it is often irrelevant to your needs and an obstacle to their fulfillment.

In response let me outline the direction the United States proposes to its friends in rededicating itself to a new era of Western Hemisphere relationships. I look forward to hearing your own views so that together we can make the Western Hemisphere community a reality.

The United States will do its utmost to settle outstanding differences. During the past year, the United States and Mexico solved the longstanding Colorado River salinity dispute.⁵ Two weeks ago Panama and the United States, taking account of the advice of their partners at Bogotá, signed a document that foreshadows a new relationship.⁶ And just 48 hours ago, Peru and the United States settled a dispute over compensation for the exercise of Peru's sovereign right to nationalize property for public purposes.⁷

⁵ On August 30, 1973, the United States and Mexico signed an agreement setting forth a permanent and definitive solution to the international problem of salinity of the Colorado River. (24 UST 1968; TIAS 7708) A White House Fact Sheet listed the significant achievements of the agreement, including: "It demonstrates the willingness of the United States to work with Mexico in removing inequities in relations between the two countries" and "It shows that through mutual effort and with good will on both sides, deeply conflicting interests between nations of this hemisphere can be reconciled constructively and amicably." See Department of State *Bulletin*, September 24, 1973, pp. 388–396.

⁶ On February 7, Kissinger and Panamanian Minister of Foreign Affairs Juan Antonio Tack initialed a joint statement of principles for the negotiation of a new Panama Canal treaty. At the signing ceremony, held in Panama City, Kissinger commented: "We meet here today to embark upon a new adventure together. Our purpose is to begin replacing an old treaty and to move toward a new relationship. What we sign today, hopefully, marks as well the advent of a new era in the history of our hemisphere and thus makes a major contribution to the structure of world peace." Kissinger's address and the text of the joint statement are printed *ibid.*, February 25, 1974, pp. 181–185.

⁷ The United States and Peru signed an intergovernmental agreement at Lima on February 19, providing the United States with \$76 million in compensation for Peruvian expropriation and nationalization of American companies on Peruvian soil. See *ibid.*,

The United States is prepared to work with the other nations of this hemisphere on methods to eliminate new disputes or to mitigate their effect.

Some of our most troublesome problems have arisen over differences concerning the respective rights and obligations of private U.S. firms operating in foreign countries and the countries which host them. These differences are based largely on differing conceptions of state sovereignty and state responsibility.

On the one hand, in keeping with the Calvo doctrine,⁸ most nations of this hemisphere affirm that a foreign investor has no right to invoke the protection of his home government. On the other hand, the United States has held that nations have the right to espouse the cause of their investors if they believe they have been unfairly treated. This conviction is reflected in the legislative provisions of the Gonzalez and Hickenlooper amendments.⁹

Realistically, we must admit that these two elements cannot be easily or quickly reconciled. But the United States is prepared to begin a process to this end and to mitigate their effects. Even before a final resolution of the philosophical and legal issues, we are ready to explore means by which disputes can be removed from the forefront of our intergovernmental relations.

In our private meetings I shall make specific proposals to establish agreed machinery which might narrow the scope of disputes. For example, we might consider the establishment of a working group to examine various procedures for factfinding, conciliation, or the settlement of disputes. Other approaches are possible, and I shall welcome the views of my colleagues. Let me affirm here that a procedure acceptable to all the parties would remove these disputes as factors in U.S. Government decisions respecting assistance relationships with host countries. We would be prepared to discuss with our Congress appropriate modifications of our legislation.

March 18, 1974, pp. 272–273. Nixon, in a statement released by the White House on February 19, indicated that the administration needed to develop a “new approach” for the resolution of these types of conflicts, one “without lengthy negotiations and without complicating good relations between friends.” See *Public Papers: Nixon, 1974*, p. 175.

⁸ Named after Argentine jurist and diplomat Carlos Calvo, who elucidated these concepts in *International Law of Europe and America in Theory and Practice* (1868).

⁹ The Gonzalez amendment, approved by Congress in March 1972, required the President to instruct his representatives to international financial institutions, such as the IDA and IBRD, to vote against any foreign loans to countries that had expropriated U.S. investments without compensation. The Hickenlooper amendment to the 1961 Foreign Assistance Act terminated foreign assistance programs in nations that expropriated U.S. property without compensation and also required the United States to vote against loans made by international financial institutions to countries engaged in expropriation activities.

But we cannot achieve our goals simply by remedying specific grievances or even by creating mechanisms that will eliminate the sources of disputes. A special community can only emerge if we infuse it with life and substance.

We must renew our political commitment to a Western Hemisphere system. Thomas Macaulay once observed, "It is not the machinery we employ but the spirit we are of that binds men together." We are here because we recognize the need for cooperation. Yet we can only cooperate if our people truly believe that we are united by common purposes and a sense of common destiny.

The United States will be guided by these principles:

—We will not impose our political preferences.

—We will not intervene in the domestic affairs of others.

—We will seek a free association of proud peoples.

In this way, the Western Hemisphere community can make its voice and interests felt in the world.

We realize that U.S. global interests sometimes lead to actions that have a major effect on our sister republics. We understand, too, that there is no wholly satisfactory solution to this problem.

However, to contribute to the sense of community we all seek, the United States commits itself to close and constant consultation with its hemispheric associates on political and economic issues of common interest, particularly when these issues vitally affect the interests of our partners in the Western Hemisphere.

In my view, the best way to coordinate policies is to make a systematic attempt to shape the future. I therefore recommend that today's meeting be considered the first of a series. The Foreign Ministers assembled here should meet periodically for an informal review of the international situation and of common hemispheric problems. In the interval between our meetings, the heads of our planning staffs or senior officials with similar responsibilities should meet on a regular basis to assess progress on a common agenda. The principle of consultation on matters affecting each other's interests should be applied to the fullest extent possible. Specifically:

—The United States is prepared to consult and adjust its positions on the basis of reciprocity, in the multilateral trade negotiations.

—The United States also recognizes a fundamental congruity of interests among the countries of the hemisphere in global monetary matters. We favor a strong voice for Latin America in the management of a new monetary system, just as we favor its effective participation in the reform of this system.

—The United States is ready to undertake prior consultation in other international negotiations such as the Law of the Sea Conference, the World Food Conference, and the World Population Conference.

The Western Hemisphere community should promote a decent life for all its citizens. No community is worthy of its name that does not actively foster the dignity and prosperity of its peoples. The United States as the richest and most powerful country in the hemisphere recognizes a special obligation in this regard.

Let me sketch here the program which President Nixon has authorized and which I shall discuss in greater detail with my colleagues this afternoon:

—*First, in trade.* During the period of great economic uncertainty arising from the energy situation, it is essential that nations behave co-operatively and not take protective or restrictive action. I pledge to you today that the United States will do its utmost to avoid placing any new limitations on access by Latin America to its domestic market.

In the same spirit we renew our commitment to the system of generalized tariff preferences. We shall strongly support this legislation. Once it is enacted, we will consult closely with you on how it can be most beneficial to your needs.

—*Second, in science and technology.* We want to improve our private and governmental efforts to make available needed technology, suited to varying stages of development in such vital areas as education, housing, and agriculture. Private enterprise is the most effective carrier of technology across national borders. But government, while not a substitute, can usefully appraise the overall needs and spur progress. The United States therefore recommends that we establish an inter-American commission on technology. It should be composed of leading scientists and experts from all the Americas and report to governments on the basis of regular meetings.

—*Third, in energy.* This hemisphere, linking oil-producing and oil-consuming countries, is uniquely situated for cooperative solutions of this problem. The United States is prepared to share research for the development of energy sources. We will encourage the Inter-American Development Bank to adapt its lending and fundraising activities to cushion the current strains. We are also prepared to explore ways of financing oil deficits, including the removal of remaining institutional impediments to your access to U.S. capital markets.

—*Fourth, in development assistance.* The U.S. Government in its executive branch is committed to maintain our aid levels, despite rising energy costs. On the other hand, the development problem can no longer be resolved simply by accelerating official assistance. We need a comprehensive review and recommendations on how all flows of capital and technology—whether from concessional assistance, world capital markets, or export credits—can contribute most effectively to hemispheric needs. I recommend charging the inter-American body with these tasks.

—*Fifth, in reshaping the inter-American system.* We must identify and preserve those aspects of the Rio Treaty¹⁰ and the Organization of American States which have shielded the hemisphere from outside conflict and helped preserve regional peace.

Some form of institutional structure for peace and cooperation is clearly necessary. However, we must reinforce the formal structure of the OAS by modernizing its institutions and agreeing on the principles of inter-American relations. The United States is prepared to cooperate in creative adjustments to meet new conditions.

A Spanish poet once wrote: “Traveler, there is no path; paths are made by walking.” This is our most immediate need. We are not here to write a communiqué, but to chart a course. Our success will be measured by whether we in fact start a journey. I suggest we move ahead in three ways:

—First, let us make clear to our peoples that we do have a common destiny and a modern framework for effective cooperation.

—Second, let us agree on an agenda for the Americas, a course of actions that will give substance to our consensus and inspiration to our peoples.

—Third, let us define a program to bring that agenda to life.

Mr. President, my distinguished colleagues, four centuries ago totally alien cultures met for the first time near here. We are moving toward a world whose demands upon us are nearly as alien to our experience as were the Spaniards and the Aztecs to each other.

Today, if we are to meet the unprecedented challenge of an interdependent world, we will also have to summon courage, faith, and dedication. The United States believes we can build a world worthy of the best in us in concert with our friends and neighbors. We want future generations to say that in 1974, in Mexico, the nations of the Western Hemisphere took a new road and proclaimed that in the Americas and the world they have a common destiny.¹¹

¹⁰ The 1947 Inter-American Treaty of Reciprocal Assistance, commonly known as the Rio Treaty, committed its signatories to providing reciprocal assistance to meet armed attacks against American states.

¹¹ The Declaration of Tlatelolco, issued on February 24 at the conclusion of the conference, is printed in Department of State *Bulletin*, March 18, 1974, pp. 262–264.

29. Memorandum of Conversation¹

Washington, March 11, 1974, 3:10–4:45 p.m.

PARTICIPANTS

Dr. Henry A. Kissinger, Secretary of State and Assistant to the President for National Security Affairs
 Dr. James R. Schlesinger, Secretary of Defense
 William P. Clements, Deputy Secretary of Defense
 The Joint Chiefs of Staff
 —Adm. Thomas H. Moorer, Chairman
 —Gen. Creighton Abrams, USA
 —Adm. Elmo R. Zumwalt, CNO
 —Gen. Robert E. Cushman, USMC
 —Gen. John D. Ryan, USAF
 Major General Brent Scowcroft, Deputy Assistant to the President for National Security Affairs

SUBJECT

Kissinger Trip to the Soviet Union²

Kissinger: We began détente in 1970 in an environment when we had to defend the budget for the Vietnam War and fight constantly against the unilateral disarmers. Détente gave us: first, domestic maneuvering room; secondly, an opportunity to get control of our allies, and thirdly, to get into a position where we would not get the blame for every confrontation that occurred.³ It would be seen that we would bend over backwards. So paradoxically, it has kept the Defense budgets not high, but at an acceptable level; it has kept our allies in line; and it let us end the Vietnam War in an acceptable way. Détente—even with a President who is so hated—has resulted in the liberals going to

¹ Source: Ford Library, National Security Adviser, Memoranda of Conversations, 1973–1977, Box 3, Memoranda of Conversations—Nixon Administration, March 11, 1974—Kissinger, Schlesinger, Joint Chiefs. Secret; Nodis. The meeting took place at the Pentagon.

² Kissinger met with Soviet officials in Moscow March 25–27 in preparation for Nixon's meetings with Brezhnev in late June and early July. See *Foreign Relations*, 1969–1976, volume XV, Soviet Union, June 1972–August 1974, Documents 165–170.

³ During a March 8 meeting with Scowcroft and the Republican congressional leadership, Kissinger and Nixon underscored the desirability of détente. Kissinger said: “A moderate Soviet policy is important—therefore the President's relationship with Brezhnev is important—and MFN. We can't put it to them in every area and expect them to continue to take it.” Nixon added: “Remember, if the Soviet Union and China had wanted the Vietnam War to go on, it would have, and the POW's would still be there. Our interests are opposed to those of the Soviet Union in most areas of the world—but we discuss with them our differences and we seek to avoid any of these issues from provoking nuclear war.” The full memorandum of conversation is printed in *Foreign Relations*, 1969–1976, volume XXVI, Arab-Israeli Dispute, 1974–1976, Document 31.

the right of the Administration. If détente were ended, they would immediately go left and hit us for its failure.

We held off on trade until 1971, when they started to move on SALT. We played tough on Berlin, on Jordan, and on Cienfuegos.

We had given the Soviet Union a list of areas where progress had to be made: Middle East, Berlin, Vietnam, Cuba—we had good restraint. If I were in the Politburo, I could make a case against Brezhnev for détente—much more so than against us. Only the wheat deal⁴—and that is just a bureaucratic snafu.

On SALT, we were in a period of declining defense budgets; we had no programs which we gave up. The defensive agreement was a conspiracy of the bureaucracy. This is no intellectual defense of the defensive agreement, except that we didn't lose by it.

Where are we now? In the Middle East, the Soviet Union must be beside itself. This is very worrisome. They could turn hard line.

Schlesinger: What would they do if they went hardline?

Kissinger: They could make trouble in the Middle East, in Europe, and especially domestically.

Clements: What the Soviet Union wants is the Suez Canal open. They can't screw up the Middle East until they get the Canal open.

Kissinger: I see no evidence of that. The Soviet Union always talks in terms of an overall, not partial settlement. They do that to force us either into affirming or changing the '67 boundaries—either way we would get one side down on us and get them back in.

What this means is we can't thwart the Soviet Union in every way at the same time—on MFN, in the Middle East, in SALT. It is not just a position they can't accept, but one which will result in Brezhnev being attacked for having been fooled.

We want the defense budget as high as the environment will allow; we want to be tough when we need to do so; but keep the détente or peace symbol for ourselves.

Schlesinger: How about Europe? Hints that we may withdraw troops may be useful.

Kissinger: The Atlantic area is the key to our security. If we think that by competing in the Third World we can do anything but bring about the destruction of the Western World, we are wrong.

In Europe, we have weak governments that are appealing to all sides. They kick the U.S., they spend a little more on defense for the right and to get American protection free. Every decision the EC has made has been anti-American.

⁴ See footnote 4, Document 20.

Take Japan (and Canada). All the Europeans get is the Japanese maneuvering between us and the Europeans and thus encouraging Japanese nationalism. The EC-Arab meeting⁵ reflects their insecurity. They just maneuver. And this will come at the very time when we will be in trouble in the Middle East on the issues of Palestine and Jerusalem. We can't tolerate a Europe united against us. The defense people there are still good—and there are others.

The Europeans can't be organically anti-American. If they are, why are American troops in Europe? The defense of Europe is essential to the U.S. How we defend it, however, is open. Our withdrawal could turn Europe neutralist; if they are going that way anyway, we may have to threaten some withdrawal. That would be a last resort. We have given up troop withdrawals. We have to appeal to the good types in Europe.

French policy can be viciously shortsighted. In the 19th century, they succeeded in unifying both Germany and Italy. Between the wars they surrounded Germany with weak states. They weakened and humiliated Germany but didn't take steps to prevent them from doing anything about it. The Maginot line was an invitation to Germany to turn east against the small states.

We don't want troop withdrawal. That is too drastic.

Schlesinger: An excellent formulation. We must have a common outlook on Europe and on the world as a whole.

I think on SALT⁶ we understand that we must not use too-tough words now. Essential equivalence we need for a permanent agreement; but we know we need maneuvering room now.

Kissinger: There is no differences between us on equivalence. We have had words on tactics, but not on the overall strategy like bomber throw-weight.

I will make no agreement with the Soviet Union. You will not be faced with a *fait accompli*. It is essential not to be too mechanical over what we consider equivalence. I look at overall equivalence, not equality in subcategories.

Schlesinger: I speak for the JCS—we don't want to force them into a mirror image.

Kissinger: We will be looking it over to bring back something to talk about.

Schlesinger: On the budget, we may have seen an irreversible change.

⁵ Reference is to the EC summit meeting held in Copenhagen December 14–15, 1973. Representatives of four Middle Eastern nations also attended the summit.

⁶ The SALT talks resumed in Geneva on February 19.

Kissinger: I hope you are right. As a historian though, I think the liberals will turn if détente ends after the next election.

Schlesinger: How about the Far East—the Chinese, Japan, Korean deployments?

Kissinger: Our best NATO ally is China. They understand the nature of politics and power. They are tough realists. Huang Chen complained to me about the Mideast alert, without instructions, and Mao bawled him out in front of me.

They want us to stay in Asia. That is why I am leary of pulling the B-52s out of Thailand.

Schlesinger: We have a new idea—to float the squadrons in and out.

Kissinger: The Chinese want a visible American presence in Asia. The Japanese are not organically anti-American. Japan can shift courses very rapidly. We can't assume that democracy after '45 is a permanent phenomenon. They will be okay as long as the balance of power stays—if it shifts, they could change overnight.

Our deployments in the Pacific and our overall strength are essential to keep Japan in line.

The Chinese are not our allies—they would be very aggressive if they weren't so scared of the Soviet Union.

[Omitted here is discussion unrelated to the Soviet Union and SALT.]

Zumwalt: We have a special technical problem. It is dangerous to make arms control decisions that haven't been worked through the JCS.

Kissinger: They couldn't possibly propose anything which could be accepted without being scrubbed down.

Zumwalt: It is still questionable whether we will come out in the long term. Decoupling MIRV from equivalence could be dangerous. If they are separated, it must be done very carefully.

Kissinger: There is nothing going on in any channel of which you are not aware.

30. Memorandum of Conversation¹

Washington, March 13, 1974.

SUBJECT

Washington Post Luncheon

PARTICIPANTS

Department of State

The Secretary

George S. Vest, Special Assistant for Press Relations

Washington Post

Benjamin Bradlee, Executive Director

Howard Simons, Managing Editor

Philip Geyelin, Editorial Page Editor

Meg Greenfield, Editorial Page Duty Editor

Steve Rosenfeld, Editorial Page

Richard Harwood, Assistant Managing Editor For National Affairs

Philip Foisie, Assistant Managing Editor For Foreign Affairs

Lee Lescaze, Assistant Foreign Editor

Ronald Koven, Correspondent

Murray Marder, Correspondent

Marilyn Berger, Correspondent

Dan Morgan, Correspondent

[It was agreed that all comments would be DEEP BACKGROUND, unless otherwise specified.]²

Question: What do we want the Europeans to be, allies or satellites?

The Secretary: We began our effort with the Europeans early last year in the conviction that our relationship was more like that of adversaries than of friends. I felt we required a new vision. That was the essential intent of my April 23rd speech.³ However, the debate quickly degenerated into something weird and almost unbelievable. I set out to initiate a creative dialogue. If I had foreseen the results, I would not have begun the process.

People say I did not consult adequately before the speech. In January, 1973, I discussed my ideas on two separate times with Heath. I fully explained them then to Pompidou as is evidenced by his inter-

¹ Source: National Archives, Nixon Presidential Materials, NSC Files, Box 1028, Presidential/HAK MemCons, MemCons 1 Mar 1974–8 May 1974 HAK & Presidential [3 of 4]. Limited Official Use. Drafted by Vest. The meeting was held at the *Washington Post* building.

² Brackets are in the original.

³ Document 8.

view with Scotty Reston in December, 1972. I also discussed them with Brandt. After the speech I tried to proceed in a cooperative way—particularly with France. I saw Jobert four times and his condition for cooperation in May and June, 1973,⁴ was that we pursue the matter bilaterally with France. Davignon was outraged. The first phase was a bilateral. However, France shifted to a second phase in August and insisted that all work should go through the European Community, that the Community could not talk to the U.S. until after it had a firm united position and then that its designated spokesman could communicate but not negotiate any change in that position. It was like dealing with Vichinsky.⁵ This turned the whole effort into a theological argument. We do not want a Europe which is a satellite, but we should be able to define our differences and discuss them rationally with the Europeans.

As for the declaration, it was to have been the precursor of a substantive dialogue, not a substitute for it. You ask should we continue with it. We don't know. The declarations are not important in themselves. If we choose not to finish them or if we don't finish them, then I would think that we cannot really go to Europe. The issue is whether it makes better sense to pretend there is understanding among us or to let the issue rest for awhile and make another genuine effort later on. OFF THE RECORD: You asked why I was not willing to advertise to you in advance that the April 23rd speech was an important one. You should recall that I was the Special Assistant to the President at the time I spoke and had a natural jurisdictional problem with my predecessor,⁶ so I was reticent about building up my public statements at the time. END OFF THE RECORD.

You ask, since I have called the Europeans "corrupt and craven", what is their value? Why are we making such an effort over them? First, family quarrels have a special intensity. In my writings you will find that I have always expressed a special concern with the Europeans. Their behavior has been tragic, legalistic and petty. I may have been extreme in my comment at times but the consequences are of such importance. Consider, what can be the future of Europe. It can become Finlandized, a backwater, or play a helpful Western role.

Always we have to keep in mind the problem of future evolution in the Soviet Union. We cannot dispute the possibility that some young Russians may reach positions of power and say, "Let's get this country

⁴ Records of Kissinger's discussions with Jobert are scheduled for publication in *Foreign Relations*, 1969–1976, volume E-15, part 2, Documents on Western Europe, 1973–1976.

⁵ Reference is to Andrey Vyshinsky, who served as Soviet Foreign Minister, 1949–1953.

⁶ Secretary of State William Rogers resigned his position in August 1973 and was succeeded by Kissinger. See Document 16.

moving again” and then it will be a much more dangerous situation. The third world is anti-Western, if not anti-U.S. The U.S. cannot do everything by itself on the globe. Thus it is extremely important that other centers assume responsibility. I consider it highly important for Europe to be more confident and more active. For me the whole point of the Year of Europe was not to create the conditions for a satellite but to encourage the evolution of allies who could play a role such as I have been mentioning.

As for a prediction about what Europe might become, I think there is a better than even chance Europe will become a historical backwater. Its present course is suicidal. Take the case of oil and consider their own interests. If we in the West engage in bilateral competition for resources, they will lose, but in the end it will be bad for all of us. If they go to a meeting with Arab Ministers, it is bound to turn out badly since the Europeans simply will be forced to back the radical Arab elements. They are not strong enough to do otherwise. The official European story as to how the European Community was drawn into its special effort with the Arabs is hardly believable. It goes back to the moment when the four Arab representatives spontaneously, so some Europeans claim, turned up at Copenhagen.⁷ The four were ministers from Tunisia, Sudan, United Arab Emirates and Algeria. And they obviously did not really represent the Arabs. The Europeans only told me about their proposed activity with the Arabs two days before the Washington Energy Conference.⁸ At that time an FRG official leaked a document (which turned out to be inaccurate) forewarning us and saying his action would be denied if revealed. We never received an official communication.

Now, for the most recent episode in Europe in Bonn.⁹ I had some general talk with Scheel but no real forewarning of impending action. The next day I was in Brussels, a peculiar situation where the European foreign ministers were present in town but I was left to talk to the ambassadors in NATO. I never attempted to see the ministers and Scheel only informed me of action after the fact.

I do think we have to keep our perspective. Neither we nor the Europeans should have a veto on action by the other. But on matters af-

⁷ See footnote 5, Document 29.

⁸ See Document 27 for details concerning the Washington Energy Conference.

⁹ Kissinger met with Brandt and Scheel in Bonn on March 3. On March 4, Kissinger arrived in Brussels in order to brief NATO and EC officials on the Middle East peace process. While in Brussels, Kissinger met with Scheel at the West German Embassy and discussed the relationship between the United States and EC nations and the EC's decision to offer industrial and economic cooperation to Arab nations. Documentation is scheduled for publication in *Foreign Relations*, 1969–1976, volume E-15, part 2, Documents on Western Europe, 1973–1976.

fecting vital policy of the other, each should be ready to consult and try to coordinate. In practice the European Community as it now works has not been willing to do this. The problem of the mechanics or an arrangement for consultation is in part the guts of the issue. We do not believe we would have had the differences we have had on the Middle East or on energy if we had talked these issues out fully and freely. But the real issue is that the Europeans it seems cannot define their position except in opposition to the U.S.

OFF THE RECORD: On my relations with the President, I see him every day. Obviously he has many preoccupations now and the intensity of our discussions on foreign policy matters is less. After all, whatever your judgement of events it has been a shattering experience for him. Is he short tempered? Not with me. I have never had such treatment. I would say over the last several months, from the time he came back from San Clemente until this week, he has acquired a certain serenity, none of the nastiness such as your paper has implied from time to time. Is he in charge of foreign policy? I'm getting adequate guidance. There was a period when the public relations people gave the impression he was making every tactical move. In fact he has always concentrated on the big strategic issues and he makes the fundamental decisions, the major ones. On tactical moves, I think I know his mind and what he wants. This way of working is nothing new. It is simply a matter of degree. END OFF THE RECORD.

As I have said before, you cannot continue to attack the central authority without some consequence for our ability to carry out policy. I say this analytically, you cannot do this without paying a price. With all modesty one consequence these days has been an excessive attention to me. But remember when a foreign leader makes agreements, he does so on the basis of his expectation of performance in carrying out that agreement. And, of course, when the central authority is attacked enough, that expectation is reduced.

I have to supply continuity and a sense of steadiness and be true to my responsibility to the President. On the way back from Panama¹⁰ a group of Congressmen were holding forth that it would be easier to impeach and that moreover, I would take care of foreign policy so it really didn't matter so much. I responded that it would be very different to carry on foreign policy for an impeached president than for one who was under attack. I have never said what I would do. But be clear on this. I will not let my office be used as a basis for influencing Congressional action on impeachment.

¹⁰ See footnote 6, Document 28.

Question: What's happening to détente and what are the Soviets up to?

The Secretary: There has been much argument over who has gained what in the process of détente. You should keep in mind that the Soviets could ask themselves rather searching questions about whether they have gained enough in the process. Grain, yes, they did gain. It was not discussed at the Summit between the President and Brezhnev. But they did put one over on us because of a bumbling bureaucracy. But except for the wheat deal what have they gotten out of détente?

In this country some liberal groups seem unwilling to accept any monument to an achievement by this administration.

I think we have to assess in which direction Soviet attitudes are moving. I think I can detect a certain chill in Soviet attitudes. They are faced with a lot of problems when they look at the course of affairs inside the U.S. and even a compromise with Jackson on MFN may not save détente; without a compromise it is hard to foresee what might happen to détente. As for the form of a compromise, I can't say now, that is really up to Jackson and Ribicoff.

On SALT, I agree with your editorial.¹¹ Jackson's pressure was a major factor in increased Jewish emigration from the Soviet Union, but beyond a certain point it is not helpful. On SALT, I don't negotiate with Jackson. We will pay no price in that area in order to get MFN. SALT affects the future of this country for the next fifteen years and we just will not play with it.

I have no difference with Schlesinger—although people try to impute problems to us. He has a different constituency from mine. I have no evidence that he does not see the basic problems of SALT in the same way I do. We have breakfast together every week, plus other frequent meetings together with Colby and Moorer. And there are verification panel meetings which are used to bring out all technical viewpoints. I consider him an ally.

As for a chill with the Soviets, I should emphasize that there are no Soviet actions yet that you can really judge by, it is just a gut feeling, the way communications are addressed, the number of them and this rather lengthy absence of Dobrynin. What could happen next? It could take some form of stiff opposition from the Soviets in all international forums, but most immediately in the Middle East making it difficult to proceed as we do, a push for reactivation of the Geneva Conference, increased détente efforts with the Europeans and an effort to create differences between us and the Europeans. I repeat, it has not showed up

¹¹ "Trade, Détente—and Soviet Emigration," *Washington Post*, March 10, 1974, p. B-6.

as yet. Maybe they're only waiting for me to get there. Gromyko's pattern on the Middle East was frantic and a little undignified: in each capital he arrived after me, after the decisions had been made. The Soviet media commentary on the oil embargo which backed a hard line, is it a sign? Maybe. Certainly progress in SALT would be a litmus test—absence of progress on SALT would not be. It depends on how big a bite we want. But we can have a SALT further agreement in time for the Presidential visit to Moscow.

In SALT there would normally be three phases. First, technical discussions, second a conceptual break-through, and the time need not be too long between the second and third phase, final negotiations. However, we have not yet made the conceptual break-through.

You ask if the *détente* has not loosened the alliance. Well in CSCE, the Europeans have been almost as obnoxious to the Soviets as any one else. The truth of the matter is that *détente* with its illusion of peace, or perhaps the reality of peace, leaves the nations free to be tougher with the Soviets.

The reaction to the alert during the Middle East war must raise questions in the Soviet minds about how long the U.S. can sustain stiff positions. This is a factor we have to bear in mind. On balance, I expect the Soviets to continue to opt for *détente*.

You asked what are the benefits for the U.S. in *détente*? It has enabled us to end the Viet-Nam war, temporarily to calm down the Middle East war, to stabilize the situation in Europe, and to start on the path toward controlling the arms race. The two super-powers have begun to regulate their relationship and to make a beginning of working on problems without pushing to extremes.

What about Ambassador Bruce? He asked some time ago if he could come back for consultation. While here I got his judgment on Europe. His presence here had nothing to do with China. The Chinese have been going to great efforts to signal to us that their own policy initiative to the U.S. is unchanged. It is true that they don't seem at the moment to have the time to cultivate our relationship as they did last year.

As for the Soviets and the Middle East, I don't think the Soviets have made up their minds what they want in the Middle East, or what they are prepared to pay in that area. They are in the process of reassessing their policy. They have three choices. One, they can force the issue and drive us to another air lift for Israel, which would be difficult to sustain. Two, they can wait for us to fall on our face. The further down the road we go, the more difficult the tasks become. We have scrupulously avoided saying we support the '67 frontiers. Three, they could go ahead and accept peace in the area, which is incidentally, quite unlikely. A settlement between Israel and Syria will take a miracle. Israel now has placed settlements on the edge of the Golan

Heights. Syria operates on the theory that all of Israel historically belongs to Syria. The chances are slightly better than 50–50 that I can succeed in obtaining a disengagement there.

My timetable for the immediate future is, first, a visit to Moscow later this month with a stop in London on the way back. I do not plan to add a visit to the Middle East on the way back from Moscow. That would be too much of an indignity for the Soviets. I expect to come back from Moscow, deal with a Syrian emissary, and then hope for vacation.

Question: What about subpoenas, and this talk of more wire taps?

The Secretary: I have not been subpoenaed in connection with Ehrlichman¹² or any other case and can only be asked questions in connection with the situation in 1970. It would reveal that I took a very dim view of the theft of the Pentagon papers or of unauthorized revelations concerning the China trip or the SALT negotiations. But to go from there to a connection with the burglaries of a psychiatrist's office is a big step. I think it would be a double-edged sword.

Will the President go to the Middle East in May? There is talk of it, but no date. It depends on progress on Syrian disengagement. As for a trip to Europe, we have not made a decision.

On Viet-Nam, it seems quite clear that there will be no offensive this dry season. Plausibly, if South Viet-Nam doesn't withstand an offensive now, it will be their own fault. They have the wherewithal.

Back to the Soviet Union, I do not believe the Soviet Union exercised the restraint it could have in the Middle East. On the other hand, if the Soviets perceived that the Arabs would lose the war and didn't want to further diminish their influence, it could be understood why the Soviets played out their hand as they did. The U.S.-Soviet relationship is delicate, partly antagonistic, partly collaborative, and where the balance is, I cannot judge. I do not think the Soviets provoked the Middle East war. Arab leaders assured me of this. But the Soviets did provide the objective conditions in which the war could happen. I would not be surprised as a result of Gromyko's visit to Egypt to see more Soviet arms sent to Egypt. I make this comment based on no intelligence sources whatsoever.

As for King Hussein, we'll give him some more arms but we cannot compete on the Soviet scale. He is paying the price of moderation. Given the Israeli political situation, the Israelis have almost no

¹² During September 1973, former Assistant to the President for Domestic Affairs John Ehrlichman was indicted on burglary conspiracy charges in California in connection with the 1971 burglary of Dr. Lewis Fielding's office. Fielding was Dr. Daniel Ellsberg's psychiatrist. See Anthony Ripley, "Several 'Major' Criminal Indictments In Next 2 Months Hinted by Jaworski," *New York Times*, January 1, 1974, p. 17.

choice, because their choice is to deal with the King or Arafat. They are doing neither at the moment, which is really a choice for Arafat. I assume someone will speak for Arafat when Geneva reopens. But Israel needs the National Religious Party to govern—so this inhibits the Israelis from making any decision on the West Bank.

Back to Europe, if the Europeans pursue their present course, we'll disassociate from them for their own good. It is a historic tragedy. For years they complained that we ignored them. Now they complain about being dragged into too close a relationship. The leadership there is obsessed with internal matters and with lesser things. It was prepared to haggle interminably over the word "partnership" and to be obsessed about procedure so that at the Washington Energy Conference, for which we had prepared in great detail, we never reached substance but were hung up on procedure among the Europeans. We were not trying to tell Europe what was best for each of them.

In France there is an inflamed domestic situation in which the French are united only on being anti-American. The FRG wishes not to break with either side. The UK is internally preoccupied with its own politics. If the Europeans go ahead and give technical assistance at a meeting with the Arabs, what will we do? The U.S. has not fully decided; our next course is under study. OFF THE RECORD: As for the declarations, we could stop any more work on them today and have the President go to Europe and have a great success, because 98% of what I asked for in my speech last year could be claimed as achieved. But it would be politically and historically false. It would not mean that the Atlantic nations were moving vigorously toward unity of action and understanding. So I ask, is it worth going on to a big production under that circumstance or is the issue something we have to decide. If we shelve the declaration, people will say it was a great failure. If we go on with them, we contribute to an illusion. There is a 50–50 chance they will be completed but the way in which this is done and the timing will be our decision. The real question is will it be a meaningful activity. END OFF THE RECORD.

As for the Argentine and Canadian application to ship to Cuba, the Canadian request is different because it is a Canadian company with some U.S. directors and using some U.S. parts. The Argentine case involved a U.S. subsidiary. I have made two separate recommendations, not necessarily different, to the President and it is in his hands. It is very possible the question will be resolved by the time of the OAS meeting in Atlanta in the latter part of April.¹³

¹³ Kissinger addressed the fourth regular General Assembly of the OAS in Atlanta April 19–20. For the text of Kissinger's remarks, see Department of State *Bulletin*, May 13, 1974, pp. 509–515.

31. Editorial Note

The Nixon administration's trade bill, sent to Congress in April 1973 (see footnote 1, Document 5 and footnote 3, Document 19), continued to generate congressional debate during early 1974. The opponents of the administration's proposal, led by Senator Henry "Scoop" Jackson (D-Washington) and Representative Charles Vanik (D-Ohio), asserted that the United States should not extend most-favored-nation status (MFN) to the Soviet Union, due to restrictive emigration policies applied to Soviet Jews. As Jackson commented in late December 1973: "We are asked to believe that the prospects for peace are enhanced by the flow of Pepsi-Cola to the Soviet Union and the flow of vodka to the United States." He continued: "We will move much further along the road to a stable peace when we see the free flow of people and ideas across the barriers that divide East and West—a flow unchecked by arbitrary and capricious power." ("Debate Looms in Congress on Soviet Trade," *Washington Post*, January 1, 1974, page A4) President Richard Nixon and Secretary of State Henry Kissinger placed the trade bill within the larger context of détente, asserting that a relaxation in trade policy stood to benefit the United States, the Soviet Union, major trading nations, and the developing world. During his testimony to the Senate Committee on Finance on March 7, 1974, Kissinger responded to criticisms that the pursuit of détente with the Soviet Union condoned Soviet internal policies:

"The most painful aspect of this debate—for me personally and for many others in the administration—centers around the question of respect for human rights in the Soviet Union.

"This is not a dispute between the morally sensitive and the morally obtuse. It is, rather, a problem of choosing between alternatives.

"I do not oppose the objective of those who wish to use trade policy to affect the evolution of Soviet society; it does seem to me, however, that they have chosen the wrong vehicle and the wrong context. We cannot accept the principle that our entire foreign policy—or even an essential component of that policy such as a normalization of our trade relations—should be made dependent on the transformation of the Soviet domestic structure.

"I say this with some anguish, since both as a historian and as one whose own origins make him particularly conscious of the plight of minority groups, I would prefer that we could do otherwise.

"Let us remember that we seek détente with the Soviet Union for one overwhelming reason: Both countries have the capability to destroy each other—and most of the rest of the world in the process. Thus, both of us have an overriding obligation to do all in our power to prevent such a catastrophe.

“Détente is not rooted in agreement on values; it becomes above all necessary because each side recognizes that the other is a potential adversary in a nuclear war. To us, détente is a process of managing relations with a potentially hostile country in order to preserve peace while maintaining our vital interests. In a nuclear age, this is in itself an objective not without moral validity—it may indeed be the most profound imperative of all.

“Détente is founded on a frank recognition of basic differences and dangers. Precisely because we are conscious that these differences exist, we have sought to channel our relations with the U.S.S.R. into a more stable framework—a structure of interrelated and interdependent agreements. Forward movement in our relations must be on a broad front, encompassing a wide range of mutually reinforcing activities, so that groups and individuals in both countries will have a vested interest in the maintenance of peace and the growth of a stable international order.

“Since détente is rooted in a recognition of differences and based on the prevention of disaster, there are sharp limits to what we can insist upon as part of this relationship. We have a right to demand responsible international behavior from the U.S.S.R.; we did not hesitate to make this clear during the Middle East crisis. We also have a right to demand that agreements we sign are observed in good faith.

“But with respect to basic changes in the Soviet system, the issue is not whether we condone what the U.S.S.R. does internally; it is whether and to what extent we can risk other objectives—and especially the building of a structure for peace—for these domestic changes. I believe that we cannot and that to do so would obscure, and in the long run defeat, what must remain our overriding objective: the prevention of nuclear war.” (Department of State *Bulletin*, April 1, 1974, page 323)

A week after Kissinger testified to the Senate Committee on Finance, Nixon attended a meeting of the Executives’ Club of Chicago on March 15. The President, commenting that the club’s members had previously indicated their preference for a question-and-answer session over a lengthy speech, eschewed prepared remarks. In response to concerns that the administration’s pursuit of détente jeopardized American domestic and foreign positions, Nixon responded:

“With regard to the policy of détente, let us first understand that whether it is with the Soviet Union or the People’s Republic of China, neither side—and I have met the top leaders of both—has any illusions about our vast differences as far as philosophy is concerned.

“Second, the fact that we have negotiation rather than confrontation does not in any way imply that we approve of their internal policies or for that matter that they approve of ours.

“Third, when we say that the policy of détente has been two for them, in effect, and one for us—I think that is shorthanding what you said, but I think properly so—I think that what we must understand, first, is what the policy of détente has accomplished.”

Nixon proceeded to mention the administration’s success in ending the Vietnam war, avoiding a military confrontation with the Soviet Union during the October 1973 Middle East war, and pursuing agreements to limit strategic arms. The President then returned to the issue of détente’s critics:

“And finally, the alternative to détente. There are those who say because of the way the Russians treat their minorities, we should break off our relations with them, we should not trade with them, we should deny them credits, and then maybe they will change. Well, first, they aren’t going to change if we do that. It will have exactly the opposite effect.

“But the second point is, if we go back to the old policy of confrontation, not negotiating to limit nuclear arms and other arms possibly in the future, not negotiate with the hope of resolving differences at the conference table rather than on the battlefield, then what you have to do is to face the necessity for the United States to enter an arms race, and instead of an \$8 billion increase in the arms budget, you would have \$100 billion increase in the arms budget. And eventually you would confront what would be a massive crisis between the Soviet Union and the United States in the Mideast, in Europe, possibly even in the Mediterranean, as well as in the Caribbean area, where our interests are in conflict.

“I would simply conclude my answer with this: Nobody, I know, will question my credentials with regard to the Soviet system and my disagreements with it. I would also say, however, that I have learned that it is much better to have your voice heard within the Kremlin than outside.

“One of the problems that has concerned me, sir, has been the fact that many complaints very properly have been made with regard to the treatment of minorities in the Soviet Union and particularly those of the Jewish faith.

“Let me tell you the figures. Before we started talking to the Soviets in our period of negotiation, 400 Soviet Jews a year got out. In the first year of our talks, 17,000 got out. Last year 35,000 got out.

“Now, they still aren’t doing what we would do or what we would want them to do, but it is far better to have the voice of the President of the United States heard from within the Kremlin than the outside, because those walls are mighty thick, I can tell you.

“So, therefore, let us continue to talk to them, so we won’t have to fight them.” (*Public Papers: Nixon, 1974*, pages 271–272)

On October 18 the administration and members of Congress reached a compromise position on the trade bill. Jackson offered an amendment to the bill that allowed the President to waive the ban on MFN and Export-Import Bank credits for 18 months if the President could report to Congress that the Soviet Union had made progress in relaxing emigration curbs. Both Houses of Congress approved the Trade Act of 1974 (P.L. 93–618) on December 20, 1974. President Gerald Ford signed the bill into law on January 3, 1975. Less than 2 weeks later, on January 14, Kissinger announced that the Soviet Union rejected the terms of the legislation and canceled the 1972 U.S.-Soviet trade agreement. Documentation on the impact of the Jackson-Vanik amendment on U.S.-Soviet relations is printed in *Foreign Relations, 1969–1976*, volume XXXI, Foreign Economic Policy, 1973–1976, and *ibid.*, volume XVI, Soviet Union, August 1974–December 1976. See also *Congress and the Nation*, volume IV, 1973–1976, pages 131, 133.

32. Address by Secretary of State Kissinger¹

New York, April 15, 1974.

The Challenge of Interdependence

We are gathered here in a continuing venture to realize mankind's hopes for a more prosperous, humane, just, and cooperative world.

As members of this organization, we are pledged not only to free the world from the scourge of war but to free mankind from the fear of hunger, poverty, and disease. The quest for justice and dignity—which finds expression in the economic and social articles of the United Nations Charter—has global meaning in an age of instantaneous commu-

¹ Source: Department of State *Bulletin*, May 6, 1974, pp. 477–483. Kissinger gave the address to the Sixth Special Session of the United Nations General Assembly. The Algerian Representative to the United Nations, Abdellatif Rahal, proposed the session, held April 9–May 2, in the interest of furthering discussion and action on development and raw materials issues. The General Assembly approved two resolutions at the session: U.N. Resolution 3201 (S–VI), Declaration on the Establishment of a New International Economic Order and U.N. Resolution 3202 (S–VI), Programme of Action on the Establishment of a New International Economic Order. (*Yearbook of the United Nations*, 1974, pp. 324–332) For information concerning the planning of the special session and the American response to the U.N. resolutions, see *Foreign Relations, 1969–1976*, volume XXXI, Foreign Economic Policy, 1973–1976, Document 257.

nication. Improving the quality of human life has become a universal political demand, a technical possibility, and a moral imperative.

We meet here at a moment when the world economy is under severe stress. The energy crisis first dramatized its fragility. But the issues transcend that particular crisis. Each of the problems we face—of combating inflation and stimulating growth, of feeding the hungry and lifting the impoverished, of the scarcity of physical resources and the surplus of despair—is part of an interrelated global problem.

Let us begin by discarding outdated generalities and sterile slogans we have—all of us—lived with for so long. The great issues of development can no longer realistically be perceived in terms of confrontation between the “haves” and “have-nots” or as a struggle over the distribution of static [*statist?*] wealth. Whatever our ideological belief or social structure, we are part of a single international economic system on which all of our national economic objectives depend. No nation or bloc of nations can unilaterally determine the shape of the future.

If the strong attempt to impose their views, they will do so at the cost of justice and thus provoke upheaval. If the weak resort to pressure, they will do so at the risk of world prosperity and thus provoke despair.

The organization of one group of countries as a bloc will, sooner or later, produce the organization of potential victims into a counterbloc. The transfer of resources from the developed to the developing nations—essential to all hopes for progress—can only take place with the support of the technologically advanced countries. Politics of pressure and threats will undermine the domestic base of this support. The danger of economic stagnation stimulates new barriers to trade and to the transfer of resources.

We in this Assembly must come to grips with the fact of our interdependence.

The contemporary world can no longer be encompassed in traditional stereotypes. The notion of the northern rich and the southern poor has been shattered. The world is composed not of two sets of interests but many: developed nations which are energy suppliers and developing nations which are energy consumers, market economies and nonmarket economies, capital providers and capital recipients.

The world economy is a sensitive set of relationships in which actions can easily set off a vicious spiral of counteractions deeply affecting all countries, developing as well as technologically advanced. Global inflation erodes the capacity to import. A reduction in the rate of world growth reduces export prospects. Exorbitantly high prices lower consumption, spur alternative production, and foster development of substitutes.

We are all engaged in a common enterprise. No nation or group of nations can gain by pushing its claims beyond the limits that sustain world economic growth. No one benefits from basing progress on tests of strength.

For the first time in history, mankind has the technical possibility to escape the scourges that used to be considered inevitable. Global communication insures that the thrust of human aspirations becomes universal. Mankind insistently identifies justice with the betterment of the human condition. Thus economics, technology, and the sweep of human values impose a recognition of our interdependence and of the necessity of our collaboration.

Let us therefore resolve to act with both realism and compassion to reach a new understanding of the human condition. On that understanding, let us base a new relationship which evokes the commitment of all nations because it serves the interests of all peoples. We can build a just world only if we work together.

The Global Agenda

The fundamental challenge before this session is to translate the acknowledgment of our common destiny into a commitment to common action, to inspire developed and developing nations alike to perceive and pursue their national interest by contributing to the global interest. The developing nations can meet the aspirations of their peoples only in an open, expanding world economy where they can expect to find larger markets, capital resources, and support for official assistance. The developed nations can convince their people to contribute to that goal only in an environment of political cooperation.

On behalf of President Nixon, I pledge the United States to a major effort in support of development. My country dedicates itself to this enterprise because our children—yours and ours—must not live in a world of brutal inequality, because peace cannot be maintained unless all share in its benefits, and because America has never believed that the values of justice, well-being, and human dignity could be realized by one nation alone.

We begin with the imperative of peace. The hopes of development will be mocked if resources continue to be consumed by an ever-increasing spiral of armaments. The relaxation of tensions is thus in the world interest. No nation can profit from confrontations that could culminate in nuclear war. At the same time, the United States will never seek stability at the expense of others. It strives for the peace of cooperation, not the illusory tranquility of condominium.

But peace is more than the absence of war. It is ennobled by making possible the realization of humane aspirations. To this purpose this Assembly is dedicated.

Our goal cannot be reached by resolutions alone. It must remain the subject of constant, unremitting efforts over the years and decades ahead.

In this spirit of describing the world as it is, I would like to identify for this Assembly six problem areas which, in the view of the U.S. delegation, must be solved to spur both the world economy and world development. I do so not with the attitude of presenting blueprints but of defining common tasks to whose solution the United States herewith offers its wholehearted cooperation.

Expanding the Supply of Energy

First, a global economy requires an expanding supply of energy at an equitable price.

No subject illustrates global interdependence more emphatically than the field of energy. No nation has an interest in prices that can set off an inflationary spiral which in time reduces income for all. For example, the price of fertilizer has risen in direct proportion to the price of oil, putting it beyond the reach of many of the poorest nations and thus contributing to worldwide food shortages. A comprehension by both producers and consumers of each other's needs is therefore essential:

—Consumers must understand the desires of the producers for higher levels of income over the long-term future.

—Producers must understand that the recent rise in energy prices has placed a great burden on all consumers, one virtually impossible for some to bear.

All nations share an interest in agreeing on a level of prices which contributes to an expanding world economy and which can be sustained over the long term.

The United States called the Washington Energy Conference² for one central purpose—to move urgently to resolve the energy problem on the basis of cooperation among all nations. The tasks we defined there can become a global agenda:

—Nations, particularly developed nations, waste vast amounts of existing energy supplies. We need a new commitment to global conservation and to more efficient use of existing supplies.

—The oil producers themselves have noted that the demands of this decade cannot be met unless we expand available supplies. We need a massive and cooperative effort to develop alternative sources of fuels.

—The needs of future generations require that we develop new and renewable sources of supply. In this field, the developed nations

² See Document 27.

can make a particularly valuable contribution to our common goal of abundant energy at reasonable cost.

Such a program cannot be achieved by any one group of countries. It must draw on the strength and meet the needs of all nations in a new dialogue among producers and consumers.

In such a dialogue, the United States will take account of—and take seriously—the concern of the producing countries that the future of their peoples not depend on oil alone. The United States is willing to help broaden the base of their economies and to develop secure and diversified sources of income. We are prepared to facilitate the transfer of technology and to assist industrialization. We will accept substantial investment of the capital of oil-producing countries in the United States. We will support a greater role for oil producers in international financial organizations as well as an increase in their voting power.

Avoiding Imbalances in Raw Materials

Second, a healthy global economy requires that both consumers and producers escape from the cycle of raw material surplus and shortage which threatens all our economies.

The principles which apply to energy apply as well to the general problem of raw materials. It is tempting to think of cartels of raw material producers to negotiate for higher prices. But such a course could have serious consequences for all countries. Large price increases coupled with production restrictions involve potential disaster: global inflation followed by global recession from which no nation could escape.

Moreover, resources are spread unevenly across the globe. Some of the poorest nations have few natural resources to export, and some of the richest nations are major commodity producers.

Commodity producers will discover that they are by no means insulated from the consequences of restrictions on supply or the escalation of prices. A recession in the industrial countries sharply reduces demand. Uneconomical prices for raw materials accelerate the transition to alternatives. And as they pursue industrialization, raw material producers will ultimately pay for exorbitant commodity prices by the increased costs of the goods they must import.

Thus the optimum price is one that can be maintained over the longest period at the level that assures the highest real income. Only through cooperation between consumers and producers can such a price be determined. Such a cooperative effort must include urgent international consideration of restrictions on incentives for the trade in commodities. This issue—dealing with access to supply as well as access to markets—must receive high priority in GATT [General

Agreement on Tariffs and Trade]³ as we seek to revise and modernize the rules and conditions of international trade.

In the long term, our hopes for world prosperity will depend on our ability to discern the long-range patterns of supply and demand and to forecast future imbalances so as to avert dangerous cycles of surplus and shortage.

For the first time in history, it is technically within our grasp to relate the resources of this planet to man's needs. The United States therefore urges that an international group of experts, working closely with the United Nations Division on Resources, be asked to undertake immediately a comprehensive survey of the earth's nonrenewable and renewable resources. This should include the development of a global early warning system to foreshadow impending surpluses and scarcities.

Crisis in Food Production

Third, the global economy must achieve a balance between food production and population growth and must restore the capacity to meet food emergencies. A condition in which 1 billion people suffer from malnutrition is consistent with no concept of justice.

Since 1969, global production of cereals has not kept pace with world demand. As a result, current reserves are at their lowest level in 20 years. A significant crop failure today is likely to produce a major disaster. A protracted imbalance in food and population growth will guarantee massive starvation—a moral catastrophe the world community cannot tolerate.

No nation can deal with this problem alone. The developed nations must commit themselves to significant assistance for food and population programs. The developed nations must reduce the imbalance between population and food which could jeopardize not only their own progress but the stability of the world.

The United States recognizes the responsibility of leadership it bears by virtue of its extraordinary agricultural productivity. We strongly support a global cooperative effort to increase food production. This is why we proposed a World Food Conference at last year's session of the General Assembly.⁴

Looking toward that conference, we have removed all domestic restrictions on production. Our farmers have vastly increased the acreage under cultivation and gathered record harvests in 1973. 1974 promises to be even better. If all nations make a similar effort, we believe the recent rise in food prices will abate this year, as it has in recent weeks.

³ Brackets are in the original.

⁴ See Document 17 and footnote 4 thereto.

The United States is determined to take additional steps. Specifically:

—We are prepared to join with other governments in a major worldwide effort to rebuild food reserves. A central objective of the World Food Conference must be to restore the world's capacity to deal with famine.

—We shall assign priority in our aid program to help developing nations substantially raise their agricultural production. We hope to increase our assistance to such programs from \$258 million to \$675 million this year.

—We shall make a major effort to increase the quantity of food aid over the level we provided last year.

For countries living near the margin of starvation, even a small reduction in yields can produce intolerable consequences. Thus, the shortage of fertilizer and the steep rise in its price is a problem of particular urgency—above all for countries dependent on the new high-yield varieties of grain. The first critical step is for all nations to utilize fully existing capabilities. The United States is now operating its fertilizer industry at near capacity. The United States is ready to provide assistance to other nations in improving the operation of plants and to make more effective use of fertilizers.

But this will not be enough. Existing worldwide capacity is clearly inadequate. The United States would be prepared to offer its technological skills to developing a new fertilizer industry in developing countries and especially in oil-producing countries, using the raw materials and capital they uniquely possess.

We also urge the establishment of an international fertilizer institute as part of a larger effort to focus international action on two specific areas of research: improving the effectiveness of chemical fertilizers, especially in tropical agriculture, and new methods to produce fertilizers from non-petroleum resources. The United States will contribute facilities, technology, and expertise to such an undertaking.

Nations at the Margin of Existence

Fourth, a global economy under stress cannot allow the poorest nations to be overwhelmed.

The debate between raw material producers and consumers must not overlook that substantial part of humanity which does not produce raw materials, grows insufficient food for its needs, and has not adequately industrialized. This group of nations, already at the margin of existence, has no recourse to pay the higher prices for the fuel, food, and fertilizer imports on which their survival depends.

Thus, the people least able to afford it—a third of mankind—are the most profoundly threatened by an inflationary world economy.

They face the despair of abandoned hopes for development and the threat of starvation. Their needs require our most urgent attention. The nations assembled here in the name of justice cannot stand idly by in the face of tragic consequences for which many of them are partially responsible.

We welcome the steps the oil producers have already taken toward applying their new surplus revenues to these needs. The magnitude of the problem requires, and the magnitude of their resources permits, a truly massive effort.

The developed nations, too, have an obligation to help. Despite the prospect of unprecedented payment difficulties, they must maintain their traditional programs of assistance and expand them if possible. Failure to do so would penalize the lower income countries twice. The United States is committed to continue its program and pledges its support for an early replenishment of the International Development Association. In addition, we are prepared to consider with others what additional measures are required to mitigate the effects of commodity price rises on low-income countries least able to bear the burden.

Applying Science to the World's Problems

Fifth, in a global economy of physical scarcity, science and technology are becoming our most precious resource.

No human activity is less national in character than the field of science. No development effort offers more hope than joint technical and scientific cooperation.

Man's technical genius has given us labor-saving technology, healthier populations, and the Green Revolution.⁵ But it has also produced a technology that consumes resources at an ever-expanding rate, a population explosion which presses against the earth's finite living space, and an agriculture increasingly dependent on the products of industry. Let us now apply science to the problems which science has helped to create:

—To meet the developing nations' two most fundamental problems, unemployment and hunger, there is an urgent need for farming technologies that are both productive and labor intensive. The United States is prepared to contribute to international programs to develop and apply this technology.

—The technology of birth control should be improved.

—At current rates of growth, the world's need for energy will more than triple by the end of this century. To meet this challenge, the

⁵ The Green Revolution relied on the use of chemical fertilizers, pesticides, and improved seed hybrids to produce higher crop yields during the late 1960s and early 1970s.

U.S. Government is allocating \$12 billion for energy research and development over the next five years, and American private industry will spend over \$200 billion to increase energy supplies. We are prepared to apply the results of our massive effort to the massive needs of other nations.

—The poorest nations, already beset by manmade disasters, have been threatened by a natural one: the possibility of climatic changes in the monsoon belt and perhaps throughout the world. The implications for global food and population policies are ominous. The United States proposes that the International Council of Scientific Unions and the World Meteorological Organization urgently investigate this problem and offer guidelines for immediate international action.

An Open Trade and Finance System

Sixth, the global economy requires a trade, monetary, and investment system that sustains industrial civilization and stimulates growth.

Not since the 1930's has the economic system of the world faced such a test. The disruption of the oil price rises, the threat of global inflation, the cycle of contraction of exports and protectionist restrictions, the massive shift in the world's financial flows, and the likely concentration of invested surplus oil revenue in a few countries—all threaten to smother the dreams of universal progress with stagnation and despair.

A new commitment is required by both developed and developing countries to an open trading system, a flexible but stable monetary system, and a positive climate for the free flow of resources, both public and private.

To this end the United States proposes that all nations here pledge themselves to avoid trade and payment restrictions in an effort to adjust to higher commodity prices.

The United States is prepared to keep open its capital markets so that capital can be recycled to developing countries hardest hit by the current crisis.

In the essential struggle to regain control over global inflation, the United States is willing to join in an international commitment to pursue responsible fiscal and monetary policies.

To foster an open trading world the United States, already the largest importer of the manufactures of developing nations, is prepared to open its markets further to these products. We shall work in the multilateral trade negotiations to reduce tariff and nontariff barriers on as wide a front as possible. In line with this approach we are urging our Congress to authorize the generalized tariff preferences which are of such significance to developing countries.

Matching Physical Needs With Political Vision

All too often, international gatherings end with speeches filed away and with resolutions passed and forgotten. We must not let this happen to the problem of development. The complex and urgent issues at hand will not yield to rhetorical flourishes. Their resolution requires a sustained and determined pursuit in the great family of United Nations and other international organizations that have the broad competence to deal with them.

As President Nixon stated to this Assembly in 1969:⁶

Surely if one lesson above all rings resoundingly among the many shattered hopes in this world, it is that good words are not a substitute for hard deeds and noble rhetoric is no guarantee of noble results.

This Assembly should strengthen our commitment to find cooperative solutions within the appropriate forums such as the World Bank, the International Monetary Fund, the GATT, and the World Food and Population Conferences.⁷ The United States commits itself to a wide-ranging multilateral effort.

Mr. President, Mr. Secretary General, we gather here today because our economic and moral challenges have become political challenges. Our unprecedented agenda for global consultations in 1974 already implies a collective decision to elevate our concern for man's elementary well-being to the highest political level. Our presence implies our recognition that a challenge of this magnitude cannot be solved by a world fragmented into self-contained states or competing blocs.

Our task now is to match our physical needs with our political vision.

President Boumediene cited the Marshall plan of a quarter century ago as an example of the possibility of mobilizing resources for development ends. But then the driving force was a shared sense of purpose, of values, and of destination. As yet, we lack a comparable sense of purpose with respect to development. This is our first requirement. Development requires, above all, a spirit of cooperation, a belief that with all our differences we are part of a larger community in which wealth is an obligation, resources are a trust, and joint action is a necessity.

We need mutual respect for the aspirations of the developing as well as the concerns of the developed nations. This is why the United

⁶ For Nixon's September 18, 1969, address to the United Nations General Assembly, see *Public Papers: Nixon, 1969*, pp. 724–731.

⁷ The U.N.-convened Third World Population Conference, which was the highlight of World Population Year, was held in Bucharest August 19–30. For documentation on the conference, see *Foreign Relations, 1969–1976*, volume E–14, part 1, Documents on the United Nations, Documents 116–117.

States has supported the concept of a Charter of Economic Rights and Duties of States⁸ put forward by President Echeverría of Mexico.

The late President Radhakrishnan of India once wrote:

We are not the helpless tools of determinism. Though humanity renews itself from its past, it is also developing something new and unforeseen. Today we have to make a new start with our minds and hearts.

The effort we make in the years to come is thus a test of the freedom of the human spirit.

Let us affirm today that we are faced with a common challenge and can only meet it jointly. Let us candidly acknowledge our different perspectives and then proceed to build on what unites us. Let us transform the concept of world community from a slogan into an attitude.

In this spirit let us be the masters of our common fate so that history will record that this was the year that mankind at last began to conquer its noblest and most humane challenge.

⁸ See footnote 5, Document 17.

33. Memorandum of Conversation¹

Washington, April 24, 1974.

PARTICIPANTS

President Nixon

Vice President Ford

Dr. Henry A. Kissinger, Secretary of State and Assistant to the President for
National Security AffairsMajor General Brent Scowcroft, Deputy Assistant to the President for National
Security Affairs

Congressional Leadership

The President: We have a subject which does not command unanimity—foreign aid.² A lot of people will support it because the interests of the nation require it, despite the views of most of their constituents. We need to go over it all, but there are two areas where peacekeeping is especially important—one is Vietnam. I will only say we believe it is a good investment in keeping the peace in the area. It's better to take this step rather than one which will drift into another conflict.

The other area is the Middle East. The controversial area is Israel. Also Egypt and an increase to Jordan. I support both. Aid for Israel is important if it is to survive, and we had to support it against the Soviet-supported attack. For Egypt, some Israeli supporters oppose it, saying we should support only Israel. But it is far better that we support Egypt than that others do. I know no constituency in the U.S. for Israel's neighbors, and there's a big one for Israel because of Jewish contributors to this country. But this aid is of great importance to Israel.

¹ Source: National Archives, Nixon Presidential Materials, NSC Files, Box 1028, Presidential/HAK MemCons, MemCons 1 Mar 1974–8 May 1974 HAK & Presidential [1 of 4]. Secret; Nodis. The meeting was held in the Cabinet Room. According to the President's Daily Diary, the meeting took place from 8:38 to 9:50 a.m. In addition to Nixon, Ford, Kissinger, and Scowcroft, Senators Mike Mansfield, Robert Griffin, George Aiken, John Stennis, Strom Thurmond, Daniel Inouye, Edward Brooke, and John Sparkman; Representatives Tip O'Neill, John Rhodes, Carl Albert, John McFall, Leslie Arends, Peter Frelinghuysen, William Bray, George Mahon, Elford Cederberg, Otto Passman, Garner Shriver, Clement Zablocki, and William Broomfield; and Armstrong, Ash, Haig, Flanagan, Dean Burch, Gerald Warren, William Timmons, Thomas Korologos, Daniel Parker, Linwood Holton, and Max Friedersdorf attended the meeting. (Ibid., White House Central Files)

² The President had that day transmitted to Congress proposed legislation for funding foreign assistance programs in FY 1975. See *Public Papers: Nixon, 1974*, pp. 373–379.

The idea that Israel can defend itself with only American arms was proved false in October.³ Israel can't survive against Soviet opposition.

We are at a watershed period in foreign policy, in a period when often we are tied exclusively to Israel. We are now developing a relationship of friendship with the whole area. It's not to get the Soviet Union out—that is self-defeating—but to have us in. Not with a big giveaway, but to play a peacekeeping role. Others may have designs on the Middle East. The Arabs who are turning to us know they have nothing to fear from us. This is a great price for their independence and peace in the area.

It's the same for Southeast Asia—whether we will have the strength and vision to play the role that only we can play in bringing an at best uneasy peace in the area.

Speaker Albert: We should assess this situation and examine your recommendations. I will do everything I can in a period of divisiveness to show that we stand united behind this important foreign policy program.

Secretary Kissinger: The program has development assistance, a significant program for the Middle East, and Indochina.⁴ With respect to general development assistance, they have been carefully reviewed with respect to functional categories and the poorer countries. Having just come from a Latin American conference,⁵ I would say this program has great political significance. It's not just do good. It comes at time of attempts at producer control and consumer-producer confrontation. We can stand this better than most, but it is dangerous for the world. We want to defuse the confrontation. We have drawn even the Algerians into cooperation with us.

Our basic point is not that of the 50's and 60's, that raising living standards in undeveloped countries would bring stability, but in order to build cooperation which would prevent bloc confrontation.

So when you study our proposals, you should know that our basic philosophy is to induce cooperation, and to prevent confrontation or pressure on our allies.

³ During the October 1973 Arab-Israeli war.

⁴ During his April 26 news conference, Kissinger commented, in reference to these geographical areas, that the administration's foreign assistance program "has been deliberately shaped to take account of the priority areas that we have put before the special session of the General Assembly and before the Organization of American States, and we hope that during the year we can further refine these programs." (Department of State *Bulletin*, May 20, 1974, p. 537) Congress subsequently approved the Foreign Assistance Act of 1974 (P.L. 93-559; 88 Stat. 1795) on December 18. For additional details concerning passage of the act, see *Congress and the Nation*, volume IV, 1973–1976, pp. 858–860.

⁵ See Document 28 for Kissinger's address at the Conference of Tlatelolco in Mexico City.

We will be available to your committees.

First, Middle East progress. We are introducing one of significant diplomatic revolutions of the postwar world. Before we did it we assumed that most Middle East countries were Soviet satellites. We assumed that we spoke for Israel and the Soviet Union spoke for the Arabs whenever we had a summit. It was the President's firmness at the summit which showed the Arabs that the Soviet Union couldn't deliver anything but arms.⁶

The structure needed in the Middle East is an Israel strong enough that it can't be defeated by the Arabs and an American diplomacy not so one-sided that the Arabs won't talk to us. That is why both are important in the progress we have achieved.

The President: Our Israeli aid is ten times that of the Arabs.

Secretary Kissinger: We're asking \$250 million for Egypt plus \$100 million for a contingency fund.

You who have been in the Middle East know that Egypt has made an enormous turn in its foreign policy—from war to peace. Sadat is the first leader to commit his country to peace on terms other than the extermination of Israel. The disengagement couldn't have happened without Sadat's wisdom and his willingness to look to the long range. He has also broken the Soviet link, which made Egypt the focal point for Soviet aid and Soviet propaganda. Cairo Radio used to be the spearhead. Egypt is now making a positive effort to introduce the U.S. in the Middle East. A lifting of the embargo is not possible without Egypt's help. Egypt needs help partly because of the need for reconstruction and partly because Sadat has to demonstrate to his people that the new policy has benefits and that he has ties to the United States.

The items in line for Egypt are extremely modest, and we can't exclude that we might need more. But this is our best judgment now.

Other items are for Jordan. As long as Jordan represents the Palestinians and leads the negotiation on that front, there is hope for stability and progress.

We also support the traditional amounts for Israel. We can make progress with Israel only to the extent they don't feel their security is jeopardized. The usual amounts are in, plus a breakout of the \$2.2 billion.

Senator Brooke: If Israel would send signals that it would accept this approach, it would help this proposal.

⁶ Presumably a reference to the summit meetings in Washington and San Clemente in June and July 1973.

Secretary Kissinger: I saw Dinitz last night. I told him if the Soviet Union cut off Egypt, we couldn't let Egypt down. He said "I understand what you are doing." I will ask him today about sending a signal.

Senator Brooke: It would be a practical move.

Secretary Kissinger: I will make the point, and also with the American Jewish leaders. All the money is for the Suez Canal Zone. Israel's withdrawal from the Canal was on the assumption of a massive reconstruction effort as an inducement for peace.

The President: Why don't you discuss a breakdown of the emergency package.

Secretary Kissinger: The President determined that one billion would be grant and 1.2 billion credit with an increase of \$500 million after a continuation of the negotiation. Our problem was to make a determination at the time that wouldn't pay too great a cost in the Arab world. It is strongly supported by Israel.

Congressman Rhodes: Do we have any understanding about the use of the Suez Canal by all nations, and warships?

Secretary Kissinger: Its use is regulated by the Treaty of Constantinople of 1888.⁷ Egypt will regulate the speed of the Canal clearing. They cannot prevent the passage of warships. We don't think it will change the strategic situation. We have had task forces in the Indian Ocean for months with this in mind. Privately I can tell you that Egypt will allow Israeli cargoes, not Israeli flag ships for now. Israel is happy about this, and most Israeli ships go to Eilat and Haifa; Israel is contented with this.

Vice President Ford: Could the Congress help your negotiation?

Secretary Kissinger: Not by next week, but some sympathetic words would be helpful.

Congressman Frelinghuysen: You referred to my trip to Egypt. President Sadat is very impressive. I asked how we could help. He said "Support Nixon."

Secretary Kissinger: The more the Canal is rehabilitated, the more stake Sadat has in peace. That is what Israel wants.

Senator Brooke: What do you mean for the contingency fund? Is that for Syria?

Secretary Kissinger: Syria's situation is more complex and Asad is not a leader like Sadat. Russia's ability to make enemies among the

⁷ Also known as the Convention of Constantinople. Signed on October 29, 1888, by representatives of the United Kingdom, the Ottoman Empire, Germany, France, the Austro-Hungarian Empire, Italy, Spain, the Netherlands, and Russia, the treaty neutralized the Suez Canal and guaranteed the free passage of ships in times of peace and war.

Arabs is phenomenal. Asad may try a cautious move like Sadat did. We then may need some for Syria.

Congressman O'Neill: When is the bill coming up?

Secretary Kissinger: Maybe today.

Congressman Zablocki: What happened to the \$750 million?

Secretary Kissinger: It went for equipment.

Vice President Ford: Doesn't that mean that without a disengagement agreement it would have cost more?

Secretary Kissinger: Yes. This \$2.2 billion is for the last war. We are seeking a disengagement agreement so we can calmly consider peace.

The President: Let's talk a bit about Southeast Asia.

Secretary Kissinger: This is a painful subject, but remember we accomplished what we set about—to prevent imposition of Communist government. There has been massive infiltration and massive aid by the Soviet Union, China and Eastern Europe. Without that, South Vietnam's difficulties would largely disappear. Our hope is to put large amounts into South Vietnam now so as to induce self-sustaining growth. We could cut back now, but at the expense of increases in the future. The Senate Foreign Relations Committee asked us to submit a longer term projection for South Vietnam. We are happy to do so. We foresee a down turn in the future if we give enough now.

Considering the 50 thousand American dead, the enormous total of wounded, not to spend a few hundred million to get them going seems to be a big mistake. We cut the Ambassador's recommendation substantially. In large measure the increase was due to the huge increase in the costs of fertilizer and fuel, neither of which is South Vietnam's fault.

On development assistance, we have attempted to respond to the Congressional mandate and emphasize food, health, education.

Congressman O'Neill: What is the total?

Secretary Kissinger: \$4.2 billion. For Indochina \$943 million. \$650 for Vietnam.

Senator Brooke: I think one of the problems is coming in perennially. I think a five-year projection would be helpful. I see us on our way out, so we know what we are up against.

The President: Projections must recognize the world is changing and our projection would be on the high side.

Congressman Albert: What is it for Israel?

Secretary Kissinger: \$300 million in FMS and \$50 for Supporting Assistance.

The President: That doesn't include the \$2.2.
India.

Secretary Kissinger: \$75 million.

Congressman Mahon: We had a hassle in the House over MASF increased for South Vietnam from 1.1 to 1.6.

Secretary Kissinger: That is military aid which we can't really control.

The President: You must remember that what we provide South Vietnam is under conditions of a peace agreement on a replacement basis. We are continuing diplomatic initiatives with the Soviet Union to make clear that neither side profits by fueling this conflict. This may not immediately change our five-year projection, but gradually it may, and the more progress we can make, the less it will cost us. The better off we can make the GVN, the less incentive there is for the DRV to start it up again. We know it is unpopular, but we think it is a good investment in peace.

On the Middle East, the most unreasonable people supporting Israel are not their government, but the American Jewish community. Look at Israel; it has no natural resources, only courageous people. It's able to survive only because the United States has poured in massive aid, in amounts which dwarf what we've given to Southeast Asia. The United States has stood up, especially last October, to keep the Soviet Union out of the area. When the Soviet Union thought of sending troops . . . none of you want to use U.S. troops . . . the old-line Israeli supporters say just give us the tools and we will do the job; they don't need military troops. It worked three times, but Israel now knows the Arabs can fight and the old policy is not enough. We need to resolve the dispute. So we have to give heavy aid to Israel to give them the security to have the flexibility to make peace. From Israel's standpoint, they should not want their neighbors to be supported only by the Soviet Union.

If there is another war, who will pay? We will. That is what the \$2.2 is for. So the \$250 is an investment to prevent another war.

Don't put this in terms of kicking the Soviet Union out. That is not our policy. Only the United States can bring a peace, but it is not possible if the Soviet Union is against it. What is our policy toward the Soviet Union? This is what I have told Gromyko and what I will tell Brezhnev—if they think we are trying to drive them out, we have problems, because their hard-liners can't take that. We don't seek hegemony, but peace for all, and all states who wish to should play a role. That is the American policy.

The Balkans used to be the source of European wars—today the Middle East is the Balkans of the world.

Henry has done a masterful job in dealing with those people. For the first time in 1,000 years, there is a chance that if we use skill and

have the Soviet Union play a role where they can be useful, that we can have peace and build strong, peaceful and stable countries in the area.

34. Memorandum of Conversation¹

Washington, May 28, 1974.

PARTICIPANTS

President Nixon
Cabinet Meeting

President: I want to give the Cabinet officers a rundown of how the Government is operating. After each of you has reported, we will have a wrap-up session, perhaps at Camp David.

We have been concentrating in the last weeks on economic matters. We're sending a report to the Congress today—which is worth reading.² It explains why there can be no tax cut, and why we need a tight budget. You will all have to cut some, with the possible exception of DOD.

Let me say something about Ken Rush's responsibilities. [He circulates a paper].³ It's been reported that he will be an economic Kissinger. There is only one Kissinger, and economics is different from the NSC. Many Cabinet officers have responsibilities in this area. Rush will be a funnel, not a filter. All Cabinet areas affect the economy. In foreign policy, where there can be only one voice—even here we assure that every voice can be heard—but the President has to make the decisions and it must be tightly held. Economic decisions are much broader.

¹ Source: National Archives, Nixon Presidential Materials, NSC Files, Box 1029, Presidential/HAK MemCons, MemCons—HAK & Presidential, May 8–31, 1974 [1 of 3]. Secret. The meeting was held in the Cabinet Room at the White House. According to the President's Daily Diary, the meeting took place from 10:05 until 11:34 a.m. In attendance were Nixon, Ford, Simon, Schlesinger, Morton, Butz, Dent, Weinberger, Brinegar, Ash, Burch, Rush, Schubert, Bush, Attorney General William Saxbe, Secretary of Housing and Urban Development James Lynn, United Nations Ambassador John Scali, Haig, Ziegler, Cole, Scowcroft, Hartmann, and Special Assistant to the President David Parker. (Ibid., White House Central Files)

² The President's message transmitting the report of the Council of Economic Advisers on May 28 is printed in *Public Papers: Nixon, 1974*, pp. 460–461.

³ Brackets are in the original. Nixon announced on May 25 that he was appointing Deputy Secretary of State Rush as his Counselor for Economic Policy at Cabinet rank. For additional details on Rush's appointment, see *ibid.*, p. 453. The paper was not found.

Let me fill you in in the Middle East.⁴ We have had a number of breakthroughs, but both sides are still holding on certain points as a matter of honor. I can't tell you how it is going because it is still 50–50.

The Government is moving ahead and this is what we want to demonstrate. Brinegar, you begin.

[Omitted here is discussion of domestic transportation issues.]

[President:] Now to Earl and food.

Butz: The political problem of food prices is behind us. We are having a tremendous increase in production. Wheat is 2.2, up 500 million, corn is up 1.5–2 million bales. In 1973 we had record farm income. In 1974 it will be a bit less. Soft spots are cattle and beef; the feeders are now actually losing money. Food prices should stay at this level the rest of the year. Retail margins are widening. Exports will total \$21 billion, imports \$9 billion—for an 11.5 contribution to the balance of payments. We will use 700 million bushels of wheat—the rest is for export. We need to export half of the soybeans.

On food aid and stockpiling, a debate is developing. Humphrey and his friends think we should have a large Government food reserve. I disagree. We are out of the food reserve business and I think we should stay out. We carried the world food reserve and everyone got soft—they didn't have to plan. We need food reserves, but they can be carried by private industry and foreign governments. We have carried the lion's share of production aid for years, going back to the Marshall Plan.

President: The whole idea that if we feed the world there will be peace is nonsense. But taking an area like the Middle East, if we develop a new relationship with the Arabs, the Middle East is one of the hungriest areas of the world. Food is indispensable in our foreign policy. The Soviet Union is providing arms to the Arabs; we can counter here. If we tried to give arms both to Israel and the Arabs, there would be a hell of a fuss raised.

⁴ Kissinger departed Washington on April 28 for the Middle East in order to negotiate a separation of forces agreement between Syria and Israel. En route, he met with Gromyko in Geneva on April 28–29 in preparation for Nixon's upcoming summit meeting with Brezhnev. For records of the Kissinger-Gromyko meetings, see *Foreign Relations, 1969–1976*, volume XV, Soviet Union, June 1972–August 1974, Documents 175–178. Kissinger then met with Boumediene and Sadat before shuttling between Damascus and Jerusalem May 3–29. During this period, Kissinger also made short visits to Jordan, Cyprus, Saudi Arabia, and Egypt in order to brief Jordanian King Hussein, Gromyko, Saudi King Faisal, and Sadat on the negotiations. Documentation on Kissinger's shuttle diplomacy and the disengagement agreement signed by Syrian and Israeli representatives on May 31 is printed *ibid.*, volume XXVI, Arab-Israeli Dispute, 1974–1976.

The United States should move away from multilateral to bilateral aid. Keep this in mind at the World Food Conference.⁵ We need it for foreign policy. As our military assistance recedes, we need other bilateral aid. The IMF sort of thing is OK, but we need this tool for our foreign policy. This has to be closely held, because it goes against the grain of the altruists.

Scali: We can count our bilateral aid toward world goals, and we can't look too selfish.

President: OK, but let's have no illusion that we need to be able to influence governments and what they do. The World Bank does a fine job, but it is not an effective instrument of U.S. foreign policy. Frequently, it has not helped where we wanted and has helped countries where it was not in our interest.

One final word, we are not going to solve our budget problems by slashing DOD. We are at a critical juncture in foreign policy. We don't rule out cuts in DOD, but that is not our goal. The Soviet Union has a crash program going on and unilateral cuts would be disastrous. India goes nuclear so it can push its weight around a bit in South Asia.

We must stay strong not just in order to be number one, but because it is essential for our diplomacy with the Soviet Union, the Chinese, Europe and the rest. If they get the impression the U.S. is turning away from world leadership, we are finished.

I want every Department head to look hard at personnel. We all know there can be some cutting. I would rather have the Departments initiate it than do it from the White House.

⁵ See Document 47.

35. Address by President Nixon¹

Annapolis, Maryland, June 5, 1974.

Pragmatism and Moral Force in American Foreign Policy

[Omitted here are Nixon's introductory remarks.]

When the war ended in Europe and Asia in 1945, America was the only economic and military superpower in the world. Most of Europe

¹ Source: Department of State *Bulletin*, July 1, 1974, pp. 1–5. Nixon's address was made before the graduating class of the U.S. Naval Academy.

and Japan were in ruins—economically exhausted, politically demoralized. Leadership of a whole free world fell on our shoulders, whether we wanted it or not.

Hard as it was, our task at the outset was made easier by our overwhelming material strength and by a strong, unified sense of national purpose.

Around the globe, we, as Americans, committed ourselves to halting the advance of communism, to promoting economic development, and even to encouraging other countries to adopt our economic, political, and social ideals.

Simplistic and occasionally misguided as this goal may have been, it was a noble and unselfish goal in its enthusiasm. And despite some mistakes which we came to correct, we in our hearts know—and millions in Europe and Japan and in the developing world know—that America's contribution to mankind in the quarter century after the war was of historic and unprecedented dimensions.

And we can be proud that America was as generous in helping our former enemies as we were in aiding our friends.

During this same period, the face of the world changed more rapidly and dramatically than ever before in the world's history. Fifty-eight newly independent nations joined the world community. The once-monolithic Communist bloc was splintered. New centers of power emerged in Europe and Asia.

American zeal and innocence were tempered during these years, also. The war in Korea, followed by the long war in Viet-Nam, sapped too much of our national self-confidence and sense of purpose. Our own domestic needs commanded greater attention. And by the later 1960's, our policy of trying to solve everyone's problems all over the world was no longer realistic, nor was it necessary.

America was no longer a giant, towering over the rest of the world with seemingly inexhaustible resources and a nuclear monopoly.

As our overwhelming superiority in power receded, there was a growing threat that we might turn inward, that we might retreat into isolation from our world responsibilities, ignoring the fact that we were, and are still, the greatest force for peace anywhere in the world today.

This threat of a new wave of isolationism, blind to both the lessons of the past and the perils of the future, was, and remains today, one of the greatest potential dangers facing our country—because in our era, American isolation could easily lead to global desolation. Whether we like it or not, the alternative to détente is a runaway nuclear arms race, a return to constant confrontation, and a shattering setback to our hopes for building a new structure of peace in the world.

When we came into office in 1969, this administration faced a more complex, a more challenging, and yet in some ways a more promising world situation than that which existed in the post-World War II era.

While we could not, and will not, abdicate our responsibilities as the most powerful nation in the free world, it was apparent that the time had come to reassess those responsibilities. This was the guiding purpose of the Nixon doctrine,² a doctrine which says that those we help to enjoy the benefits of freedom should bear a fair share of the burden of its defense as well.

It was also clear that both pragmatism and moral force had to be the double prongs of any American foreign policy in the new era. A sense of moral purpose is part of our heritage, and it is part of the tradition of our foreign policy. Pragmatism, realism, and technical efficiency must not be the sole touchstone of our foreign policy. Such a policy would have no roots or inspiration and could not long elicit positive support from the American people and the Congress, and more important, it would not deserve the respect of the world.

We had to remember, however, that unrealistic idealism could be impractical and potentially dangerous. It could tempt us to forgo results that were good because we insisted upon results that were perfect.

Resolving Problems With the Soviet Union

A blend of the ideal and the pragmatic in our foreign policy has been especially critical in our approach to the Soviet Union.

The differences between our two systems of life and government are sharp and fundamental. But even as we oppose totalitarianism, we must also keep sight of the hard, cold facts of life in the nuclear age.

Ever since the Soviet Union achieved equality in strategic weapons systems, each confrontation has meant a brush with potential nuclear devastation to all civilized nations. Reduction of tensions, therefore, between us has become the foremost requirement of American foreign policy.

The United States will not retreat from its principles. The leaders of the Soviet Union will not sacrifice theirs. But as we have the valor to defend those principles which divide us as nations, we must have the vision to seek out those things which unite us as human beings.

Together, we share the capacity to destroy forever our common heritage of 4,000 years of civilization. Together, we are moving to insure that this will not—because it must not—happen.

Slowly and carefully over the past five years, we have worked with the Soviet Union to resolve concrete problems that could deterio-

² See footnote 2, Document 9.

rate into military confrontations. And upon these bridges we are erecting a series of tangible economic and cultural exchanges that will bind us more closely together.

The American people are a great people; the Russian people are a great people. These two great people who worked together in war are now learning to work together in peace. Ultimately, we hope that the United States and the Soviet Union will share equally high stakes in preserving a stable international environment.

The results of this policy have been heartening. The problem of Berlin, where our nations were at swords' point for a quarter of a century, has now been resolved by negotiation. Our two countries have concluded an historic agreement to limit strategic nuclear arms.

We and our allies have engaged the Soviet Union in negotiations on major issues of European security, including a reduction of military forces in Central Europe. We have substantially reduced the risk of direct U.S.-Soviet confrontation in crisis areas. We have reached a series of bilateral cooperative agreements in such areas as health, environment, space, science and technology, as well as trade.

At the Moscow summit in 1972, our Secretary of the Navy, the Commander-in-Chief of the Soviet Navy, signed an agreement on the prevention of incidents on and over the high seas—a code of conduct aimed at eliminating dangerous actions of the cold war era and a code of conduct which has already proved a success.

Over the past five years, we have reached more agreements with the Soviet Union than in the entire postwar period preceding that, and this is a record in which all Americans can take pride.

In keeping with our efforts to bring America's foreign policy into line with modern realities, we have also sought to normalize our relations with the People's Republic of China, where one-fourth of all of the people in the world live, a country with which we shared nothing but confrontation and distrust during a quarter century of cold war.

Beginning with an official dialogue opened in 1971, we have negotiated constructive agreements in the areas of trade and scientific and cultural exchanges. We established Liaison Offices in our respective capitals last year. We expect further progress in the years ahead.

We have also succeeded, as Admiral Mack³ has indicated, in ending our military involvement in Viet-Nam in a manner which gave meaning to the heavy sacrifices we had made and which greatly enhanced the preservation of freedom and stability in Southeast Asia.

One result is that today the 20 million people of South Viet-Nam are free to govern themselves and they are able to defend themselves.

³ Vice Admiral William P. Mack, Superintendent of the U.S. Naval Academy.

An even more important result is that we have proved again that America's word is America's bond.

We have preserved the trust of our allies around the world by demonstrating that we are a reliable partner in the defense of liberty; we have earned the respect of our potential adversaries by demonstrating that we are a reliable partner in the search for peace.

Road to Middle East Peace

America's unique and essential contribution to peace is nowhere better demonstrated than in the Middle East. The hate and distrust that has for so long poisoned the relationship between Arabs and Israelis had led to war four times in the last 40 years, and the toll of death and human suffering was immense, while the tension made the Middle East a world tinderbox that could easily draw the United States and the Soviet Union into military confrontation.

The need for a stable solution among the regional parties as well as between the great powers was overwhelmingly urgent.

The October war of last year, while tragic, also presented a unique opportunity—because for the first time it was clear to us and clear to the moderate leaders of the Arab world that a positive American role was indispensable to achieving a permanent settlement in the Middle East. And it was for this reason that I sent Secretary of State Kissinger to the Middle East to offer our good offices in the process of negotiation.

The results, which reflect more than anything else the vision and statesmanship of the leaders of both sides, have been encouraging. An agreement to separate military forces has been implemented on the Egyptian-Israeli front, and now a similar accord has been negotiated between Israel and Syria.⁴ For the first time in a generation, we are witnessing the beginning of a dialogue between the Arab states and Israel.

Now, the road to a just and lasting and permanent peace in the Mideast is still long and difficult and lies before us. But what seemed to be an insurmountable roadblock on that road has now been removed, and we are determined to stay on course until we have reached our goal of a permanent peace in that area. The role of Secretary Kissinger in this process has presented a testament to both his remarkable diplomatic capabilities and to the soundness and integrity of our belief that a lasting structure of peace can and must be created.

⁴ The Egyptian-Israeli disengagement agreement was signed at Kilometer 101 on the Cairo-Suez Road on January 18; Syrian and Israeli officials signed the Syrian-Israeli disengagement agreement on May 31.

Primary Concern of Foreign Policy

In surveying the results of our foreign policy, it is ironic to observe that its achievements now threaten to make us victims of our success. In particular, a dangerous misunderstanding has arisen as to just what détente is and what it is not.

Until very recently, the pursuit of détente was not a problem for us in America. We were so engaged in trying to shift international tides away from confrontation toward negotiation that people were generally agreed that the overriding consideration was the establishment of a pattern of peaceful international conduct. But now that so much progress has been made, some take it for granted.

Eloquent appeals are now being made for the United States, through its foreign policy, to transform the internal as well as the international behavior of other countries, and especially that of the Soviet Union.⁵ This issue sharply poses the dilemma I outlined at the outset. It affects not only our relation with the Soviet Union but also our posture toward many nations whose internal systems we totally disagree with, as they do with ours.

Our foreign policy therefore must reflect our ideals, and it must reflect our purposes. We can never, as Americans, acquiesce in the suppression of human liberties. We must do all that we reasonably can to promote justice, and for this reason we continue to adhere firmly to certain humane principles, not only in appropriate international forums but also in our private exchanges with other governments—where this can be effective. But we must recognize that we are more faithful to our ideals by being concerned with results and we achieve more results through diplomatic action than through hundreds of eloquent speeches.

But there are limits to what we can do, and we must ask ourselves some very hard questions, questions which I know members of this class have asked themselves many times. What is our capability to change the domestic structure of other nations? Would a slowdown or reversal of détente help or hurt the positive evolution of other social systems? What price, in terms of renewed conflict, are we willing to pay to bring pressure to bear for humane causes?

Not by our choice, but by our capability, our primary concern in foreign policy must be to help influence the international conduct of nations in the world arena. We would not welcome the intervention of

⁵ Reference is possibly to the U.S. reaction to the treatment of Aleksandr Solzhenitsyn, Russian author of *One Day in the Life of Ivan Denisovich* and *The Gulag Archipelago* and recipient of the 1970 Nobel Prize in Literature. He was stripped of his citizenship by the Soviet Government on February 12 and sent into exile in West Germany.

other countries in our domestic affairs, and we cannot expect them to be cooperative when we seek to intervene directly in theirs.

We cannot gear our foreign policy to transformation of other societies. In the nuclear age, our first responsibility must be the prevention of a war that could destroy all societies.

We must never lose sight of this fundamental truth of modern international life: Peace between nations with totally different systems is also a high moral objective.

An Era of Cooperation

The concepts of national security, partnership, negotiation with adversaries, are the central pillars of the structure of peace that this administration has outlined as its objective.

If a structure of peace is to endure, it must reflect the contributions and reconcile the aspirations of nations. It must be cemented by the shared goal of coexistence and the shared practice of accommodation. It must liberate every nation to realize its destiny free from the threat of war, and it must promote social justice and human dignity.

The structure of peace of which I speak will make possible an era of cooperation in which all nations will apply their separate talents and resources to the solution of problems that beset all mankind: the problems of energy and famine, disease and suffering—problems as old as human history itself.

It was with this thought in mind that in February we launched an effort to bring together the principal consumer countries to begin working on the problem of equitably meeting the needs of people throughout the world who are faced with the prospect of increasingly scarce resources—in this case, energy.⁶

Out of recognition of the tragedy of human hunger and of the urgent need to apply man's technology cooperatively to its solution, the United States has also called for a U.N. World Food Conference to take place in Rome this fall.⁷

My trip to the Middle East next week⁸ will provide an opportunity to explore with the leaders of the nations I shall visit ways in which we can continue our progress toward permanent peace in that area.

⁶ See Document 27.

⁷ See Document 47.

⁸ Nixon departed for the Middle East on June 10, with a 2-day stopover in Austria, and returned to Washington on June 19, after spending an evening in the Azores. The President, accompanied by Kissinger, met with Sadat, Faisal, Assad, Israeli President Ephraim Katzir and Foreign Minister Yitzhak Rabin, and Hussein. See Department of State *Bulletin*, July 15, 1974, pp. 77–122.

And then later this month, on June 27, I will again journey to Moscow to meet with General Secretary [Leonid I.]⁹ Brezhnev to explore further avenues, further prospects for a lasting peace not only between the Soviet Union and the United States but among all nations.

Each of these missions, in a way, is a reflection of America's broader hopes and responsibilities. And I say to you gentlemen, these are hopes and responsibilities each of you will be helping to meet as you journey to your first duty stations.

As long as you do your duty, as long as the people and the government support you, the America, the country you love and serve, will survive.

Today, each one of you becomes a custodian of a noble tradition of service. As the first class to have begun its studies in the post-Viet-Nam era, it falls to you to serve in such a way that the graduates who follow you in the years to come will enter a U.S. Navy that is strong, that is prepared and is respected, and above all, a Navy and a nation at honorable peace with all nations in the world.

One-hundred seventy years ago, after Nelson's great victory at Trafalgar, Prime Minister William Pitt was honored at a dinner at London's historic Guildhall. He was hailed as the savior of Europe. He responded to that toast with a brief speech that has been named by Lord Curzon as one of the three masterpieces of English eloquence.

Listen to his words: I return you many thanks for the honor you have done me. But no single man will save Europe. England has saved herself by her exertions and will, I trust, save Europe by her example.

Today, 170 years later, we can say no single nation can save the world but America can and will save herself by her exertions and will, we trust, by our example, save the cause of peace and freedom for the world.

⁹ Brackets are in the original.

36. Memorandum of Conversation¹

Washington, July 10, 1974, 8:30 a.m.

PARTICIPANTS

President Nixon
 Dr. Henry A. Kissinger, Secretary of State and Assistant to the President for
 National Security Affairs
 Senator George D. Aiken [R-Vermont]
 Congressman John J. McFall [D-California]
 Senator John O. Pastore [D-Rhode Island]
 Senator Harry F. Byrd, Jr. [D-Virginia]
 Senator Hugh Scott [R-Pennsylvania]
 Senator Mike Mansfield [D-Montana]
 Congressman Carl Albert [D-Oklahoma]

SUBJECT

Joint Leadership Meeting on the Summit Trip to Moscow

The President: We have a full plate today. I will go over the Brussels meeting and highlight Moscow and Henry will follow up on the meetings with the European leaders following the summit.² They were significant. Those of you who saw the communiqués and heard the public utterances know most of what went on.

¹ Source: Library of Congress, Manuscript Division, Kissinger Papers, Box CL 280, Memoranda of Conversations, Presidential File, Apr. 1973–Dec. 1974. Secret; Sensitive. The meeting took place in the White House Cabinet Room. Brackets are in the original. Blank underscores are omissions in the original. Talking points for the meeting, forwarded to Nixon by William Timmons on July 9, are in the National Archives, Nixon Presidential Materials, NSC Files, Box 310, Subject Files, Cabinet Meetings [January 69–July 74] [1 of 1]. Also printed in *Foreign Relations*, 1969–1976, volume XV, Soviet Union, June 1972–August 1974, Document 200.

² Kissinger's post-summit briefings took place in Brussels, Paris, Rome, Dusseldorf, Munich, and London July 3–9. Nixon arrived in Moscow on June 27 for meetings with top Soviet officials and returned to the United States on July 3. In remarks broadcast live over nationwide television and radio networks, the President noted that his visits over the past two months were directed toward the same purpose: "Among the nations of the Middle East, among those of the Western Alliance, and between the United States and the Soviet Union, new patterns are emerging, patterns that hold out to the world the brightest hopes in a generation for a just and lasting peace that all of us can enjoy." (*Public Papers: Nixon*, 1974, p. 579) Documentation on the summit is printed in *Foreign Relations*, 1969–1976, volume XV, Soviet Union, June 1972–August 1974.

The stop in Brussels was useful. The Europeans have always been concerned about a US-Soviet condominium. We stopped to consult and sign the NATO declaration.³

When I went to Europe in 1969, they thought we should do something about China and relations with the Soviet Union. The problem then for them was a possible US-Soviet confrontation. Since then, European attitudes have turned 180°. They have urged a European Security Conference on us; now they are cooling on it and on the idea of having a summit conclusion. Détente is a period of great opportunity and also of danger for the alliance. The Europeans wanted our assurances on security but they have been less than cooperative on economics, the Middle East, etc. They can't have it both ways—they can't keep our forces up and confront us everywhere else. They don't always have to agree—but they can't go off on their own and in antagonism. In Brussels, I met with the NAC and then individually with Schmidt, Wilson, Rumor and with others at the reception. Giscard was not there—he is more cooperative but he still depends on the Gaullist forces and he can't move too fast. The Alliance was invigorated by this. The allies said they would try to strengthen their forces. The Alliance got a security shot in the arm—which is difficult when all of them see the tension receding. On the economic side, we laid the foundation for more cooperation between the US and the Community. The Europeans' interests were almost exclusively economics. After talking with them, I wouldn't exchange our problems for theirs.

About Moscow: We didn't know the type of public reception we would get. There had been differences on the Middle East conflict and the October confrontation. The Soviet approach to the Middle East is to do everything at once. Ours is to use Geneva but also anything else which is helpful. They insist on having the Palestinians and immediate withdrawal to the '67 frontiers. That would blow up any conference. Thanks to Henry, we have cooled the area. Therefore the positions of the US and Soviet Union were far apart.

The discussions this year were the fullest and the least belligerent, and the relationships were "friendliest" in the proper interpretation of

³ Nixon attended the NATO Heads of Government meeting in Brussels June 25–27. On June 26, Nixon and European leaders signed the Declaration on Atlantic Relations, which had been promulgated at the North Atlantic Council meeting in Ottawa June 18–19. As Kissinger remarked in a June 19 news conference, "So far as the United States is concerned, we look at this declaration as an expression by the free countries of the Atlantic area that they will gear their policies to the new realities—that they recognize their destiny as common in the next quarter of a century, as it has been in the last quarter of a century." (Department of State *Bulletin*, July 8, 1974, p. 37) The Declaration, which is printed *ibid.*, pp. 42–44, marked the culmination of the U.S. effort to engage its European allies in a new relationship, as Kissinger outlined in his April 23, 1973, Year of Europe speech (Document 8).

that term. We have laid over the years the groundwork for laying the hard problems out on the table, discussing them frankly, not giving up about disagreements but to continue to grapple. The Soviet Union now has positive interest in good relations with the United States.

In the bilateral area, it can't be said that these nonsecurity agreements will keep them from confrontation with us when our interests clash; but each one gives them an incentive not to throw over détente. We signed some new agreements—in economics, housing, energy, and on research on the artificial heart. These don't get much play.

Then we discussed the international field. Europe. The Soviet Union wants a CSCE summit. We agree we'll do it if the substance warrants. On the Middle East, they accepted the proposal that we must continue bilateral step-by-step efforts but they insist on playing a role and even more so on an early Geneva Conference. Our position is—if you take the steps remaining, to get a pull-back on both fronts, the West Bank and the Palestinians—if you lay it all out in Geneva, everyone there would oppose us and Israel. So they don't agree, but will go along with some bilateral efforts—but we can't say this publicly.

Southeast Asia was also mentioned.

In the strategic area, we made some progress which if it happened two years ago would have been monumental. On ABM, we agreed to go to one site. Their field covers not only Moscow but also much of their industry and a missile field.

The TTB: The Soviet Union proposed it. Their motives are that we are far ahead in testing. They are worried about the Chinese, so the threshold at 150KT makes sense. Our military think that more testing is essential but fundamentally a comprehensive test ban is unverifiable. We won't yet submit the TTB because of the side issue of peaceful nuclear explosions. We will work out agreement on PNE. They have agreed on prior announcement and observers. It's the first on-site inspection ever agreed.

On environmental warfare, we agreed to talks. While it doesn't seem important now, but who knows what science will bring?

SALT is the toughest of all, as I told you before. The Soviet throw weight is greater but our advantage is enormous—we have a 3.5-to-1 advantage in warheads and also in sophistication and accuracy. As we look to the future, if the Soviet Union agreed to freeze now, it would be freezing itself into a public position of inferiority—which they won't do. The Soviet Union has a missile advantage, but you get hit by warheads. We would first discuss this, but our own warhead advantage doesn't include our allies—but they count them. They are also worried about China; and we might have to be also. In 1972, I had a rough 4½

hour session on Vietnam.⁴ In 1973, from midnight, we had a rough three hours on the Middle East.⁵ Had we crumbled in either case, there would not have been a Vietnam settlement or the present Middle East situation. What we come up with now was an agreement to conclude a 10-year agreement on quantitative and qualitative steps. We have to choose whether to conclude an agreement which will protect us and yet be acceptable to them or, with their MIRV breakthrough, go into a race which we will win but which would leave neither side really better off. There comes a point where it makes no difference who has the most. Those are our choices—negotiate a decent agreement or increase our defense and race with them.

Kissinger: At one point, we told Brezhnev what he would have with MIRVs; he confirmed our intelligence estimate. Then he told us what we had, which included everything—bombers, overseas bases, everything. We never think this way, because we think of second-strike. The significance is that they can't hit NATO without fearing we will hit them as they cannot hit us, or if they hit NATO and the US, we will still have enough.

The President: I had a talk with Grechko. We agreed that Henry would go back this fall. We have narrowed the differences. There is still a gulf, but we hope we can agree on something. If we can't, they will go balls out, and with their throw weight, it will be a problem. It would be a race no one would win. We are laying the groundwork for a longer-term agreement.

Senator Aiken: What effect will the French development have?

The President: The Soviet Union puts great emphasis on French and British developments—and also the Chinese. Looked at coldly, they are mini-powers.

Kissinger: After France has finished its program in 1980, they will have one half as many warheads as we have on one Poseidon.

The President: The last thing the Europeans want is for us to be more inferior to the Soviet Union, but they also fear a runaway race.

A Senator: Where is China? Better than France?

Kissinger: Not much better. They will have one-third as many as one Poseidon by 1978.

The President: But the Soviet Union thinks the Chinese are going much faster.

⁴ For the record of Nixon and Brezhnev's meeting, see *Foreign Relations, 1969–1976*, volume XIV, Soviet Union, October 1971–May 1972, Document 271.

⁵ See *ibid.*, volume XV, Soviet Union, June 1972–August 1974, Document 132.

Kissinger: Also, how much is enough? The Chinese in four years could kill millions of Russians, and might accept millions of Chinese killed.

McFall: What would be a reasonable agreement? Can they both agree?

The President: We think so. It is very complex. All systems must be considered. We can't discuss numbers now. Our general view is that all of us concerned with this must not adopt the view of why bother to try for an agreement because we could win a race. But we don't want a bigger budget—neither do the Soviets—but lacking an agreement, we will move and have told them so.

Pastore: We have had a deterrent policy for 25 years. Our military now think there could be a limited nuclear war. That is impossible. Do the Soviets think that?

The President: The Soviets believe in inevitable escalation.

Kissinger: Soviet weapons are not geared that way.

Senator Pastore: Then why have more artillery shells?

Kissinger: We must distinguish between battlefield and strategic.

Pastore: A President shouldn't have to make a holocaust decision because artillery shells are 30 miles from the front.

Kissinger: We agree, but then we need more conventional forces.

The President: That is the point. More and more weapons won't help us.

Pastore: Let the Germans put up the forces.

Kissinger: The tough speeches the President made last spring have brought the Europeans to fundamentals. The changes in Germany and France have been very helpful.

The Europeans now also see that our energy institutions were far-sighted. They all wanted to talk energy. They are all running balance of payments deficits because of oil prices. Also the new deposits coming in are short-term and lending is on a long-term basis. They now realize we weren't talking hegemony but enlightened self-interest to keep Europe healthy. The Europeans now want to cooperate. France has been stuck with exorbitant oil prices as result of bilateral deals, and energy cooperation is working so well that Giscard now wants to cooperate if he can do it without publicly reversing his course.

On the previous summits, the Europeans feared condominium. This time most felt it was successful—it contributed to easing the atmosphere; they liked the measured way we are proceeding; and it encouraged progress on CSCE and MBFR. I made good progress on those two without backbiting. The most troublesome things are US domestic carping over US inferiority. Spain asked about Zumwalt's comment on

the Navy having to stay out of confrontations. We must get the Europeans to strengthen their forces. The Soviet Union can't get superiority strategically, but at some level, though, strategic forces cancel each other out and conventional forces become critical.

They are okay on SALT, but they don't know enough to discuss the details. Their concern is to look into the future and their concern is economic.

Italy is in bad shape. Talking to them is like talking to a Harvard professor's seminar. With the communists and fascists, the democratic factions have little maneuver. They are tempted to move to the communists and we told them that would be dangerous.

Scott: Isn't it time they have decent alternatives?

Kissinger: Yes, they need able democratic parties to govern. In France, Giscard wants to cooperate; he has no hangups. They just need time and must maneuver carefully. Whatever France's policy, as long as they don't bring pressure on their allies, we can work it out.

Schmidt has none of Brandt's rapid [*vapid?*] sentimentality. Where a year ago they thought we needed them, that has changed. In the Middle East they see we are right and we are urging them to move in economics, as long as it is supportive.

Byrd: What were the issues that were impossible of resolution?

What are parameters of trade and what are the quids pro quo?

Kissinger: There are words being thrown around. Take throw weight. Married with MIRVs and high accuracy, they can be dangerous against fixed targets—so they are more vulnerable than we. So far things have not gone to maximum MIRVing. If we can keep it there, we are okay. But if they put 20 MIRVs on a missile, it would be a problem. Also, we can put a big missile in the Minuteman III silos if need be.

In the Crimea we each told the other our intelligence projection of the each other's forces.⁶ Any MIRV limitation we could accept would severely limit them and look bad. Also, most of the buildup is coming just at the end of the extended period. We thought if we could extend the time, we could put a cap on numbers which is below the capacity of each side and slow down the arms race. It's still large numbers, but the instability comes from each racing. There is no way an attack on the United States could leave us with less than 4,000 warheads.

The President: An agreement means nothing unless it means both sides restrict what they would otherwise do.

⁶ Some of the 1974 summit meetings were held in Oreanda in the Crimea.

Kissinger: We could have juggled the numbers, but it would have been hard to justify that it was less than their program. We want either to restrict them or to be sure they refuse to be limited.

The economic agreement doesn't involve transfer of resources. They facilitate trade.

There is a myth developing that détente is one sided. But:

- (1) We settled Vietnam on our terms.
- (2) We squeezed them in the Middle East in an unbelievable way.
- (3) We protected Berlin.
- (4) We stopped a Cuban submarine base.

What did they get? Some Ex-Im credits, a little trade, some wheat—which was not part of détente. We tie everything to good foreign policy behavior. If we prevent benefits to them, they will go back to the cold war.

The President: The balance of trade with the Soviet Union is very favorable.

Kissinger: And if we don't trade, the Europeans and Japanese already are doing it, and it's better if it's done under our close controls than without them.

The President: We are trying to work out methods how a private trading economy can trade with a state system. Also, it will eventually pertain to the PRC.

Scott: They are opening a big trade center.

Kissinger: Look at the record. Every time they have moved, we have been tough. We have showed them if they move militarily, we will stop them. Conversely, if they cooperate, we will make it useful. Remember, until the 1972 summit, there was no trade at all.

When you get the Soviet leadership and news talking the success of détente, it gives them a stake—though they can change.

We have paralyzed the left in Europe with this policy. What would happen if we had one crisis after another? There were no commitments as to loans, or transfer of resources.

The President: We told them we couldn't yet get MFN but we're working on it.

Three things moved them at this summit:

(1) What will happen with China? Will they force us into détente with China and opposition to them?

(2) Why didn't they react in Vietnam and the Middle East? Why did they settle Berlin: (1) fear of the tough United States. They are still obsessed with World War II. The people were out, and they could not do it just for peace but for friendship. Good relations with the United States is in their interest. They are doing better but they are far behind

Europe and even more so, the United States. (2) The more stake we can give the Soviet leadership and people in peace and cooperation, the more they will lose if détente fails.

MFN—you can say: “cut them off”—but it applies in spades to the Chinese. But the more we can give them a stake in good relations, the more we can influence them. If we can get the trade bill,⁷ it may improve trade, and it will be more help on Jewish emigration than if we slam the door. In 1969 there were less than 1,000 per year; last year it was 33,000. This year it’s down, probably because of the October War. So we need them to fear us but also there has to be a positive element to give them an incentive. There is no give-away. There will have to be a quid pro quo, but no unilateral giveaways. Without MFN, they certainly won’t change their policies.

Cederburg: Any thought to sending the Secretary of Defense to Moscow?

The President: It might be good for someone to talk to Grechko.

Kissinger: If we want to drive the Europeans and Chinese crazy, just let the military staffs talk.

The President: That is not what the leadership is saying. But it is a sensitive area.

Mansfield: It is most inadvisable, Mr. President, and you better keep control.

The President: I will.

———: Netherlands defense cuts.

Kissinger: I think it won’t happen.

Albert: How about energy?

Kissinger: It’s an agreement on research and development exchange on alternative sources, etc. It has nothing to do with purchases of Soviet energy, resources.

The President: Just an exchange.

Mansfield: Aren’t these private deals?

Kissinger: For Armand Hammer, etc., yes—but this agreement is on technical exchange. The development of energy resources is private. This is totally separate.

⁷ See Document 31.

37. Editorial Note

President Richard Nixon resigned the Presidency at 11:35 a.m. on August 9, 1974, as a result of the Watergate scandal, whereupon Vice President Gerald R. Ford assumed the nation's highest office. In remarks made upon taking the oath of office, administered by Chief Justice Warren Burger, Ford characterized the occasion as "an hour of history that troubles our minds and hurts our hearts." Referencing the foreign policy commitments of the United States, Ford stated: "To the peoples and the governments of all friendly nations, and I hope that could encompass the whole world, I pledge an uninterrupted and sincere search for peace. America will remain strong and united, but its strength will remain dedicated to the safety and sanity of the entire family of man, as well as to our own precious freedom."

Addressing his American audience, Ford said: "I believe that truth is the glue that holds government together, not only our Government but civilization itself. That bond, though strained, is unbroken at home and abroad.

"In all my public and private acts as your President, I expect to follow my instincts of openness and candor with full confidence that honesty is always the best policy in the end.

"My fellow Americans, our long national nightmare is over." Ford spoke at 12:05 p.m. in the East Room of the White House. The oath of office and the President's remarks were broadcast live on nationwide radio and television networks. (*Public Papers: Ford, 1974*, pages 1–3)

38. Minutes of a Washington Special Actions Group Meeting¹

Washington, August 9, 1974, 10:47–11:10 a.m.

SUBJECT

Transition

PARTICIPANTS*Chairman*

Henry A. Kissinger

State

Robert Ingersoll

Joseph Sisco

Defense

William Clements

Robert Ellsworth

JCS

Gen. George S. Brown

Lt. Gen. John Pauly

CIA

William Colby

NSC Staff

Major Gen. Brent Scowcroft

Richard T. Kennedy

Jeanne W. Davis

SUMMARY

—The NSC system will continue in being as it exists at present. The flow of papers on national security issues to the President will remain the same—through the Office of the Assistant to the President (for National Security Affairs).

—The State and Defense Departments are to prepare by Monday, August 12, briefing papers on key issues for the use of the new President.²

¹ Source: Ford Library, National Security Council, Institutional Files, Box 24, Institutional Files—Meetings, Meeting Minutes—Washington Special Actions Group, August 1974. Top Secret; Sensitive. The meeting took place in the White House Situation Room. Richard Kennedy sent Kissinger an August 8 briefing memorandum, accompanied by talking points, in advance of the meeting. Kennedy's memorandum, which bears a note indicating that Kissinger saw it, began: "The *purpose* of the meeting is to stress to the principals the need for unity and solidarity in this difficult time of transition, to focus attention on potential trouble spots as a basis for possible contingency planning, and to establish a climate of more intensive focus on the situation over the coming weeks." (Ibid., Box 18, Institutional Files—Meetings, Washington Special Actions Group Meeting, 8/9/74—Transition)

² On August 12, Department of State Acting Executive Secretary Samuel R. Gammon forwarded to Scowcroft a briefing book, drafted by the Departments of State and Defense, for the President covering major foreign policy issues. (Ibid., National Security Adviser, Presidential Files of NSC Logged Documents, Box 51, NSC "NS" Originals Files, Survey of Important Issues in Foreign Policy and National Security) A large collection of briefing papers is ibid., Presidential Transition File, 1974, Box 1, Transition Subject File, Issue Papers 1–3.

—The DCI is to prepare a brief summary of world situation from the intelligence viewpoint.³

—The DCI is to prepare by Saturday morning (August 10) a list of 40 Committee issues.

—The JCS will consider and inform General Scowcroft of the matters they plan to discuss in their meeting with the President scheduled for August 13.

—The State and Defense Departments will prepare a list of U.S. commitments to foreign countries that the President should be aware of.

—Reconnaissance flights should be restored to their customary level as soon as the new President is sworn in.

Secretary Kissinger: This won't be a long meeting, but there are a number of things the Vice President has asked me to get done. First, he will sign a directive to the Departments this afternoon continuing the NSC system as it presently exists. Second, the flow of papers to the President on national security matters will remain the same—through the Office of the Assistant to the President (for National Security Affairs). The NSC system will obviously have to be more active, at least in the initial period. After any new policies have been clearly established, perhaps it can slow down some. But for the present, we will go back to the more formal tendencies of the earlier Nixon Administration. The Vice President is extremely interested in getting all the options. He does not just want the positions of the various Departments. So you should each get your Departments organized along these lines.

There will be an NSC meeting tomorrow morning for about 15 minutes. We'll let you know the time.

Mr. Colby: Will you need a CIA briefing?

Secretary Kissinger: No, this will be an organizational meeting for the President to affirm the continuity of our foreign policy and procedures. There will probably be another more substantive NSC meeting in about 10 days and I would appreciate your suggestions as to the most urgent problems that require consideration in the NSC. We will have to discuss SALT at an early meeting but probably not within 10 days.

Tomorrow, Saturday, there will be a Cabinet meeting, followed by the NSC meeting. That will be for statutory members and advisers only.

³ "Problem Issues on the International Scene," a paper prepared by the CIA and dated August 9, outlined six issues "of a particularly high order of importance": Soviet-U.S. relations, the strategic balance, the Arab-Israeli conflict, energy prices, Cyprus, and Vietnam. (Ibid., Presidential Files of NSC Logged Documents, Box 51, NSC "NS" Originals Files, Survey of Important Issues in Foreign Policy and National Security)

The President wants from the Departments brief briefing papers on the key issues. Also (to Colby) he wants a brief summary of the world situation from the intelligence point of view.

Mr. Colby: We've already done that in this morning's National Intelligence Daily.

Secretary Kissinger: I'm going to get that thing abolished! I just can't take seriously anything that looks like a newspaper! How do other people feel about that format?

Mr. Colby: We sent out a questionnaire and most people like it. The President has been reading both the PDB and the NID.

Secretary Kissinger: He wants the PDB. I didn't ask him specifically about the NID, but go on sending it to him until we find out what he wants.

(to Clements) The President also needs to know what you consider the major issues in the Defense area that require decision.

(to Gen. Brown) The President will meet with the Chiefs on Tuesday. Secretary Schlesinger should be there and I will be there. (to Clements) I'll find out about your attendance. That meeting will be in the White House. (to Gen. Brown) We would welcome your ideas on what should be discussed. Would you want to brief him on the five-year plans of the services in terms of force levels?

Gen. Brown: We could, but I wonder whether that is the best approach. That's a lot of detail. We might better tell him what forces we have and where they are—what we're doing.⁴

Secretary Kissinger: And why?

Mr. Clements: Let us think about that and be in touch through Brent (Scowcroft).

Secretary Kissinger: The major purpose of the meeting will be to establish a relationship between the Chiefs and the President. Whatever the Chiefs think is most important for him to know as Commander in Chief.

Gen. Brown: At some time in the future he will want the specifics of SIOP implementation.

Secretary Kissinger: He is getting a briefing on that from Gen. Lawson at 5:15 p.m. today. He has had the SIOP briefing, hasn't he?

Gen. Brown: Yes, in December.

Secretary Kissinger: He doesn't feel the need for any more on SIOP.

⁴ The memorandum of conversation of this August 13 meeting is *ibid.*, Memoranda of Conversations, Box 4, Ford, Kissinger, Schlesinger, Joint Chiefs.

Gen. Brown: It might be helpful for him to know what he might be called on to do under certain circumstances. What his options are.

Secretary Kissinger: Sometimes the military are reluctant to be specific on what they want to do for fear the civilians will stop them from doing it. My experience has been that a President will act forcefully and with confidence if he knows what he can do. Give him a sense of what we have and what it gives him a chance to do. What are our actual capabilities—in NATO, SAC, etc.

Gen. Brown: He has been to SAC for a briefing.

Secretary Kissinger: He's confident on the SIOP, and he will be getting the decision elements this afternoon.

Mr. Clements: Jim (Schlesinger), Gen. Brown and I will talk and come up with something.

Secretary Kissinger: The idea of deployments is a good one. We want to make the point that the Chiefs are the central feature on the military side. The Defense budget issues will come later. (to Colby) Is he up-to-date on CIA?

Mr. Colby: He came out to visit us about three months ago. And we have had a CIA officer assigned to him who has seen him almost every day.

Secretary Kissinger: Who was that?

Mr. Colby: [*name not declassified*]

Secretary Kissinger: (to Colby) Can you pull together a list of all 40 Committee actions—whatever he needs to know about the 40 Committee—by tomorrow morning?

Mr. Colby: Sure.

Secretary Kissinger: Also, each Department should prepare a list of U.S. commitments to foreign countries—such things as nuclear arrangements, for example—that he should know about. These will be primarily Defense, I suppose.

Mr. Clements: We might cover these in our issues briefings.

Secretary Kissinger: I have two additional observations: First, and my own department probably needs this more than anyone but I will direct my remarks to all. It is very important that there be no adverse comment to the effect that the conduct of foreign policy has been affected by Watergate. We must behave with dignity to a man who made major and courageous decisions in foreign policy. We must cast no aspersions on a man who performed great services for this nation. Second, it is most important that we give the impression of a united government. If anyone should decide to take a run at us, we would probably over-react, if anything. The Vice President is determined to have a very rapid transition. He is sending about 45 messages to Heads

of Governments this afternoon.⁵ And either he or I will be in touch with almost every government by the end of today. We will meet with most of the Ambassadors here today,⁶ and I will see the remaining ones tomorrow at the State Department. There will be very visible continuity. We will have meetings with Fahmy and King Hussein next week. We will also plan to have a substantive meeting of this group the middle of next week.

Mr. Clements: (to Gen. Brown) Do you want to tell Henry about the message you sent out yesterday.

Gen. Brown: I sent a message to all the unified commanders yesterday (reads message). We told them to increase their diligence and to move with extreme caution in areas which might be seen as provocative—told them to take appropriate measures and to report back to me. All the reactions were quite reasoned. We did pull back some risky reconnaissance missions.

Secretary Kissinger: I'm not sure about that; it will be noted, won't it? Can we resume the reconnaissance this afternoon?

Gen. Brown: Yes. We did fly the SR-71 mission last night.

Secretary Kissinger: Let's restore the reconnaissance to its previous levels as soon as the Vice President is sworn in. We should show no unusual concerns.

Gen. Brown: We'll resume reconnaissance this afternoon. We've increased our intelligence watch.

Secretary Kissinger: The message was a very good idea; you were right to do it. We will send you a message for the Armed Forces from the President by 2:00 p.m. today,⁷ and the directive on continuation of the NSC system. I think those are the only actions, except for seeing the Ambassadors, that the President will take in foreign policy in the next 72 hours. If something boils up, we will be in touch with the WSAG.

⁵ Ford's letters to foreign heads of government are *ibid.*, Presidential Transition File, 1974, Box 1, Transition Subject File, Letters to and from World Leaders—Memoranda to the President.

⁶ Ford and Kissinger met individually or in groups with Ambassadors and Chargés the afternoon and evening of August 9. In remarks to the NATO Ambassadors, Kissinger indicated that he would continue to serve as both the President's Assistant for National Security Affairs and Secretary of State. According to a memorandum of conversation, Kissinger "noted that those in attendance had been serving in the United States during a difficult and tragic period in America's history. However, he went on to say that the content of US foreign policy had not been impaired by the domestic problems which President Nixon had faced. United States foreign policy he said has bipartisan support, and for this reason the continuity of our foreign policy is assured." (*Ibid.*, Presidential Agency File, Box 15, NATO, 8/12/74–9/30/74)

⁷ Ford's August 9 memorandum to Schlesinger, to be conveyed to all members of the Department of Defense, stated that, as President, he had assumed his constitutional duty as Commander-in-Chief of the U.S. armed forces. (*Ibid.*, Box 6, Defense, Department of)

Mr. Clements: When do you want the papers on the issues?

Secretary Kissinger: Opening of business Monday morning. (to Colby) I'll be in touch with you after I get a better feel for what the President wants. I believe he may be less restrictive in seeing people. We won't know until we try.

Mr. Colby: He comes in fairly well briefed.

Secretary Kissinger: Yes; I spent two hours with him yesterday and an hour today. He's in good shape on most issues. Well, we've been through a lot together in this group. We'll meet again Monday or Tuesday to review where transition stands. Let's aim for Tuesday, so I'll need the papers Monday. The President will speak to the Congress Monday night.

Mr. Clements: Do you want our papers Monday morning or Monday night? An extra day will be a big help.

Secretary Kissinger: Let me have what you can Monday morning and the rest Monday night.

39. National Security Decision Memorandum 265¹

Washington, August 9, 1974.

TO

The Secretary of State
The Secretary of the Treasury
The Secretary of Defense
The Attorney General
The Secretary of the Interior
The Secretary of Agriculture
The Secretary of Commerce
The Director of Central Intelligence

SUBJECT

The National Security Council System

The provisions of NSDM 1 and NSDM 2,² dated January 20, 1969, as amended and extended by subsequent National Security Decision Memoranda, which set forth the organization and procedures of the National Security Council System, are reaffirmed and remain in effect.

The National Security Council System shall assist me in carrying out my responsibilities for national security affairs and the National Security Council shall continue to be the principal forum for consideration of policy issues requiring Presidential determination. The operation of the National Security Council System will continue to be under the direction of the Assistant to the President (National Security Affairs). Communications to me relating to national security matters shall be transmitted through the Assistant to the President (National Security Affairs).

Henry A. Kissinger is hereby designated as Assistant to the President (National Security Affairs).

Gerald R. Ford

¹Source: Ford Library, National Security Adviser, National Security Decision Memoranda and National Security Study Memoranda, 1974–1977, Box 1, NSDM File, NSDM 265 The National Security Council System, 8/9/74. Confidential. Copies were sent to the Director of the OMB, the Counselor to the President for Economic Policy, the President's Assistant for National Security Affairs, the Administrator of the Federal Energy Administration, the Administrator of AID, the Director of ACDA, the Chairman of the CEA, the Chairman of the JCS, the Chairman of the AEC, and the Executive Director of the CIA.

²NSDMs 1 and 2 are printed in *Foreign Relations, 1969–1976*, volume II, Organization and Management of U.S. Foreign Policy, 1969–1972, Documents 10 and 11. NSDM 1 established the National Security Decision and Study Memoranda series. NSDM 2 reorganized the NSC system under President Nixon.

40. Minutes of a National Security Council Meeting¹

Washington, August 10, 1974, 11:15–11:35 a.m.

SUBJECT

Presidential Transition

PARTICIPANTS

Chairman

The President

State

Henry A. Kissinger

Robert S. Ingersoll

Defense

James R. Schlesinger

William P. Clements, Jr.

JCS

Gen. George S. Brown

White House Staff

Jack Marsh

Donald Rumsfeld

Alexander M. Haig

Robert Hartmann

CIA

William Colby

NSC

L/Gen. Brent Scowcroft

Richard T. Kennedy

SUMMARY OF CONCLUSIONS

—That the NSC meet every two weeks during the period of transition to familiarize the President with the issues and people. After about six months, meetings could be less frequent.

—Attendance will be decided by the President on the basis of a list which he will receive and approve before each meeting.

—The next meeting will take up the question of Israeli economic and military requests.

—Dr. Kissinger will brief the President personally on the structure and the workings of the NSC system.

The President: I want to thank you all for coming this morning. Henry (Kissinger) and Jim (Schlesinger), of course, were here earlier for

¹ Source: Library of Congress, Manuscript Division, Kissinger Papers, Box TS 85, National Security Council, Meetings, Jan. 1974–Apr. 1975. Top Secret; Sensitive; Eyes Only. The meeting took place in the Cabinet Room at the White House. According to the President's Daily Diary, the meeting lasted from 11:07 until 11:40 a.m. (Ford Library, National Security Adviser, Staff Secretary's Office) Kissinger sent Ford a memorandum, with attached talking points and an NSC organization chart, briefing him on the meeting's purpose, which was "to affirm your strong interest in the continuance and revitalization of the NSC system as a vital aid to your decision making in national security matters." A notation on the memorandum indicates the President saw it. (Ibid., National Security Council, Institutional Files, Box 8, Institutional Files—Meetings, NSC Meeting, 8/10/74—NSC System)

the Cabinet meeting.² This will not really be a substantive meeting, but rather to talk about the procedures we should follow, how often we should meet, and perhaps to focus in a little on subjects we might want to take up. First, I want to say that the Foreign Policy and the Military Policy have been the hallmark of the previous Administration. No Administration in my lifetime ever did better in those fields. I want to congratulate all of you who participated in that for the work which was done. It was a great accomplishment. A good share of my Congressional service was on the Committee on Appropriations, in particular, on the Subcommittees on Defense, Foreign Aid, and as you know, Bill (Colby), on CIA. That service was important not only in a substantive way, but also it enabled me to get to know the people in the Congress who dealt with these matters, also to get to know the military. I want you all to know that I consider the military a very fine group of people. I saw the Chairman of the JCS and the Chiefs, and the working level in the military establishment, frequently. They are absolutely dedicated and we should all be proud of them. [To General Brown] George, I want you to express my feelings to our military personnel. [General Brown assured the President that he would do so.]³

The previous system that was used in the previous Administration produced results and I feel that we should continue it. My general view is that if you have a system that works and produces, you should continue it as in the past. I don't have a view, however, on how often we should meet and I would appreciate hearing your views.

Secretary Kissinger: Mr. President, I would recommend that, at the beginning, we meet every two weeks to get a clear picture of the issues and direction of policy. It also would give you an opportunity to get a feel for the thinking of your principal advisors; then later, after perhaps six months, meetings could be less frequent.

The President: I like that idea. It sounds about right to me. What do you think, Jim (Schlesinger)?

Secretary Schlesinger: Sir, I believe that is an excellent idea. We do not want to press heavily on your schedule. However, sir, if you feel that this might have the effect of making your schedule too tight, perhaps every three weeks would be often enough.

The President: Well, I will just make the time available. I want to meet with this group. So let us plan to meet, at the beginning, every two

² A memorandum of conversation of the Cabinet meeting the morning of August 10 is *ibid.*, Memoranda of Conversations, Box 4, Cabinet Meeting. According to briefing materials prepared by Haig, the purpose of the meeting was to inform Cabinet members as to their role in the Ford administration. The briefing materials, including suggested talking points and a list of participants, are *ibid.*, Staff Secretary's Office, Presidential Handwriting File, Box 9, Subject File, Cabinet Meetings, 1974/08–1975/01.

³ Brackets are in the original.

weeks. Let us program it that way. Are those present today the regular members of the Council?

Secretary Kissinger: Mr. President, these are the statutory members and statutory advisors. The Director of the Office of Emergency Preparedness used to be a member, but that office is now phased out. Actually, it had become less and less involved in the important national security issues. In any event, President Nixon asked Attorney General John Mitchell to be a regular member of the Council and later also asked Treasury Secretary Connally, but these were members designated by him and not statutory members. Others, in addition to the statutory members, can be designated at the pleasure of the President.

The President: Well, in other words, we could have others here depending upon the subject if we want to do so. For now, at least, let's keep it this way. I also would like to have the group use both sides of the table for seating so that we can be closer together and facing each other as much as possible.

Secretary Kissinger: I also should note, Mr. President, that the Deputy Secretaries of State and Defense are here as well. They are not statutory members, but have usually attended because they have a great deal to do with the implementation of decisions which you may take. Also, in the case of the Deputy Secretary of State, he acts as the representative of the Department of State at the meeting in my stead, since at most NSC meetings I serve at the meeting as your Assistant for National Security Affairs.

Secretary Schlesinger: Mr. President, I would like to be able to bring Bob Ellsworth with me to the meetings in addition to Deputy Secretary Clements.

The President: Well, I have known Bob for a long time. He is your international man. Is that correct?

Secretary Kissinger: One way to decide on the attendance would be to have you decide upon a list of proposed attendees before each meeting.

The President: Yes, I will do it that way. I can see that Bob Ellsworth could be helpful in some situations. On the other hand, I don't suppose that he would be involved in discussions of SALT, for example. So we might have some different attendance depending on the nature of the meeting. I will plan on approving who should come on the basis of a list which I will receive before each meeting.

Mr. Clements: Sir, I would like to comment on Deputy Secretary Ingersoll's role and my own. We are members of the principal sub-groups of the NSC system. Along with Secretary Kissinger, Mr. Colby and General Brown, we make up the core groups of each of those NSC bodies. All of the staff work within the system is performed under

us operating in those bodies. It is in that context that we are here and I find it extremely helpful to me.

Secretary Kissinger: Yes, they have the operational responsibility.

The President: I like to have a staff person at meetings in order that I do not have to call staff in after a meeting and pass on to them all of the discussions and decisions that have been taken, myself. I agree that Secretaries Ingersoll and Clements should be here. They could be helpful in getting decisions implemented. Does anyone have any other comment?

Secretary Schlesinger: Sir, there are two issues I believe you will want to focus on in the National Security Council as a matter of priority. The first involves our nuclear strategy. During the last six months, based from a NSDM approved by Nixon, we have altered the nuclear strategy of the U.S. and our deterrent declaratory strategy.⁴ We think it would be very desirable at an early opportunity to discuss this strategy with you. We believe that it enhances our deterrent capability. The second question concerns our armament policy toward Israel. We are under great pressure from the Israelis. They have proposed a very large military aid package. If you are going to decide upon this, it will be a matter which you will probably want to focus on very early as one of the most pressing decisions. The pressure on Defense is extremely great, and they will be putting great pressure on Congress as well. Secretary Kissinger may wish to comment on this.

Secretary Kissinger: I had mentioned this briefly earlier, Mr. President. The Israelis want a five-year commitment of \$1.5 billion per year. Obviously this involves the most profound foreign policy and military policy issues.

The President: Do they want all grant?

Secretary Kissinger: Well, there would be some mix of cash and credit. We must remember, however, that last year the Saudis imposed an oil embargo when we were talking about a package of \$2.2 billion in the middle of a war. Now we are talking about a package of plus \$5 billion. While negotiations are going on this could be a massive problem with the Arabs. There will be, however, great pressures. Jim is right on that. They will be pushing hard; they want authorization from the Congress this year even if they don't get the appropriation.

The President: What is the status of the \$2.2 billion program? We have committed all of the funds under that program and also have committed the \$300 million plan for FY 1975. They are now in the posi-

⁴ NSDM 242, "Policy for Planning the Employment of Nuclear Weapons," January 17, 1974, is scheduled for publication in *Foreign Relations, 1969–1976*, volume XXXV, National Security Policy, 1973–1976.

tion of having to decide whether to go on with their military program. They should tap into their own foreign exchange or seek more direct aid from the U.S., and they are pushing for the latter course.

Secretary Kissinger: If you want to avoid the longer term foreign policy issues, which a massive program of this kind would generate, you might make a decision on only one year and at a lower level than they are asking. The impact on the Arabs this year would not be as bad as an agreement for a large package for the long term impact, but we need to relate whatever we do to the on-going process of negotiations. If we can show progress in negotiations, the Arabs can swallow military aid decisions, but if we make military aid to Israel decisions in the context of a stalemate in negotiations, we will have a massive problem.

Mr. Clements: I agree we could have a very serious problem if we are not extremely cautious in dealing with this Israeli aid proposal. We could face another oil embargo.

The President: Thought also has to be given to this Israeli request in the context of the \$250 million request for Egypt. We just have to recognize the political realities on the Hill. Has the Egypt request been submitted yet?

Secretary Kissinger: Yes sir, I believe it is being marked up now.

General Scowcroft: It has been marked up on the House side.

Mr. Clements: We also have to be concerned with the question of Egypt's military needs. That issue could be a serious one.

The President: Well, let us not get involved in that question now. Let us concentrate on getting the economic aid situation straightened out.

Secretary Schlesinger: There is a shorter term problem in the Israeli military aid picture also. They are requesting immediate delivery of much of the material which was in the \$2.2 billion package. They see a possible war as early as November when the UN forces are removed. They consider this a very real threat for which they want to be prepared now. To the extent we provide some of the equipment that they have asked for, we must take it away from the U.S. forces with the result that those forces will be much less ready.

The President: Do they understand that that is the case?

Secretary Schlesinger: Yes sir, but they consider that their needs take priority.

The President: That certainly is an unselfish attitude.

Secretary Kissinger: We are studying this entire Israeli aid problem in the interagency system and I think we would want to have that study completed for your consideration.

The President: I would like to make that a matter of priority and consider that as a subject for our next meeting in two weeks.

Mr. Marsh: Mr. President, I suggest also at the meeting in two weeks you might like to have a briefing on the various groups that operate within the NSC system.

Secretary Kissinger: I suggest that perhaps I might be able to go over that with you directly, Mr. President, rather than in the format of a meeting.

The President: Yes, I would like to do that, but I think we can do it directly as you suggest, Henry. Bill (to Mr. Colby), what is the latest on our ship project in the Pacific?⁵

Mr. Colby: Well sir, as you know, the tines were damaged when we picked up the sub and we lost [*less than 1 line not declassified*] of the ship. However, we have the rest of it inside the recovery ship and the ship has now steamed away from the area. The Soviet tug, which was in the area, has left the area. We are confident that it was only there in connection with its normal servicing of Soviet submarines. Our ship is now steaming on the way to Hawaii. It is very hard to tell what they have, but they have detected some radioactivity. [*7½ lines not declassified*] There may be some pieces on the bottom which could be recovered. They may have fallen loose. We think that at least one of the missiles was loose and it may have fallen free, but it will be some time before we know just what the situation is. It is too bad that, with the whole mission having gone so very well, we lost [*less than 1 line not declassified*] of the target.

Secretary Schlesinger: [*2½ lines not declassified*]

Mr. Colby: [*3½ lines not declassified*]

The President: Is this a regular operating submarine?

Mr. Colby: It is a regular submarine, but it has been especially configured for this task. Actually, it is a very old ship and will soon be decommissioned.

General Brown: I would emphasize, however, sir, that although it is a regular operating submarine, it is a very special operation.

The President: If it's an old one, I wonder if it could be the submarine that Mrs. Ford commissioned.

General Brown: No sir, it is a different ship.

The President: Well, I just wondered because it occurred to me that if they thought we were doing it direct like this with a submarine which my wife had commissioned, I wonder how they would view it. They

⁵ Reference is to the *Hughes Glomar Explorer*, which set out on a secret mission in June 1974 to recover a Soviet submarine sunken in the Pacific Ocean since August 1968. The mission, organized by the U.S. intelligence community and codeworded Azorian, was only partially successful.

would really think we are up to something. I am glad it is not the same ship.

Gentlemen, if there is nothing else, I suggest we adjourn and I thank you all very much.

41. Address by President Ford¹

Washington, August 12, 1974.

[Omitted here are Ford's introductory remarks and a discussion of domestic policy.]

Successful foreign policy is an extension of the hopes of the whole American people for a world of peace and orderly reform and orderly freedom. So, I would say a few words to our distinguished guests from the governments of other nations where, as at home, it is my determination to deal openly with allies and adversaries.

Over the past 5½ years in Congress and as Vice President, I have fully supported the outstanding foreign policy of President Nixon. This policy I intend to continue.

Throughout my public service, starting with wartime naval duty under the command of President Franklin D. Roosevelt, I have upheld all our Presidents when they spoke for my country to the world. I believe the Constitution commands this. I know that in this crucial area of international policy I can count on your firm support.

Now, let there be no doubt or any misunderstanding anywhere, and I emphasize anywhere: There are no opportunities to exploit, should anyone so desire. There will be no change of course, no relaxation of vigilance, no abandonment of the helm of our ship of state as the watch changes.

We stand by our commitments and we will live up to our responsibilities in our formal alliances, in our friendships, and in our improving relations with potential adversaries.

On this, Americans are united and strong. Under my term of leadership, I hope we will become more united. I am certain America will remain strong.

¹ Source: *Public Papers: Ford, 1974*, pp. 6–13. Ford addressed a joint session of Congress at 9:06 p.m. in the House Chamber at the Capitol. The President's speech was broadcast live on nationwide radio and television networks.

A strong defense is the surest way to peace. Strength makes détente attainable. Weakness invites war, as my generation—my generation—knows from four very bitter experiences.

Just as America's will for peace is second to none, so will America's strength be second to none.

We cannot rely on the forbearance of others to protect this Nation. The power and diversity of the Armed Forces, active Guard and Reserve, the resolve of our fellow citizens, the flexibility in our command to navigate international waters that remain troubled are all essential to our security.

I shall continue to insist on civilian control of our superb military establishment. The Constitution plainly requires the President to be Commander in Chief, and I will be.

Our job will not be easy. In promising continuity, I cannot promise simplicity. The problems and challenges of the world remain complex and difficult. But we have set out on a path of reason, of fairness, and we will continue on it.

As guideposts on that path, I offer the following:

—To our allies of a generation in the Atlantic community and Japan, I pledge continuity in the loyal collaboration on our many mutual endeavors.

—To our friends and allies in this hemisphere, I pledge continuity in the deepening dialog to define renewed relationships of equality and justice.

—To our allies and friends in Asia, I pledge a continuity in our support for their security, independence, and economic development. In Indochina, we are determined to see the observance of the Paris agreement on Vietnam and the cease-fire and negotiated settlement in Laos. We hope to see an early compromise settlement in Cambodia.

—To the Soviet Union, I pledge continuity in our commitment to the course of the past 3 years. To our two peoples, and to all mankind, we owe a continued effort to live and, where possible, to work together in peace, for in a thermonuclear age there can be no alternative to a positive and peaceful relationship between our nations.

—To the People's Republic of China, whose legendary hospitality I enjoyed,² I pledge continuity in our commitment to the principles of the Shanghai comminiqué.³ The new relationship built on those principles

² Ford, then serving as House Minority Leader, and House Majority Leader Hale Boggs (D-Louisiana) visited the People's Republic of China in 1972. See *Foreign Relations, 1969–1976*, volume E-13, Documents on China, 1969–1972, Documents 109 and 110.

³ See footnote 5, Document 3.

has demonstrated that it serves serious and objective mutual interests and has become an enduring feature of the world scene.

—To the nations in the Middle East, I pledge continuity in our vigorous efforts to advance the progress which has brought hopes of peace to that region after 25 years as a hotbed of war. We shall carry out our promise to promote continuing negotiations among all parties for a complete, just, and lasting settlement.

—To all nations, I pledge continuity in seeking a common global goal: a stable international structure of trade and finance which reflects the interdependence of all peoples.

—To the entire international community—to the United Nations, to the world's nonaligned nations, and to all others—I pledge continuity in our dedication to the humane goals which throughout our history have been so much of America's contribution to mankind.

So long as the peoples of the world have confidence in our purposes and faith in our word, the age-old vision of peace on Earth will grow brighter.

I pledge myself unreservedly to that goal. I say to you in words that cannot be improved upon: "Let us never negotiate out of fear, but let us never fear to negotiate."

[Omitted here are general concluding remarks.]

42. Memorandum of Conversation¹

Washington, August 13, 1974.

SUBJECT

Highlights of Secretary Kissinger's OFF THE RECORD Breakfast with *Time, Inc.*,
Madison Room, Department of State, August 13, 1974.

Present at the breakfast were

Henry A. Kissinger, Secretary of State
Hedley Donovan, Editor-in-Chief
Henry Grunwald, Managing Editor
Murray Gart, Assistant Managing Editor
Jerrold Schecter, Diplomatic Editor
Hugh Sidey, Washington Bureau Chief
Robert Anderson, Special Assistant to the Secretary for Press Relations

QUESTION: Could you give us your comments on, and reaction to, Nixon's resignation? (Donovan)

SECRETARY: No matter what one thinks of the issue, this was a tragedy also in human terms. One can well imagine how a man who was one day the single most powerful man in the world and cast into utter oblivion the next must feel. It was not until Wednesday night, August 7, that the resignation was 98% certain.² I did not speak to President Nixon about the subject of resignation until Tuesday, August 6, and that was in terms of the continuity of the respect for the American people. On Monday, August 5, those close to the President such as Ron Ziegler did not seem to understand the significance of the tapes about to be released. Ziegler, for example, thought they might cause a little furor which would soon die down. During the past week I had no legal discussions on Watergate with the White House and did not talk to St. Clair³ about the subject. My only discussions concerned the effect of Watergate on the national interest. When the Supreme Court decision was rendered, I thought resignation inevitable. I was told in May that the transcripts released last week were exculpatory. The tapes revealed two Nixons, one that I knew and one I didn't know. Regarding his swearing, I never heard him use profane language. Then, too, his sentence structures one reads from the tapes are most peculiar and cer-

¹ Source: Library of Congress, Manuscript Division, Kissinger Papers, Box CL 426, Subject File, Media, Briefings, Background, April–October 1974. Confidential; Nodis. Drafted by Robert Anderson (S/PRS) and retyped on September 6.

² For Kissinger's recollections of August 7–9, from the day of Nixon's decision through his departure from the White House, see *Years of Upheaval*, pp. 1206–1214.

³ James D. St. Clair, Special Counsel to Nixon during the Watergate period, argued the case of *United States v. Nixon* in front of the Supreme Court on July 8.

tainly not like the articulate Nixon I dealt with. For example, “Do this quickly, like in ten minutes” is not the type of expression I would have expected from Nixon.

QUESTION: What about Nixon’s legal future? (Sidey)

SECRETARY: I know Nixon talked to Jaworski, but as far as I know this conversation was basically to inform Jaworski of the decision to resign. Without the tapes, the Watergate affair would have ended without Nixon’s removal from office.

QUESTION: How did taping start in the White House? Was it Haldeman’s idea? (Sidey)

SECRETARY: I did not know about the taping of the President’s conversations when it started. In talking about taping, one must understand the peculiar atmosphere in the White House. In 1962 Nixon was joined by such political has-beens as Haldeman and Ehrlichman and a few younger people such as Ziegler and Chapin who were on the make. Intellectually they were nothing more than advance men. Normally, advance men are put aside in a policy sense, but this was not the case. These men kept others away from getting into the White House. I was the only outsider who got in. Regarding the taping, Haldeman wanted someone at all meetings with the President to check on others. A man working in my area was considered for this role but refused to take it on. Because of this, taping was instituted, and the tapes were held by Haldeman. This caused considerable trouble as there was no way to get the tapes and if one did what the President said during his ruminations, one could be in trouble.

QUESTION: Did Haldeman and Ehrlichman resent you prior to Watergate? (Gart)

SECRETARY: Resentment came to light if something went wrong. For example, on the India-Pakistan question, they did not exactly help me, to put it mildly. My office was the only one which had people not approved by Haldeman. I recruited my own staff. My situation on entering the White House was simple—those in the White House wanted to conduct civil war; those outside the White House with whom I was emotionally associated turned on me because I joined the Nixon Administration.

QUESTION: What effect will transition have on our foreign policy?

SECRETARY: This has given us strength in foreign countries. The fact that the new President steps in on Friday, sees some 45 or more Ambassadors and talks with confidence is a source of strength. The Soviet Union has been shaken by the change. Dobrynin rushed back. When I saw the President yesterday, I told him I thought Dobrynin would come back soon. I returned to my office to find a note saying he’s

back. I returned to the President to tell him I will always try to be a good prophet for him. President Ford had handled problems more subtly than I would have thought two weeks ago. He was very deft in his talks with the Ambassadors.

QUESTION: What is going to be the foreign policy strategy in the new Administration?

SECRETARY: Our objective is to weave something of enormous complexity to give us more options. President Ford can benefit from policies now coming to fruition. For example, our relations with Japan have been on the upswing for a year. And our relations with Europe are now very strong. The President can have an opportunity for construction, not just crisis management, and he will be comfortable here.

QUESTION: Regarding relations with the Soviet Union, will Ford be tougher? (Sidey)

SECRETARY: If one analyzes our policy, where has there been an absence of toughness? The Soviets have been squeezed unmercifully in the Middle East. Nixon was not soft on the Soviets. What should we ask the USSR? On emigration, Scoop Jackson could not solve this problem alone.

QUESTION: What about SALT?

SECRETARY: Regarding SALT issues, with all due respect they are phony issues. Conservative intellectuals and Jewish groups were turned off just because they couldn't stomach Nixon. We can now have a more rational debate on the subject. We want to keep our defense budget where it is, and therefore must develop rhetoric with this in mind. The Zumwalt thesis of strategic superiority has no foreign policy or strategic basis. On the question of a first strike, the USSR could get only 20% of our force, and we could get 85% of their force. How could any responsible political leader on either side say, "Look, boss, let's shoot out our land-based missiles." He would be just plain crazy to do this, knowing the limitations of accuracy and the fact that his adversary would still have the potential to destroy him after a first strike. The only people planning any strategy in the U.S. are the people at Rand. If you put Schlesinger and me in a room, there would be some esoteric differences only. The reason for no SALT agreement thus far is the bureaucratic difficulties here and in Moscow. The chances for an agreement in 1975 have now greatly improved. I think President Ford agrees with my thinking on this subject. When Zumwalt says the balance is tipping against us, what does he mean? We now have a superiority of four to one with 7,000 missiles. But are we more confident? These missiles are politically useless in a crisis. You cannot move them; you cannot see them. By 1980 we will still have two-to-one superiority. By 1984 we will conservatively have 17,000 missiles. But what do you do with them? The Trident is coming along which will have ten warheads on each

missile, and we can base these on land if we want. What will Jackson do with strategic superiority? What will the USSR do? I am confident this wrangling may end now with the nastiness going out of the debate as the intellectuals change back with Watergate out of the way. Our objective in SALT is to put a cap on deployment. Jackson wants to reduce; we do not.

QUESTION: What are our real foreign policy tests? (Grunwald)

SECRETARY: I am confident we will do well with the Russians. Before it was a combination of a lame-duck President and Watergate. The latter issue has been removed. The chances for a SALT Agreement in 1975 are excellent. The situation in the Middle East is dangerous and we must pursue our efforts in the area. One of the greatest concerns in the weak government in Israel. I may go to China and Japan in the first half of September, and to Moscow and India in the second half of October.

43. Editorial Note

President Gerald Ford addressed the annual convention of the Veterans of Foreign Wars in Chicago on August 19, 1974. The President focused his introductory remarks upon his offer of earned reentry to Americans who had evaded the draft during the Vietnam war. He then stressed: "The United States, our allies, and our friends around the world must maintain strength and resolve. Potential adversaries obviously watch the state of our readiness and the strength of our will. I will offer them no temptations. America is not the policeman of the world, but we will continue to be the backbone of a free world collective security setup. Just as America will maintain its nuclear deterrent strength, we will never fall behind in negotiations to control—and hopefully reduce—this threat to mankind. A great nation is not only strong but wise, not only principled but purposeful. A fundamental purpose of our Nation must be to achieve peace through strength and meaningful negotiations." (*Public Papers: Ford, 1974*, page 27)

Secretary of State Henry Kissinger echoed the President's comments while addressing the American Legion National Convention in Miami on August 20. Kissinger commented:

"So our search for peace begins with America's strength. For other nations to have confidence in our purposes and faith in our word, America must remain a military power second to none. As I can attest from experience, in time of crisis and at the conference table, America's

military might is the foundation of our diplomatic strength. We have made progress toward peace in recent years because we have been flexible, but also because we have been resolute. Let us never forget that conciliation is a virtue only in those who are thought to have a choice.

“—A strong defense is the essential deterrent to aggression. By demonstrating that there is no alternative to negotiation, it is the precondition of our policy of relaxing tensions with our adversaries.

“—A strong defense is the cement of our alliances, reinforcing our partners’ will to join in the common defense. It is the basis of mutual confidence and thus of our cooperation across the whole spectrum of our common interests.” (Department of State *Bulletin*, September 16, 1974, page 374)

44. Address by President Ford¹

New York, September 18, 1974.

A Framework of International Cooperation

In 1946 President Harry Truman welcomed representatives of 55 nations to the first General Assembly of the United Nations. Since then, every American President has had the great honor of addressing this Assembly. Today, with pleasure and humility, I take my turn in welcoming you, the distinguished representatives of 138 nations.

When I took office, I told the American people that my remarks would be “just a little straight talk among friends.”² Straight talk is what I propose here today in the first of my addresses to the representatives of the world.

¹ Source: Department of State *Bulletin*, October 7, 1974, pp. 465–468. All brackets are in the original. Ford’s address was made before the U.N. General Assembly. Drought and famine characterized the global food situation during 1973–1974, thus increasing the need for American agricultural commodities and prompting the United States to reevaluate its food aid commitments. In response to a question posed at his September 16 news conference regarding the American response to global starvation, Ford asserted that a “very major decision in this area” would be made and that it was his “hope that the United States for humanitarian purposes will be able to increase its contribution to those nations that have suffered because of drought or any of the other problems related to human needs.” (*Public Papers: Ford*, 1974, p. 155)

² See Document 37.

Next week Secretary of State Henry Kissinger will present in specifics the overall principles³ which I will outline in my remarks today. It should be emphatically understood that the Secretary of State has my full support and the unquestioned backing of the American people.

As a party leader in the Congress of the United States, as Vice President, and now as President of the United States of America, I have had the closest working relationship with Secretary of State Kissinger. I have supported and will continue to endorse his many efforts as Secretary of State and in our National Security Council system to build a world of peace.

Since the United Nations was founded, the world has experienced conflicts and threats to peace. But we have avoided the greatest danger: another world war. Today we have the opportunity to make the remainder of this century an era of peace and cooperation and economic well-being.

The harsh hostilities which once held great powers in their rigid grasp have now begun to moderate. Many of the crises which dominated past General Assemblies are fortunately behind us. Technological progress holds out the hope that one day all men can achieve a decent life.

Nations too often have had no choice but to be either hammer or anvil—to strike or to be struck. Now we have a new opportunity—to forge, in concert with others, a framework of international cooperation. That is the course the United States has chosen for itself.

On behalf of the American people, I renew these basic pledges to you today:

—We are committed to a pursuit of a more peaceful, stable, and co-operative world. While we are determined never to be bested in a test of strength, we will devote our strength to what is best. And in the nuclear era, there is no rational alternative to accords of mutual restraint between the United States and the Soviet Union, two nations which have the power to destroy mankind.

—We will bolster our partnerships with traditional friends in Europe, Asia, and Latin America to meet new challenges in a rapidly

³ Kissinger addressed the U.N. General Assembly on September 23, outlining American efforts to broker peace in the Middle East and Cyprus, combat nuclear proliferation, and resolve the energy and food crises. At the conclusion of his address, Kissinger commented: "It is easy to agree to yet another set of principles or to actions *other* nations should take. But the needs of the poor will not be met by slogans; the needs of an expanding global economy will not be met by new restrictions; the search for peace cannot be conducted on the basis of confrontation. So each nation must ask what it can do, what contribution it is finally prepared to make to the common good." For the complete text of Kissinger's remarks, see Department of State *Bulletin*, October 14, 1974, pp. 498–504.

changing world. The maintenance of such relationships underpins rather than undercuts the search for peace.

—We will seek out, we will expand our relations with old adversaries. For example, our new rapport with the People's Republic of China best serves the purposes of each nation and the interests of the entire world.

—We will strive to heal old wounds reopened in recent conflicts in Cyprus, the Middle East, and in Indochina. Peace cannot be imposed from without, but we will do whatever is within our capacity to help achieve it.

—We rededicate ourselves to the search for justice, equality, and freedom. Recent developments in Africa signal the welcome end of colonialism. Behavior appropriate to an era of dependence must give way to the new responsibilities of an era of interdependence.

No single nation, no single group of nations, no single organization, can meet all of the challenges before the community of nations. We must act in concert. Progress toward a better world must come through cooperative efforts across the whole range of bilateral and multilateral relations.

America's revolutionary birth and centuries of experience in adjusting democratic government to changing conditions have made Americans practical as well as idealistic. As idealists, we are proud of our role in the founding of the United Nations and in supporting its many accomplishments. As practical people, we are sometimes impatient at what we see as shortcomings.

In my 25 years as a member of the Congress of the United States, I learned two basic practical lessons:

—First, men of differing political persuasions can find common ground for cooperation. We need not agree on all issues in order to agree on most. Differences of principle, of purpose, of perspective, will not disappear. But neither will our mutual problems disappear unless we are determined to find mutually helpful solutions.

—Second, a majority must take into account the proper interest of a minority if the decisions of the majority are to be accepted. We who believe in and live by majority rule must always be alert to the danger of the "tyranny of the majority." Majority rule thrives on the habits of accommodation, moderation, and consideration of the interests of others.

A very stark reality has tempered America's actions for decades—and must now temper the actions of all nations. Prevention of full-scale warfare in the nuclear age has become everybody's responsibility. Today's regional conflict must not become tomorrow's world disaster.

We must assure by every means at our disposal that local crises are quickly contained and resolved.

The challenge before the United States [Nations] is very clear. This organization can place the weight of the world community on the side of world peace. And this organization can provide impartial forces to maintain the peace.

And at this point, I wish to pay tribute on behalf of the American people to the 37 members of the U.N. peacekeeping forces who have given their lives in the Middle East and in Cyprus in the past 10 months, and I convey our deepest sympathies to their loved ones.

Let the quality of our response measure up to the magnitude of the challenge that we face. I pledge to you that America will continue to be constructive, innovative, and responsive to the work of this great body.

The nations in this hall are united by a deep concern for peace. We are united as well by our desire to insure a better life for all people.

Today the economy of the world is under unprecedented stress. We need new approaches to international cooperation to respond effectively to the problems that we face. Developing and developed countries, market and nonmarket countries—we are all a part of one interdependent economic system.

The food and oil crises demonstrate the extent of our interdependence. Many developing nations need the food surplus of a few developed nations. And many industrialized nations need the oil production of a few developing nations.

Energy is required to produce food, and food to produce energy—and both to provide a decent life for everyone. The problems of food and energy can be resolved on the basis of cooperation—or can, I should say, [be] made unmanageable on the basis of confrontation. Runaway inflation, propelled by food and oil price increases, is an early warning signal to all of us.

Let us not delude ourselves. Failure to cooperate on oil and food and inflation could spell disaster for every nation represented in this room.⁴ The United Nations must not and need not allow this to occur. A global strategy for food and energy is urgently required.

The United States believes four principles should guide a global approach:

⁴ During a September 17 White House meeting devoted to the food crisis, Kissinger noted: “The President is scolding everyone at the United Nations for being miserly on energy, and the less we say we’ll do on food, the less effect it has. We are trying to tell the Third World they must be cooperative, and in turn we will try to cooperate.” For the full memorandum of conversation, see *Foreign Relations, 1969–1976*, volume XXXI, Foreign Economic Policy, 1973–1976, Document 266.

—First, all nations must substantially increase production. Just to maintain the present standards of living the world must almost double its output of food and energy to match the expected increase in the world's population by the end of this century. To meet aspirations for a better life, production will have to expand at a significantly faster rate than population growth.

—Second, all nations must seek to achieve a level of prices which not only provides an incentive to producers but which consumers can afford. It should now be clear that the developed nations are not the only countries which demand and receive an adequate return for their goods. But it should also be clear that by confronting consumers with production restrictions, artificial pricing, and the prospect of ultimate bankruptcy, producers will eventually become the victims of their own actions.

—Third, all nations must avoid the abuse of man's fundamental needs for the sake of narrow national or bloc advantage. The attempt by any nation to use one commodity for political purposes will inevitably tempt other countries to use their commodities for their own purposes.

—Fourth, the nations of the world must assure that the poorest among us are not overwhelmed by rising prices of the imports necessary for their survival. The traditional aid donors and the increasingly wealthy oil producers must join in this effort.

The United States recognizes the special responsibility we bear as the world's largest producer of food. That is why Secretary of State Kissinger proposed from this very podium last year a World Food Conference to define a global food policy.⁵ And that is one reason why we have removed domestic restrictions on food productions in the United States. It has not been our policy to use food as a political weapon, despite the oil embargo and recent oil price and production decisions.

It would be tempting for the United States—beset by inflation and soaring energy prices—to turn a deaf ear to external appeals for food assistance or to respond with internal appeals for export controls. But however difficult our own economic situation, we recognize that the plight of others is worse.

Americans have always responded to human emergencies in the past. And we respond again here today.

In response to Secretary General [of the United Nations Kurt] Waldheim's appeal and to help meet the long-term challenge in food, I reiterate:

⁵ See Documents 17 and 47.

—To help developing nations realize their aspirations to grow more of their own food, the United States will substantially increase its assistance to agricultural production programs in other countries.

—Next, to insure that the survival of millions of our fellow men does not depend upon the vagaries of weather, the United States is prepared to join in a worldwide effort to negotiate, establish, and maintain an international system of food reserves. This system will work best if each nation is made responsible for managing the reserves that it will have available.

—Finally, to make certain that the more immediate needs for food are met this year, the United States will not only maintain the amount it spends for food shipments to nations in need, but it will increase this amount this year.

Thus, the United States is striving to help define and help contribute to a cooperative global policy to meet man's immediate and long-term need for food. We will set forth our comprehensive proposals at the World Food Conference in November.

Now is the time for oil producers to define their conception of a global policy on energy to meet the growing need—and to do this without imposing unacceptable burdens on the international monetary and trade system.

A world of economic confrontation cannot be a world of political cooperation. If we fail to satisfy man's fundamental needs for energy and food, we face a threat not just to our aspirations for a better life for all our peoples but to our hopes for a more stable and a more peaceful world. By working together to overcome our common problems, mankind can turn from fear toward hope.

From the time of the founding of the United Nations, America volunteered to help nations in need, frequently as the main benefactor. We were able to do it. We were glad to do it. But as new economic forces alter and reshape today's complex world, no nation can be expected to feed all the world's hungry peoples. Fortunately, however, many nations are increasingly able to help. And I call on them to join with us as truly united nations in the struggle to provide more food at lower prices for the hungry and, in general, a better life for the needy of this world.

America will continue to do more than its share. But there are realistic limits to our capacities. There is no limit, however, to our determination to act in concert with other nations to fulfill the vision of the United Nations Charter: to save succeeding generations from the scourge of war and to promote social progress and better standards, better standards of life in a larger freedom.

45. Statement by Secretary of State Kissinger¹

Washington, September 19, 1974.

Détente With the Soviet Union: The Reality of Competition and the
Imperative of Cooperation

I. The Challenge

Since the dawn of the nuclear age the world's fears of holocaust and its hopes for peace have turned on the relationship between the United States and the Soviet Union.

Throughout history men have sought peace but suffered war; all too often, deliberate decisions or miscalculations have brought violence and destruction to a world yearning for tranquility. Tragic as the consequences of violence may have been in the past, the issue of peace and war takes on unprecedented urgency when, for the first time in history, two nations have the capacity to destroy mankind. In the nuclear age, as President Eisenhower pointed out two decades ago, "there is no longer any alternative to peace."

The destructiveness of modern weapons defines the necessity of the task; deep differences in philosophy and interests between the United States and the Soviet Union point up its difficulty. These differences do not spring from misunderstanding or personalities or transitory factors:

—They are rooted in history and in the way the two countries have developed.

—They are nourished by conflicting values and opposing ideologies.

—They are expressed in diverging national interests that produce political and military competition.

—They are influenced by allies and friends whose association we value and whose interests we will not sacrifice.

Paradox confuses our perception of the problem of peaceful coexistence: if peace is pursued to the exclusion of any other goal, other values will be compromised and perhaps lost; but if unconstrained rivalry leads to nuclear conflict, these values, along with everything else, will be destroyed in the resulting holocaust. However competitive they

¹ Source: Department of State *Bulletin*, October 14, 1974, pp. 505–519. Kissinger made his statement before the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations during the Committee's hearings on U.S. relations with Communist countries. A copy is in the National Archives, RG 59, Policy Planning Council (S/PC), Policy Planning Staff (S/P), Director's Files (Winston Lord) 1969–77, Lot 77D112, Box 349, SEPT 1974.

may be at some levels of their relationship, both major nuclear powers must base their policies on the premise that neither can expect to impose its will on the other without running an intolerable risk. The challenge of our time is to reconcile the reality of competition with the imperative of coexistence.

There can be no peaceful international order without a constructive relationship between the United States and the Soviet Union. There will be no international stability unless both the Soviet Union and the United States conduct themselves with restraint and unless they use their enormous power for the benefit of mankind.

Thus we must be clear at the outset on what the term “*détente*” entails. It is the search for a more constructive relationship with the Soviet Union reflecting the realities I have outlined. It is a continuing process, not a final condition that has been or can be realized at any one specific point in time. And it has been pursued by successive American leaders, though the means have varied as have world conditions.

Some fundamental principles guide this policy:

The United States cannot base its policy solely on Moscow’s good intentions. But neither can we insist that all forward movement must await a convergence of American and Soviet purposes. We seek, regardless of Soviet intentions, to serve peace through a systematic resistance to pressure and conciliatory responses to moderate behavior.

We must oppose aggressive actions and irresponsible behavior. But we must not seek confrontations lightly.

We must maintain a strong national defense while recognizing that in the nuclear age the relationship between military strength and politically usable power is the most complex in all history.

Where the age-old antagonism between freedom and tyranny is concerned, we are not neutral. But other imperatives impose limits on our ability to produce internal changes in foreign countries. Consciousness of our limits is recognition of the necessity of peace—not moral callousness. The preservation of human life and human society are moral values, too.

We must be mature enough to recognize that to be stable a relationship must provide advantages to both sides and that the most constructive international relationships are those in which both parties perceive an element of gain. Moscow will benefit from certain measures, just as we will from others. The balance cannot be struck on each issue every day, but only over the whole range of relations and over a period of time.

[Omitted here are a historical overview of *détente* and information concerning specific agreements negotiated between the United States and the Soviet Union.]

V. Agenda for the Future

Détente is a process, not a permanent achievement. The agenda is full and continuing. Obviously the main concern must be to reduce the sources of potential conflict. This requires efforts in several interrelated areas:

—The military competition in all its aspects must be subject to increasingly firm restraints by both sides.

—Political competition, especially in moments of crisis, must be guided by the principles of restraint set forth in the documents described earlier. Crises there will be, but the United States and the Soviet Union have a special obligation deriving from the unimaginable military power that they wield and represent. Exploitation of crisis situations for unilateral gain is not acceptable.

—Restraint in crises must be augmented by cooperation in removing the causes of crises. There have been too many instances, notably in the Middle East, which demonstrate that policies of unilateral advantage sooner or later run out of control and lead to the brink of war, if not beyond.

—The process of negotiations and consultation must be continuous and intense. But no agreement between the nuclear superpowers can be durable if made over the heads of other nations which have a stake in the outcome. We should not seek to impose peace; we can, however, see that our own actions and conduct are conducive to peace.

In the coming months we shall strive:

—To complete the negotiations for comprehensive and equitable limitations on strategic arms until at least 1985;

—To complete the multilateral negotiations on mutual force reductions in Central Europe, so that security will be enhanced for all the countries of Europe;

—To conclude the conference on European security and cooperation in a manner that promotes both security and human aspirations;

—To continue the efforts to limit the spread of nuclear weapons to additional countries without depriving those countries of the peaceful benefits of atomic energy;

—To complete ratification of the recently negotiated treaty banning underground nuclear testing by the United States and U.S.S.R. above a certain threshold;

—To begin negotiations on the recently agreed effort to overcome the possible dangers of environmental modification techniques for military purposes; and

—To resolve the longstanding attempts to cope with the dangers of chemical weaponry.

We must never forget that the process of détente depends ultimately on habits and modes of conduct that extend beyond the letter of agreements to the spirit of relations as a whole. This is why the whole process must be carefully nurtured.

In cataloging the desirable, we must take care not to jeopardize what is attainable. We must consider what alternative policies are available and what their consequences would be. And the implications of alternatives must be examined not just in terms of a single issue but for how they might affect the entire range of Soviet-American relations and the prospects for world peace.

We must assess not only individual challenges to détente but also their cumulative impact:

If we justify each agreement with Moscow only when we can show unilateral gain,

If we strive for an elusive strategic “superiority,”

If we systematically block benefits to the Soviet Union,

If we try to transform the Soviet system by pressure,

If in short, we look for final results before we agree to any results, then we would be reviving the doctrines of liberation and massive retaliation of the 1950’s. And we would do so at a time when Soviet physical power and influence on the world are greater than a quarter century ago when those policies were devised and failed. The futility of such a course is as certain as its danger.

Let there be no question, however, that Soviet actions could destroy détente as well:

If the Soviet Union uses détente to strengthen its military capacity in all fields,

If in crises it acts to sharpen tension,

If it does not contribute to progress toward stability,

If it seeks to undermine our alliances,

If it is deaf to the urgent needs of the least developed and the emerging issues of interdependence, then it in turn tempts a return to the tensions and conflicts we have made such efforts to overcome. The policy of confrontation has worked for neither of the superpowers.

We have insisted toward the Soviet Union that we cannot have the atmosphere of détente without the substance. It is equally clear that the substance of détente will disappear in an atmosphere of hostility.

We have profound differences with the Soviet Union—in our values, our methods, our vision of the future. But it is these very differences which compel any responsible administration to make a major effort to create a more constructive relationship.

We face an opportunity that was not possible 25 years, or even a decade, ago. If that opportunity is lost, its moment will not quickly come again. Indeed, it may not come at all.

As President Kennedy pointed out: “For in the final analysis our most basic common link is that we all inhabit this small planet. We all breathe the same air. We all cherish our children’s future. And we are all mortal.”²

² For President Kennedy’s commencement address at American University, Washington, D.C., on June 10, 1963, see *Bulletin* of July 2, 1963, p. 2. [Footnote is in the original.]

46. Interview With Secretary of State Kissinger¹

Washington, October 6, 1974.

MR. RESTON: You have been sounding rather pessimistic in the last few weeks. Are you worried about the state of the West?

SECRETARY KISSINGER: I don’t mean to sound pessimistic. I think that there are huge problems before us, and I’m trying to define them. I believe that the problems are soluble, but they require a major effort and, in some areas, new approaches, but I’m not pessimistic about the ability to solve them. We have—

Q Could I interrupt there to say that in reading what you have written in the past, I have a sense of pessimism in your writings, even of tragedy. Do you regard your thought as being essentially tragic, when you look at the last two generations?

A I think of myself as a historian more than as a statesman. As a historian, you have to be conscious of the fact that every civilization that has ever existed has ultimately collapsed.

History is a tale of efforts that failed, of aspirations that weren’t realized, of wishes that were fulfilled and then turned out to be different

¹ Source: National Archives, RG 59, Policy Planning Council (S/PC), Policy Planning Staff (S/P), Director’s Files (Winston Lord) 1969–77, Lot 77D112, Box 348, OCT 1974. No classification marking. *New York Times* columnist James “Scotty” Reston conducted the interview with Kissinger. Reston’s article and a partial transcript of the interview were published as “Kissinger Sees the World On Verge of Historic Era,” *New York Times*, October 13, 1974, pp. 1, 34. Kissinger offered similar remarks during an off-the-record conversation with members of the *New York Times* editorial staff on September 30. (National Archives, RG 59, Policy Planning Council (S/PC), Policy Planning Staff (S/P), Director’s Files (Winston Lord) 1969–77, Lot 77D112, Box 369, WL Sensitive Non-China)

from what one expected. So, as a historian, one has to live with a sense of the inevitability of tragedy. As a statesman, one has to act on the assumption that problems must be solved.

Each generation lives in time, and even though ultimately perhaps societies have all suffered a decline, that is of no help to any one generation, and the decline is usually traceable to a loss of creativity and inspiration and therefore avoidable.

It is probably true that insofar as I think historically I must look at the tragedies that have occurred. Insofar as I act, my motive force, of which I am conscious, it is to try to avoid them.

The Issue of Feasibility

Q Don't we have to bring this problem down to practical points, the difference between the ideals of a republic and what can be done? Is there a conflict now in America between the ideals of foreign policy that you see for the order of the world and what can actually be done in terms of public understanding and in actual votes in the Congress of the United States?

A I think almost every nation right now has the problem of reconciling its domestic view of itself with the international problem because every nation has to live on so many levels.

Certainly in every non-Communist nation—and probably even in Communist nations—public opinion in one way or another is becoming more and more important. But what public opinion is conscious of are the day-to-day problems of life. The remoter issues, geographically and in time, do not impinge on the average citizen.

In foreign policy, the most difficult issues are those whose necessity you cannot prove when the decisions are made. You act on the basis of an assessment that in the nature of things is a guess, so that public opinion knows, usually, only when it is too late to act, when some catastrophe has become overwhelming.

The necessity of the measures one takes to avoid the catastrophe can almost never be proved. For that reason you require a great deal, or at least a certain amount of confidence in leadership and that becomes difficult in all societies.

But, speaking of the United States, if one looks at the crisis through which America has gone over the last decade—the assassinations, the Vietnam war, Watergate—it is very difficult to establish the relationship of confidence.

Then the United States also has particular problems in terms of its historical experience. We never had to face the problem of security until the end of the Second World War, so we could afford to be very idealistic and insist on the pure implementation of our maxims.

To the average countries that were less favored, the problems of foreign policy have usually appeared in a much more complicated form; that is, their morality could not be expressed in absolute terms. Their morality had to give the sense of inward security necessary to act step by step in less than perfect modes.

Rebellion in U.S. Sensed

We are now in a similar position and therefore there is an almost instinctive rebellion in America against the pragmatic aspect of foreign policy that is security-oriented, that achieves finite objectives, that seeks to settle for the best attainable, rather than for the best. In this sense, we are having domestic problems.

On the other hand, there is a strain in America which is curiously, extremely relevant to this world. We are challenged by the huge problems, peace and war, energy, food, and we have a real belief in interdependence—it is not just a slogan.

The solution of these problems really comes quite naturally to Americans, first, because they believe that every problem is soluble; secondly, because they are at ease with redoing the world, and the old frontier mentality really does find an expression, and even the old idealism finds a way to express itself.

In what other country could a leader say, “We are going to solve energy; we’re going to solve food; we’re going to solve the problem of nuclear war,” and be taken seriously? So I think it is true that there are strains in our domestic debate; I think it is also true that there are many positive aspects in our domestic debate that can help us reach these larger goals.

[Omitted here is discussion of Western Europe.]

Q When you came to Washington in the first place after your study of history, it was said that you had a concept of how to achieve the order of the world, and yet in the last years, since you have been here, the tendency has been to say that you have not defined your concept, but that actually what you have been doing is negotiating pragmatic problems and not really dealing with the concept or making clear the concept. What is that concept? First of all, is the criticism correct, and second, what is the concept that you see?

A Well, I think you will find few officials who will tell you that any criticism you can make of them is correct, but I don’t think the criticism is quite correct. I do not have the choice, in any position, between imposing a theoretical order or negotiating, because if you don’t solve immediate problems, you can never solve long-term problems.

If you act creatively you should be able to use crises to move the world towards the structural solutions that are necessary. In fact, very

often the crises themselves are a symptom of the need for a structural rearrangement.

I faced a number of problems partly of perception and partly of structure. I feel it is essential that when the United States acts in foreign policy, that it understands first what the American national interest is in relation to the problem. And, to define that, America has to know what the world interest is, not only in relation to the specific problem, but in relation to the historical evolution from which any solution of a problem starts.

No Response From Europe

So I have tried—historians will have to judge with what success—to understand the forces that are at work in this period. My associates will confirm that when we tackle a problem, we spend the greatest part of our time at the beginning trying to relate it to where America and the world ought to go before we ever discuss tactics.

I think somebody would have to go through my speeches and press conferences to see to what extent I have articulated general propositions. I don't think I should be the judge of this here.

Q When you made your speech at the Waldorf,² I regarded it at that time as something equivalent almost to the offer of the Marshall Plan. Yet we got no real response from Europe. Even when you went to London and talked about interdependence,³ there was no response. Now, something was wrong there. Could you define it?

A There are always at least two aspects to any problem. One is your definition of the problem. Second, how you solve it. Are you doing it correctly?

I believe that the issues that I've attempted to define are serious issues. Take my Waldorf speech, the so-called Year of Europe speech. It came at a period when we had opened to China and opened to the Soviet Union and when we had ended the Vietnam war.

Until we had accomplished at least some of those objectives, I did not see how a creative period of relationship with Europe would be possible, because the disagreement with our Vietnam policy in Europe was too deep. The fear of nuclear confrontation was too great, as was the fear that the United States was somehow to blame for this state of hostility in the world.

So, in early 1973, I thought the time was opportune to move towards a serious dialogue with Europe, and I thought it was all the more essential because I did not want success to become identified in

² Document 8.

³ Kissinger's Pilgrims speech in London, Document 24.

the public consciousness only with relations with adversaries, and I felt that the old Atlantic relationship would over a period of time become so much taken for granted and so much the province of an older generation that the next generation would consider it as something not relevant to itself.

Debate Over Consultation

I think that this perception was essentially correct. Why did it lead to this intense dialogue? One reason is that, at that particular moment, Europe was enormously absorbed with itself. Every European country, it soon became apparent, had a leadership crisis of its own and was trying to sort out its own domestic problems. Beyond that, Europe was very much occupied in forming its own identity, and it had so much difficulty in doing so that any greater conception seemed a threat to whatever autonomy they had so painfully wrested from their deliberations.

So we became involved in an abstruse theoretical debate over the nature of consultation, something that could never be written down because you can't wave a paper at somebody and tell him he's obliged to consult if he doesn't want to consult.

Then the Middle East war occurred, and that had a tendency to emphasize national frustrations, so that the larger dialogue that I had sought took a long time to get started, but finally the end result was pretty close to what we had asked—though not completely in the spirit I had hoped to evoke. We got the documents we wanted, but we didn't get the spirit of creativity that, for example, the Marshall offer evoked.

Now, similarly, with the Pilgrim speech in London. It was not received very warmly because, again, it was looked at very much from the national point of view. Nevertheless, events have moved us inevitably in that direction. The emergency sharing program which seemed revolutionary in February, has now been accepted by all the countries. Even France, I hope, will find some way of relating itself to it.

And we are now engaged in discussions which will go far beyond what we could talk about last year. In the late nineteen forties the mere fact that the United States was willing to commit itself was a tremendous event. Now, this is probably not enough, and our aspirations have to be expressed in action rather than in debate.

Q On that point, when you offer, as a basis for discussion with the Europeans and the rest of the world, a sharing of oil in a crisis, do you believe that the spirit of this country will accept it? When you come down to a question of producing oil for other countries who are in worse shape than we are, is it politically possible in this country to do it?

U.S. Disillusionment

A There is undoubtedly a profound disillusionment in America with foreign involvement in general. We have carried the burden for a generation. In fact, if you go back to the beginning of World War II, it doesn't seem to end. Most programs have been sold to Americans with the argument that they would mean an end of exertion. Now we have to convince Americans that there will never be an end to exertion. That's a very difficult problem.

And if you look at some of our recent debates you would have to say we could fail. I don't think that those in key positions at this particular moment have any real choice. At a minimum, we have to tell the American people what we think is needed. If they do not agree, at least they will know 10 years from now, if there is a catastrophe, what happened. And then there is a chance of restoring a sense of direction. But if 10 years from now there is a catastrophe and people say, "Why didn't somebody tell us about this and why didn't they ask us to do what they should have foreseen?", then I think our whole system may be in difficulty.

Q That's a critical point because I don't think the country—if one may presume to think about what the country thinks—has the vaguest idea of what it is called upon to do. We are complaining about how the oil-producing nations are using their resources, and yet we have larger reserves of food in North America than the nations of the Middle East have oil resources, and yet here we are now arguing our national interests. We are against high prices for oil, but we are still a very gluttonous wasteful country. Can that be made clear?

A I think it is fair to say that we ourselves—I say "we," those who have positions of responsibility at this moment—we ourselves are learning the magnitude of the challenges as we go along. In 1969, when I came to Washington, I remember a study on the energy problem which proceeded from the assumption that there would always be an energy surplus. It wasn't conceivable that there would be a shortage of energy.

Until 1972, we thought we had inexhaustible food surpluses, and the fact that we have to shape our policy deliberately to relate ourselves to the rest of the world did not really arise until 1973, when we did call for a world food conference.

But you are right. We have to tell the American people what they are called upon to do. That is our biggest problem. It's our biggest challenge right now. And will they support it? I hope that they will. I am, in fact, confident that they will.

For the Country

Q Can you define what those questions are that should be put to the country? What does the government want the responsible citizen to

do? He hasn't had much lead from you and your colleagues and the Government as to what you wish him to do.

A I am not sure that I agree with whether he has received leadership from my colleagues and me. I think it is also fair to say that the nature of our debate for many years now has been so bitter that it's hard to put forward a conception that doesn't immediately get ripped apart by an attack on motives.

But leaving that aside, I think in foreign policy we need a national understanding of what is needed, what is meant by peace, and an understanding that we are living in a world in which peace cannot be imposed on others, which means that sometimes the outcomes must be less than perfect. I have been concerned about the détente debate because so often the issue is put in terms of—did the Soviets benefit from a particular deal? Of course, they must benefit, or they won't feel a stake in maintaining the resulting structure.

So, we have to know what we mean by peace. We have to know what we mean by cooperation, and we have above all to understand these big issues which we have been discussing, like energy and food, in which our actions will crucially determine what happens in the rest of the world.

And, of course, what happens in the rest of the world will play back to us, so we cannot afford an isolated approach. If we try a solo effort in energy and, as a result, Italy collapses or Britain has a crisis, that is going to bring about so many political transformations that, within a very brief period of time, we would be affected in ways that even the average citizen would feel very acutely.

On food, the same is true in reverse. We there have an opportunity to demonstrate that when we talk interdependence, we are not just talking an American desire to exploit the resources of other nations. What we are saying is for our own benefit, of course. But it is also for the benefit of everybody else. Now, that requires many changes in our thinking. Of course, senior officials are always so busy with the day-to-day problems that they always seem to think one can wait for a day or a week to articulate the bigger issues.

It is also true that our people have been so preoccupied with domestic problems that it is not so easy to get attention for the longer term.

Vision of the World

Q If we do not see this problem of interdependence, what's the vision that you have of the world? What will happen to Western Civilization?

A If we do not get a recognition of our interdependence, the Western civilization that we now have is almost certain to disintegrate

because it will first lead to a series of rivalries in which each region will try to maximize its own special advantages. That inevitably will lead to tests of strength of one sort or another. These will magnify domestic crises in many countries, and they will then move more and more to authoritarian models.

I would expect then that we will certainly have crises which no leadership is able to deal with, and probably military confrontations. But even if you don't have military confrontations, you will certainly, in my view, have systemic crises similar to those of the twenties and thirties, but under conditions when world consciousness has become global.

Q Well, now, that is your nightmare.

A That's right.

Q What are your hopes? We are halfway between the end of the last world war, a little more, and the end of the century. As an historian, and not as a Secretary of State, looking back, if one can, from the end of the century to this era, how can the nations find some way of living together or going beyond the nation-state to something else?

A Looking toward the end of the century, I would hope that Western Europe, Japan and the United States would have found a way of not just overcoming the current economic crisis, but turning it into something positive by understanding the responsibilities they share for each other's progress and for developing cooperative policies that are explicitly directed towards world interests.

This requires a degree of financial solidarity, a degree of equalizing burdens and a degree of ability to set common goals that cannot be done on a purely national basis. This, incidentally, requires a united Europe because with a plethora of nation-states in Europe we'll never be able to do this.

Must Halt Arms Race

In relation to the Soviet Union and Communist China, we should have achieved a position, not of having overcome all our difficulties, but having reached a point where the solution of these difficulties by war becomes less and less conceivable and, over time, should have become inconceivable. This means that there must be a visible and dramatic downturn in the arms race. Otherwise, that race itself is going to generate so many fears that it can be maintained only by a degree of public exhortation that is inconsistent over a historic period with a policy of relaxation, and maybe even with peace.

The underdeveloped nations—the now underdeveloped nations—should by then have lost their sense of inferiority and should feel not that they have to extort, but that they should participate. Thus, what I said earlier about the relationship between Western Europe, the United

States and Japan should have begun to be institutionalized to embrace at least some of the key countries, and the Soviet Union and China must be related to that.

Take the food problem. I do not believe that over an indefinite future, we can solve the problem of world food reserves if the Soviet Union and Communist China do not accept obligations of their own, or if they simply rely on the rest of the world's production to solve their problems on an annual basis.

Q What should they be doing?

A Well, I think—and I will speak about that at the World Food Conference—we have to develop over the next five to ten years some conceptions of the reserves that should exist and the contribution that the major countries should make. Countries that will not participate should not then ask necessarily equal rights to participate in purchases of reserve stocks. But this is something that requires further study.

Q Do you foresee in the next decade the possibility of political disarray in Europe and of enormous human tragedy in other parts of the world?

A I think we are delicately poised right now. I genuinely think that the next decade could either be a period that in retrospect will look like one of the great periods of human creativity, or it could be the beginning of extraordinary disarray.

Hope in Adversity

Q Is it possible—and it is obviously a Scottish Calvinist point of view that the greatest hope of progress is adversity—that we are now really up against economic, financial and social problems of such magnitude that we are suddenly being forced, even by inflation, into a view of life that could be more hopeful?

A While this period has more strain than, say, a decade ago, it has also infinitely more opportunities, because we really have no choice except to address our problems. Who would have thought of an international food policy or a world food conference 10 years ago, or could have been taken seriously if he had? Today, it is only a question of time until we develop it, and the real question is, will we develop it soon enough? I think we can.

Q Is there a danger that if we do not deal with the world problems that here at home we would become so frustrated that we would retreat, not into the old-time isolationism, but into a kind of chauvinism that would make the whole question of world order really quite impossible?

A It is a big problem. There is such a tendency in America, but at least part of our chauvinism is disappointed idealism, so it's always a question of whether one can evoke the idealism.

[Omitted here is discussion of the organization and management of the Department of State.]

Soviet Union vs. China

Q When I was in Europe just a few weeks ago, the question was raised there about your concept of China and of the Soviet Union. The question was raised whether in your mind you have not actually chosen one over the other, and in the process were playing one up against the other. Could you clarify that?

A When one analyzes foreign policy, there is always the temptation to look at the day-to-day tactics and not at the underlying reality. Any attempt to play off the Soviet Union and Communist China against each other would have a high risk that, at least for tactical reasons, they would combine against us. The rivalry and tensions between the Soviet Union and Communist China were not created by the United States. In fact, we didn't believe in their reality for much too long a time. They cannot be exploited by the United States. They can only be noted by the United States.

The correct policy for the United States is to take account of what exists and to conduct a policy of meticulous honesty with both of them, so that neither believes we are trying to use one against the other. In the course of events, it may happen that one may feel that it is gaining benefit against the other as a result of dealing with us, but that cannot be our aim or purpose.

We have meticulously avoided forms of cooperation with the Soviet Union that could be construed as directed against China. We have never signed agreements whose chief purpose could be seen as directed against China, and conversely we have never participated with China in declarations that could be seen as aimed at the Soviet Union. We have developed our bilateral relationships with both, and left them to sort out their relationships with each other. In fact, we have rarely talked to either of them about the other.

The Kissinger Legacy

Q When you leave this office, what is it you want to have achieved at the end of your service?

A It used to be that the overwhelming concern of any President or Secretary of State had to be to make a contribution to peace in the traditional sense. That is to say, to reduce tensions among nations or regions. That remains, of course, an essential preoccupation. History has, I think, placed me in a key position at a time when we are moving from the relics of the postwar period toward a new international structure.

The Administration did not invent that structure. It did have, however, an opportunity to contribute to it—an opportunity that did not

exist 10 years earlier and that may not exist 10 years later. Now, the difference between that structure and the previous period is that there are more factors to consider and that it has to be built not on the sense of the pre-eminence of two power centers, but on the sense of participation of those who are part of the global environment.

This has required a change in the American perception of the nature of foreign policy. What is described as excessive pragmatism is really a rather conscious attempt to try to educate myself, my generation, and my associates, insofar as I can contribute to living with the world as it is now emerging. Pragmatism unrelated to a purpose becomes totally self-destructive.

In addition, I would like to leave at least the beginning of a perception of a structure that goes beyond these centers of power, and moves towards a global conception. There is no question in my mind that, by the end of the century, this will be the dominant reality of our time. I believe we have to move towards it now.

Q Can you define it?

A Before I go to that, let me say one other thing that I have been very much concerned with. However long I stay, it will be but a temporary episode. To succeed in these objectives, I will have to leave behind a public understanding and, above all, an intellectual understanding in the State Department that can carry on not only the detailed policies, but an overall understanding of where America fits into the global scheme of things. I intend to give increasing attention to this problem.

[Omitted here is discussion of the position of Secretary of State, the role of Congress in decision-making, and intelligence organizations.]

A View of America

Q I'm more interested in the rising generation than I am in the contemporary problem, and for that reason I wanted to ask you this: A colleague of mine went to see Willy Brandt and asked, "What does the young generation in Germany now think of America?" And Brandt replied, "The magic is gone." And when he was asked what he meant by that, it was that we have used power, he thought, in a way that did not comport to our ideals, particularly in Vietnam, but there was something beyond that, a kind of sense that we were engaged in a kind of disintegration. He mentioned the drug culture in America as being profoundly worrisome and that somehow we had lost our ideals in the way in which we approach the world.

A I was told last year that the public opinion polls in Germany in the second half of the year dramatically changed from showing a declining image of the United States to increasingly favoring the United States. The explanation I was given was the end of the Vietnam war and the decisive handling of the Middle East crisis.

The Germans, the younger Germans, again saw the United States as a nation that could solve problems—and that is one of the elements of the American appeal.

America has gone through many changes, dramatic changes, in the last decade. We even began to develop a new isolationism. The old isolationism was based on the proposition that we were too good for this world; the new isolationism was based on the proposition that we're not good enough for it.

When one looks at the process of growing up, it is largely a process of learning one's limits, that one is not immortal, that one cannot achieve everything; and then to draw from that realization the strength to set great goals nevertheless. Now, I think that as a country we've gone through this. We were immature in the sense that we thought the definition of goals was almost the equivalent of their realization.

Then we went to the opposite extreme, and I think from this point of view the Kennedy period is likely to be seen as the end of an era, rather than as the beginning of one: the last great flowering of the naive version of American idealism. And I don't say this as a criticism.

I think now that the drug culture, the student rebellion, are in that sense behind us. Of course, we still have the drug culture, but as problems that threaten the spirit of America, I think they either are behind us or could be behind us if we can now do what any adult has to do in his life. When you get to the recognition of your limits, then the question becomes whether you transcend them or wallow in them. That is a choice that is up to us.

Q From the period from Roosevelt through the Kennedy period, the central theme of this country was that we could do anything in the world, and then we ran into some disappointments and seemed to go into a phase of self-doubt in which we began to wonder whether we could do anything effectively. Now, do we have the self-confidence and the essential trust in one another and in our institutions to support the kind of foreign policy you want?

A I have to say this is the big question I ask myself. In some strange way, I think the American people have come through these recent crises in rather good shape. I would not have thought you could have assassinations, the Vietnam war, Watergate, and all that went with it, and still have basic confidence in government.

Among the intellectual and political leadership groups, I'm not so sure. But even there, as I said earlier, during the Watergate period, there was support for foreign policy. There is still a remarkable sense of national cohesion, so I am basically optimistic. But above all, I don't think we have any choice except to try, and in this respect, the American idealistic tradition gives the United States a resource that exists in no other country in the world.

In this country, even with all the isolationism, when you talk about a sense of responsibility, you touch the core of people; you can mention very few other countries of the world where it could be even a plausible argument.

Cohesion of the West

Q At one point the West was bound together by certain religious ideals, certain moral ideals. What is it that binds the free world together today, if anything?

A Well, what binds us together on an unsatisfactory level is industrial civilization which imposes common realities and necessities on all of us. We are also tied together by an approach to politics in which ultimately the fulfillment of human needs plays a central role. Now, the definition of what those needs are can be disputed, but that it does play a crucial role is clear. Indeed, much of the political turmoil in the industrialized world is caused by the uncertainty as to precisely what those deeper needs are.

We are tied together, too, by a perception of politics in which various groups and the individual play a crucial role. And the combination of industrial necessity plus the fact that a complicated society cannot be run by direction and must have a certain amount of consensus will in time begin to permeate even totalitarian regimes.

Q Do you see the possibility of a closer regional understanding, and even structural development of regionalism, within the Hemisphere in the foreseeable future?

A Since I've become Secretary of State, I've spent a considerable amount of time on Western Hemisphere relationships. If it is true that the relations between industrialized and developing nations are essential features of our period, then in the Western Hemisphere where we are dealing with countries of similar traditions, and indeed, similar history—this is where a beginning must be made. If we cannot solve it creatively here, it is hard to know how we can be creative about it elsewhere.

How formal that structure can be, I don't know. I have found two things: One is that the mere act of dialogue in the Western Hemisphere has had an emotional response; and, secondly, I have been struck in my meetings—I've now attended three foreign ministers' meetings in the Western Hemisphere—by the fact that if one read the records without the mood of the meetings, one would find in them a litany of criticism of the United States. But if one actually was at the meetings, one had the sense that this was a family quarrel; that in some intangible way, one was talking as a member of the family.

So I think that in the Western Hemisphere we have the possibilities of a creative phase, provided the United States can shed its traditional

predominance and recognize that the decisions that emerge must be genuinely felt by our friends in the Western Hemisphere to be theirs.

Need for Sacrifice

Q Is it reasonable for the American people to go on assuming, in a hungry world where raw materials are increasingly scarce, that our standard of living each year can go on going up, or do we have to face new responsibilities and even some sacrifices in this country in order to bring about some kind of world order?

A Now, here I'm talking off the top of my head. I would think, if we look ahead to the year 2000 and beyond, we have to be prepared to face a world quite different from what we have now. We see it already in energy. I believe that the day of the 400-horsepower engine is over, whether it's this year or five years from now. You're going to see different types of automobiles, and that affects our style of life.

We will have to develop a global food policy. We cannot deal with issues like this week's grain sale to the Soviet Union⁴ on a crash basis every few months. To do so will affect our whole perception of the relationship of agriculture to our society and our foreign policy.

Weakness of Communism

Q When you talk about cooperation between the Communists and the capitalist world, where do you see this leading? To the domination of one over the other, or to a combination of the two, or what?

A I think that any attempt at domination in a nuclear age is going to involve risks that are catastrophic and would not be tolerated. If we remain strong enough to prevent the imposition of Communist hegemony, then I believe that transformations of the Communist societies are inevitable. I believe that the imposition of state control of the kind that communism demands is totally incompatible with the requirements of human organization at this moment.

The pressure of this realization on Communist systems is going to bring about a transformation apart from any conscious policy the United States pursues, so long as there is not a constant foreign danger that can be invoked to impose regimentation.

What inherent reason is there that keeps the Communist societies in Eastern Europe from achieving the standard of living of those of Western Europe? The resources are about the same, the industrial orga-

⁴ On October 4, Ford placed a hold on wheat and corn contracts that American exporting firms had negotiated with the Soviet Union in order to prevent speculation. See William M. Blair, "2 New Shipments of American Grain to Soviet Halted," *New York Times*, October 5, 1974, p. 1.

nization is there. I think the reason is inherent in the type of society that has been created, and that I believe must inevitably change.

Looking Back

Q Looking back over these almost six years, is there anything in the conduct of our foreign policy that you regret, that you would like to change?

A I'm quite convinced that I'll be much more reflective a year or two after I leave here than I can be today. What I regret is that so much of the time had to be spent on the Vietnam war. If we could have got that behind us more rapidly, we could have brought the more positive side of our foreign policy to fruition at a time when attitudes were less rigidly formed.

The real tragedy was Watergate, because I believe that at the beginning of President Nixon's second term, we had before us—due to changing conditions—a period of potential creativity. We contributed some of that potential, but some of it was inherent in the objective situation.

Instead, we had to spend almost all of our energy in preserving what existed, rather than building on the foundations that had been laid. Even the Year of Europe could have gone differently in a different environment. But you never know what opportunities may have been lost.

Those are my big regrets. There are many tactical things I would in retrospect perhaps do differently, but I think it's premature to speculate on those.

Now, what problems I leave to my successor depends, of course, at what time I leave, and I don't want to have this sound as a valedictory. If I resigned today, he would have the Middle East problem in mid-solution.

I think we are now at a point where the framework of the structure exists, if we can put it together. We have the raw material, we have the elements, we've identified them, I hope, correctly. We are at the beginning of building a consciousness of the global community that must come after us.

Q Can you see a settlement of the Middle East thing in, say, before we get to the Bicentennial, or the end of this Administration?

A Before we get to the Bicentennial I think we can make considerable progress, at least to a point where one can see the settlement emerging. But it could also go very badly. That is yet a delicate point.

Role of Intellectuals

Q You once said to me that you were relying very heavily—even when you were in the middle of your service in Washington this time—

on concepts and intellectual support you had got from your colleagues in Cambridge way back in '59, and that you felt a lack of this as time went on. Is that still true?

A I think it is true. As I look back, for example, at the area of strategic arms limitation, most of the creative thought with which I am familiar dates back to the late fifties and was then introduced into the Government first in the Kennedy Administration and then, I hope, in ours.

Two things are lacking now: One, the same sense of relationship towards the Government that intellectuals had then; now they volunteer less and participate less. Secondly, there is a lack of relevant intellectual work.

Intellectuals are now divided into essentially three groups: those that reject the Government totally; those that work on pure, abstract intellectual models which are impossible to make relevant; and a third group that's too close to power and that sees its service to the Government as residing primarily in day-to-day tactics. No outsider can be very helpful on the day-to-day business because he doesn't know enough of the current situation to really make a contribution.

The best service intellectuals can render is, first, to ask important questions and that's a difficult problem, and, second, to provide a middle-term perspective. But for that they need to have some compassion for the problems of the policy-maker, just as he needs an understanding of their needs. I feel the lack, and I hope that now that our domestic climate is somewhat better we can restore mutual confidence.

Q Was it not a great mistake to wipe out the Office of the Science Adviser who was bringing in objective thought? I felt that lack of it, for example, on the whole question of oil and other raw materials.

A I think it's a pity. I hope that some focal point is created which will look upon the intellectual community as its constituency, and that they will be listened to.

Q Just one last point: I take it that you are saying that you don't want this to be interpreted as a swan song?

A Yes.

47. Editorial Note

The United Nations World Food Conference commenced in Rome on November 5, 1974. Secretary of State Henry Kissinger, who proposed such a forum during his September 24, 1973, speech to the U.N. General Assembly (Document 17), delivered the keynote address on the first day of the conference. After highlighting the dire food supply situation the world faced, Kissinger exhorted: "We must act now and we must act together to regain control over our shared destiny. Catastrophe when it cannot be foreseen can be blamed on a failure of vision or on forces beyond our control. But the current trend is obvious, and the remedy is within our power. If we do not act boldly, disaster will result from a failure of will; moral culpability will be inherent in our foreknowledge.

"The political challenge is straightforward: Will the nations of the world cooperate to confront a crisis which is both self-evident and global in nature? Or will each nation or region or bloc see its special advantage as a weapon instead of a contribution? Will we pool our strengths and progress together or test our strengths and sink together?

"President Ford has instructed me to declare on behalf of the United States: We regard our good fortune and strength in the field of food as a global trust. We recognize the responsibilities we bear by virtue of our extraordinary productivity, our advanced technology, and our tradition of assistance. That is why we proposed this conference. That is why a Secretary of State is giving this address. The United States will make a major effort to match its capacity to the magnitude of the challenge. We are convinced that the collective response will have an important influence on the nature of the world that our children inherit.

"As we move toward the next century the nations assembled here must begin to fashion a global conception. For we are irreversibly linked to each other—by interdependent economies and human aspirations, by instant communications and nuclear peril. The contemporary agenda of energy, food, and inflation exceeds the capacity of any single government, or even of a few governments together, to resolve."

Kissinger devoted the remainder of his address to outlining the historical precedents and current realities of the global food crisis. Resolving the problem required the United States and other nations to mount an "urgent cooperative worldwide action," designed to increase and accelerate production, improve food quality and distribution networks, and guard against crop emergencies. The Secretary then detailed the ways in which the United States planned to meet these goals and concluded his remarks by stating: "Our responsibility is clear. Let the nations gathered here resolve to confront the challenge, not each

other. Let us agree that the scale and severity of the task require a collaborative effort unprecedented in history. And let us make global cooperation in food a model for our response to other challenges of an interdependent world: energy, inflation, population, protection of the environment.” (Department of State *Bulletin*, December 16, 1974, pages 821–829) For the text of the four resolutions delegates adopted at the conclusion of the conference, see *ibid.*, pages 831–837. Documentation on U.S. planning for and participation in the World Food Conference is in *Foreign Relations*, 1969–1976, volume E–14, part 1, Documents on the United Nations, and *ibid.*, volume XXXI, Foreign Economic Policy, 1973–1976.

At a December 4 meeting of the International Food Review Group, comprised of representatives from the Departments of State, Treasury, and Agriculture, the Office of Management and Budget, the Council of Economic Advisers, the Council on International Economic Policy, the Economic Policy Board, and the National Security Council, Kissinger returned to the question of U.S. participation in resolving the food crisis: “First of all, let me explain what I think are the foreign policy interests in the food problem. My hope is that by explaining our foreign policy interests, it will help us in our later considerations. I think that one of the basic strategies we should pursue—what we want to create—is an overall statement of policy toward the food problem in relations to us and in the face of contingencies in the energy and food fields. In my view, systematic planning is one way—probably the only way—that we can get this food problem solved. I think it was a tragedy that the World Food Conference got off onto food aid and did not stick to planning. I wish now that we would have played down the food aid thing. In my view, the answer to the food problem is a systematic approach toward production, stockpiling and so forth.”

After Secretary of Agriculture Earl Butz expressed his agreement, Kissinger continued: “I think that for us to have gotten into a debate in Rome over who should be giving what was a pity. The basic theme—the basic problem as I see it from a foreign policy viewpoint—is that the food problem is a structural problem of the world economy. And, I think we should correlate our solutions with other countries. One of our major contributions is going to be aid, there is no doubt about that. But, in my opinion, I think it a pity that so many countries are obsessed with this food aid thing. They are off the track.” The memorandum of conversation is printed in full *ibid.*, Document 280.

48. Memorandum of Conversation¹

Washington, November 16, 1974.

PARTICIPANTS

President Ford

Dr. Henry A. Kissinger, Secretary of State and Assistant to the President for National Security Affairs

Lt. General Brent Scowcroft, Deputy Assistant to the President for National Security Affairs

[Omitted here is discussion of the Middle East.]

President: This talk about a war—doesn't it make the American people realize the seriousness of it?

Kissinger: Yes, but this talk is irresponsible. The press was trying yesterday to make headlines—that it is irresponsible for you to go on a trip,² that your Middle East policy is bankrupt and you ought to stay here and put it back together.

[There is discussion of Rockefeller]³

Kissinger: Dobrynin says the impact on the Soviets of Rockefeller is very bad. He keeps saying there is stability domestically but they don't understand. For a Rockefeller to go through this after 40 years in politics, four times elected governor, they can't believe it.

President: It is a vicious partisan jugular operation.

Kissinger: I told the television executives that we had not had catharsis after Vietnam because of Watergate and the country is awash with negativism. I said they were all responsible, that no idea got followed up, etc. They argued bitterly, but they called last night and apologized and said they would see how they could help. I said they should

¹ Source: Ford Library, National Security Adviser, Memoranda of Conversations, 1973–1977, Box 7, Memoranda of Conversations—Ford Administration, November 16, 1974—Ford, Kissinger. Secret; Nodis. The conversation took place in the Oval Office. According to the President's Daily Diary, the meeting was held from 10:50 a.m. until 12:10 p.m. (Ibid., Staff Secretary's Office) Also printed in *Foreign Relations*, 1969–1976, volume XVI, Soviet Union, August 1974–December 1976, Document 88.

² Reference is to the advisability of Ford undertaking a foreign trip—scheduled for November 17–24 to Japan, South Korea, and the Soviet Union—without a confirmed Vice President in office. Former New York Governor Nelson A. Rockefeller's nomination for Vice President had stalled in Congress. During a meeting with the *Time* editorial board on November 11, Kissinger responded to a query as to whether Ford should follow his scheduled itinerary: "I think he has to go ahead now that it is set up. Of course, it was set up when the President thought Rockefeller would be confirmed before the [mid-term Congressional] election." Kissinger then termed the equivocation over Rockefeller "a national disgrace." (National Archives, RG 59, Records of Henry A. Kissinger, 1973–77, Lot 91D414, Box 26, Category C—Kissinger Memcons, November 1974–March 1975)

³ Brackets are in the original.

just support any decent idea we put forth—not simple negativism, nor did we want partisan support.

Bundy⁴ called to say the energy speech could be a rallying point if you would get some Democrats around it.

President: In the case of the Marshall Plan, there was always a leadership group outside the White House which mobilized public opinion and supported the policies. That doesn't exist.

On this trip, let's talk about some people—labor, news media, academics, access to the board—that we could get to get going.

Kissinger: I would suggest that you put out a few themes to push, not 100.

President: We did a lousy job of selling in October.⁵ "Fortune" analyzed my October speech and said it was good but not sold.

Kissinger: Self-help is good here and the government doing it is bad. But your opponents are on the side of the government doing it. There is potential here.

On the trip, UNDOF might not be renewed. There will be no war. Nothing will happen before the Egyptian next step. If we don't get one, we are in trouble. If we get one, we are in pretty good shape.

There is the [*less than 1 line not declassified*]

We must discuss how to discuss with Brezhnev the Middle East.⁶ Gromyko is hard-line because of his bureaucratic experience. I told Dobrynin we are fighting for our domestic lives here—if we wanted a stalemate, we would go to Geneva.

Dobrynin asked about you. I said you were more direct but your instinct was more to the right than Nixon. It is better to have them worry a bit. We lost two years with Kennedy because they thought he was too easy and rattled. If you could show you had an option and an instinct to go to the right . . .

President: I have a tough and bombastic side . . .

⁴ McGeorge Bundy, former President's Special Assistant for National Security Affairs (1961–1966).

⁵ Presumably a reference to Ford's October 8 address to a joint session of Congress on economic matters. The President used the address to introduce the administration's Whip Inflation Now (WIN) program, aimed at creating "inflation fighters and energy savers" of the American people. See *Public Papers: Ford, 1974*, pp. 228–238.

⁶ Ford met with Brezhnev at the Okeanskaya military sanitarium near Vladivostok November 23–24. Most of their discussions focused on arms limitation. The November 24 Vladivostok agreement sought to establish an overall limit on ICBMs, SLBMs, and long-range bombers for both the United States and the Soviet Union. The text of the agreement is scheduled for publication in *Foreign Relations, 1969–1976*, volume XXXIII, SALT II, 1972–1979. Documentation on the summit is *ibid.*, volume XVI, Soviet Union, August 1974–December 1976.

Kissinger: I wouldn't do that. I would show him still just a bit then throttle it. Be firm but friendly.

President: How many will be in the meetings?

Kissinger: With President Nixon, we had very few.

President: I would prefer no private meetings for two reasons: I want to show we are close and friendly. This is the big league.

Kissinger: You are in the Brezhnev league right now. I wouldn't worry about your meeting him alone, but we should have a record of it.

President: I want them to know we are a team and would prefer not to meet alone.

Kissinger: Let's see how it goes. You shouldn't let it look like you are afraid to deal with him alone. You could speak alone and say stay in touch—we both have pressures but we must do our best. Take the Middle East: we must not let the Arabs play us against each other. We eventually have to go back to Geneva.

President: Yes, especially if there is a stalemate. They would prove worthwhile only we could make progress.

Kissinger: You don't have to worry about comparison with Nixon. He was a poor negotiator. He was tough in private, but last June he hardly knew what the subject was.⁷ Nixon never liked to say no face-to-face. The Soviets respected him not for the negotiations but for his toughness, his daring to mine Haiphong just before his meeting with them.

President: I supported all those hard decisions.

Kissinger: The Soviets didn't respect Kennedy—they thought he was weak. [Described SALT I crises and Nixon being mad.]⁸ I wouldn't get into specifics with him head to head. If you two confront each other, there is no one to fall back on.

Their normal pattern is to start out friendly, then have one tough session, where you just stay calm and strong.

I think he wants a SALT agreement. He wants to be able to report he has established a relationship with you; third, he will want to assess you in a crisis.

President: If you see things heading the wrong way, don't hesitate to set it straight.

Kissinger: We have a tough problem on the Middle East, and they do have a point. The theme in general for you to hit is that we are willing to cooperate in many areas. Be blunt with them in the crunches.

⁷ During the Moscow summit June 27–July 3. See footnote 2, Document 36.

⁸ Brackets are in the original.

President: Can I say I hope they don't get the impression that the American people are in bad shape?

Kissinger: You shouldn't do it that way. Act confident. You can say that we always have a unified country in foreign policy on major issues—and that you have great flexibility. You can mention the right-wing problems, and Jackson. You can reaffirm all our commitments and say we have to consider each other's needs. Tell them you expect to be in until 1980 and our election was on internal issues. Ask him what is on his mind right at first.

Japan I am not worried about.⁹ Hit them on the energy thing. You won't get a full endorsement, but this is an opportunity to mobilize the West like anti-Communism was.

You could mention to Brezhnev the danger of a Japanese-Chinese alliance. Say that is why we want to keep Japan tied to us and that is why we support Japan in Siberia.

The Chinese aren't with us because they like us. They are cold-bloodedly using us. For 10 years we should support the Chinese, then we may have to join the Soviet Union. The Japanese are a great danger. In all their history they've never had permanent alignments.

The Japanese can do anything. They have such an unusual society that they can adjust to anything. The basic structure of their society can accommodate to any kind of system.

If we decline in world power, we will lose the Japanese. They have no psychological understanding of other societies—they do every insensitive thing while being very sensitive themselves. Don't give Brezhnev all this but let him know there are things that only you two can do.

Your big problem will be the alliance thing. You should say you share the interest in preserving nuclear peace. Don't be too negative. You agree with the objective but this is a monumental issue. I will write out some questions for you to give him.

⁹ President Ford stopped in Tokyo for a State visit before traveling to Vladivostok.

49. Memorandum of Conversation¹

December 17, 1974, 5 p.m.

PARTICIPANTS

The Secretary
Deputy Secretary Ingersoll
Linwood Holton
Congressman Fraser
Senator Cranston
Congressman Gibbons
Congressman Bingham
Congressman Biester
Congressman Harrington
Congressman Roe
Congressman Buchanan
Parker Borg (notetaker)

SUBJECT

Human Rights

The Secretary: I hope we can have several of these meetings as the new Congress begins. I'd like to get your views on a number of subjects. I hope these sessions will not be confrontations. We hope that we will be able to let you know what our problems are and what Congress might be able to do to help us.

Mr. Holton: I think we should address first the confidentiality of this session. How do you want to handle it?

Congressman Fraser: We'll accept your ground rules.

The Secretary: Since we'd like to discuss a wide variety of matters, I think it would be best to keep all of this off the record.

Congressman Fraser: We appreciate very much the opportunity to meet with you. We know you have a very busy schedule. We also know of the many positive things which have been done recently in the field of human rights; the appointment of human rights officers. We also appreciate very much the assistance which Deputy Secretary Ingersoll has been on the Korean human rights problem. We originally proposed this

¹ Source: National Archives, RG 59, Records of Henry A. Kissinger, 1973–77, Lot 91D414, Box 22, Classified External Memcons December 1974–April 1975. Confidential. Drafted by Parker Borg. The location of the meeting is not indicated; presumably it took place at the Department of State. The Senators and Congressmen at the meeting were members of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee and House Foreign Affairs Committee. Also published in *Foreign Relations*, 1969–1976, volume E–3, Documents on Global Issues, 1973–1976, Document 245.

meeting because of the *New York Times* article not too long ago about U.S. involvement in Chilean affairs,² but that is all past history. We're interested now in where we go from here. About 13 of us had lunch yesterday and all expressed approximately the same sentiment. Basically we feel it's very difficult to continue to support foreign assistance programs to governments which oppress their own people. We feel that the United States should be putting stronger emphasis on human rights issues in countries around the world. Don't be mistaken, we are all internationalists and believe that the United States has an important role to play in the world community. As part of the Foreign Aid Bill, for example, we have provided an additional 20 million for Korea if the President reports to Congress that the government of South Korea is making substantial progress in the observance of internationally recognized standards of human rights.

Senator Cranston: The Aid Bill was decided by one vote in the Senate. Many of us have continuing problems with the Foreign Aid Bill because of the human rights issue.

The Secretary: Let me start by giving you some of my views on the human rights issue—how the United States perceives foreign policy. About one month after I came into office, I spoke at the *Pacem In Terris* Conference³ on Gaullism and the greatness of France. I think we have a similar issue in relation to human rights in the U.S. Foreign Policy. The United States stands for something, on that I agree. We have no dispute. I would be prepared to meet with Congressman and Senators to discuss this on any occasion, but there are a number of problems. First there is the issue of tactics. On any given issue, how should we express our views on human rights issues. For example, the current dispute between Senator Jackson and the State Department on the emigration of Jews from the Soviet Union. We do not believe in the involvement by the United States in the internal affairs of the Soviet Union.⁴ This is not going to be helpful in our relations. When we started talking quietly there were only 400 Jews allowed to depart annually. By quiet discussions we were able to build up the number of 35,000. In our view it is the results that are important, not the publicity. We'd like to use our better relations with the Soviet Union to permit them to solve their

² Apparent reference to Seymour M. Hersh, "C.I.A. Chief Tells House of \$8-Million Campaign Against Allende in '70-73," *New York Times*, September 8, 1974, p. 1. Hersh reported that Colby had testified to Congress that the Nixon administration had authorized the use of millions of dollars for covert activities to undermine the leadership of Chilean President Salvador Allende Gossens, who was overthrown in a coup d'état on September 11, 1973.

³ See Document 19.

⁴ See Document 31.

problem. Take Chile as another example. I could give you a list of representations we've made to the Chilean Government on behalf of human rights. I can cite one specific case where Minister Rabasa at an OAS meeting had asked for the release of 200 people who had taken asylum in various embassies in Santiago. I spoke with the Foreign Minister and our Ambassador said things to the General. We said if you can work out some way to release these people, you'll get the credit. There will be no mention of American involvement. Rabasa went down subsequently and was able to secure their release. Another example is the case of Kudirka the Lithuanian seaman who tried to jump ship a couple of years ago.⁵ President Ford met with Dobrynin shortly after coming into office.⁶ Dobrynin asked for a general reaffirmation of all former commitments between the United States and the Soviet Union. The President made a very strong pitch about the release of Kudirka. He said we don't want a cause célèbre. If you can work out a way to release him, we won't say anything. The Russians released him, we said nothing, but others claimed victory. The Russians were upset and thought we had gone back on our word, which in fact we hadn't. We had not said anything but others had felt very strongly that they should make something out of it.

Beyond the issue of tactics, there's a more fundamental issue. I think the best way to explain this might be by using an example from World War II when we made a decision to support the Soviet Union against the Germans. Some countries in certain circumstances must be supported no matter how unpleasant it might seem. A cut off of aid to Turkey, for example, would create larger problems even if we felt Turkey had acted incorrectly. We must not confuse what is convenience with what is essential. Congress has every right to question when issues of national security are raised. Even in national security issues, we should use what influence we have to promote the basic fundamentals of human rights. In determining values we must first define our terms. American institutions cannot be automatically translated and made meaningful to every country in the world.

⁵ On November 23, 1970, Lithuanian sailor Simas Kudirka attempted to defect to the Coast Guard cutter *Vigilant* from a Soviet trawler. Both vessels were linked off the coast of Martha's Vineyard for talks on North Atlantic fishing rights. The Coast Guard refused sanctuary to Kudirka, and he was forced to return to the Soviet ship. For additional information, see *Foreign Relations, 1969–1976*, volume XIII, Soviet Union, October 1970–October 1971, Document 57. He was released from Soviet detention in August 1974.

⁶ Ford and Kissinger met with Dobrynin on August 14. No record of the meeting has been found, but Kissinger's briefing memorandum for the President is printed *ibid.*, volume XVI, Soviet Union, August 1974–December 1976, Document 12.

I look upon the present as being similar to the period right after 1945. We have all suffered, we lack national self confidence and the resources to do many of the things that we would like to do. We cannot afford internal splits at this time. I will do my best to get policies on human rights which you can support, but foreign aid is very important and you must understand that we are not going to be able to meet this stiff criteria which you are setting for human rights in all instances.

Congressman Gibbons: It is the emphasis on military aid which bothers us. We can see a situation where the United States gets into giving aid to both sides as they did in the Indo-Pakistan situation a couple of years ago.

The Secretary: I think we have to look at the nature of the military governments. The juntas which we find in power in many parts of the world have often imposed themselves on reluctant populations. You can ask the question why do the military take over. Often the military is the only group in the developing society which is open to commoners. An oligarchy is in power and controls everything. The military offers one way that a person can move his way from the bottom to the top. Take the case of Peru. We're not giving any aid to Peru at the present time, but our inaction is for the wrong reasons. I think it was probably because of the IPC expropriations a couple of years ago. Now the Soviets have sold weapons to Peruvians and the Cubans are offering training to them. Their neighbors are all upset. If we offered training and weapons to countries like Peru, then we have a better control over their policies.

Take the example of Korea. Korea has a very strong powerful enemy to the north. The Japanese and other countries in the area rely very heavily on Korea for stability. In the Indo-Pakistani situation the continuing need for spare parts provides us with some influence over their military policies.

Congressman Bingham: Could you please address the \$20 million supplemental program for aid to Korea which is tied to the improvement in the human rights situation.

The Secretary: I haven't thought it through. We'll have to track it down after the meeting. Let me have a chance to think about it. I can say this though, that we won't chisel you on the aid or we won't fight you about it.

Congressman Fraser: After being bargained down from a higher figure, we hope the State Department will be able to put this assistance to maximum use.

The Secretary: You and Habib should have a talk about this.

Congressman Fraser: Are you aware of the American missionary who are [*was*] in Korea for 20 years, who has just been thrown out?⁷

The Secretary: Yes, but we were much more concerned about a crack down on the students.

Congressman Biester: We believe that the application of pressure from Congress can be very beneficial.

The Secretary: The thing that I'm most allergic to is the obligatory statutes. I don't mind requirements for reports of periodic progress, but I feel very strongly that obligatory requirements are counterproductive. Congress should continue, however, to express its view on human rights.

Congressman Harrington: You made a number of interesting statements about Soviet Jewry, internal involvement in affairs of other countries, and Latin American security. I would like to address the issue of our confidence in ourselves and I would like to use the issue of Chile. My point is were not our actions in Chile the cause of the problem there and which results now in the loss of our self confidence.

The Secretary: I didn't say that all of our military assistance in Latin America was for security reasons. I think we have to look at the issue of the loss of self confidence and explore the reasons for it. There are many explanations. Let me give you my view and then you should feel free to comment. To discuss the case in Chile you would have to go into much more detail than any of us have time for here. I'd like to look at it from the American perspective. If you look at recent American history you'll see we haven't had a normal government since the death of Kennedy. First there was his assassination and then there was Bobby's. Lyndon Johnson got a landslide victory in 1964 but was bogged down very much by Vietnam. The 1968–1972 victories for Nixon were tarnished by Watergate. I think that we are a society with simple beliefs. We face a situation where our leaders have been in a constant state of losing credibility. That over time is going to have a profound influence on the future of the United States. I think things are going to be alright so to speak during my tenure—but five years from now, are what's important.

On the issue of Chile I can see two ways that we could be defeated. On the one hand, one could be seeking perfection from all and never satisfied. Everything always seems to require compromise. We take actions on the basis of a series of imperfect conditions. In Chile as in any government there was of course much time pressure. I don't really agree that your presentation was correct.

⁷ The Reverend George Ogle became the first American missionary to be deported from South Korea. See Don Oberdorfer, "S. Korea Deports U.S. Cleric," *Washington Post*, December 15, 1974, p. A19.

Congressman Fraser: There's one thought that seems to be shared by all of us and that is we find it difficult to define what's vital with respect to 3rd world countries. Chile for example is further away than Moscow. I can't really associate it with a landing in any time in the future on the beaches of California. In the conduct of our foreign relations, it seems there must be a certain kind of decency.

The Secretary: When we got ourselves involved in Chile, it was perhaps because of an over estimation of the importance of the problem and the effectiveness of our effort. Some countries are important to us and others are not. This is one of the things leaders must determine. Some of the events in the world are important to us and others are not at all in our interest. I agree that a landing on the shores of the United States is not likely in the next 30 years. I see that our danger is a world that will become increasingly radicalized. This in historic terms, I believe, is the biggest threat.

Congressman Fraser: Mr. Secretary, I believe that we need to take a bigger stand—a stronger stand for decency in our foreign relations, not just try to provide military assistance to every country which asks.

The Secretary: We try to take human rights issues into consideration as long as they do not interfere with our national security.

Senator Cranston: We have recently completed a study showing that we're giving aid to 58 countries which were dictatorships. Many of these dictatorships are quite repressive. Our question is: . . . "Is aid to all of these countries necessary?"

The Secretary: I would have to admit that once a program is begun it is sometimes hard to turn off. There are many problems which have to be dealt with. Let me give an example. Sadat, last October, asked me if I was aware of what was happening in Ethiopia. He pointed out that the Soviet Union was providing military assistance to Somalia, but the United States was no longer giving aid to Ethiopia. He said that we should give Ethiopia more aid. I checked into it and I found that there was a \$40 million ceiling for all of Africa. Of that \$8 million was going to Ethiopia. I asked for an increase, but it was too late. Look, Sadat's concern was about a stable regime in Africa, but I just wasn't on the issue as fast as I perhaps should have been. Regarding the 58 countries which you say are dictatorships, we'd be glad to look into it. Bob Ingersoll why don't you look into it.

Congressman Roe: Mr. Secretary, my constituents and the American people, I believe, are losing faith in foreign aid.

The Secretary: I'm convinced that the biggest problem we face now is possible economic collapse: fall of the western world. One reason for this is that no country in the world now has a government which is strong enough that it can make difficult decisions. On energy we are witnessing a massive transfer of wealth for the oil producing world.

The American people begin to realize this, it will not just be this administration which will be called to question, but our whole system of government. Look what happened at the Food Conference.⁸ We publicly stated that we would give a certain amount of food but we actually gave a much higher amount. However, we were identified at the low level, while we were actually giving at a higher level—the highest level of food aid in our history.

Senator Cranston: I think it is a basic awareness of some of these things that you raised which got the aid bill through the Senate this year. I see three particular problems with aid as it is being administered at the present time. First, our foreign aid frequently becomes military aid. Second, aid is given to countries for political reasons. And third, the aid seems to serve the people who are already powerful.

The Secretary: This has been a very interesting session. Could we perhaps arrange a meeting again in late January?

Congressman Fraser: That sounds like a good idea. The Rhodesia chrome debate is tomorrow. That should be of interest to the Department of State.

Congressman Buchanan: The Bill is scheduled to come up tomorrow. We are not sure of the votes. But we are getting much pressure for the repeal of the Byrd Amendment⁹ from non-governmental associations, such as the United States [*Nations*] Association, the World Federalists, the National Council of Churches. They are all urging us to bring it to a vote tomorrow and not to postpone it any further.

Congressman Biester: What we need is a letter from the President. This was promised to us but it seems to have gotten sidetracked.

The Secretary: I have supported the repeal of the Byrd Amendment as you know in the Finance Committee and in several letters to Senators and Congressmen. I'll talk to the President tonight about it.

Mr. Holton: I'm not speaking for the President but as you will recall, we have already met with the House leadership on this. Tip O'Neill says we are going to be clobbered on the Rhodesian chrome issue. I don't think we want the President to lose any credits on this one.

The Secretary: I'm firmly in support of your position on Rhodesian chrome but I know nothing of the President's letter. I will check with him tonight.

⁸ See Document 47.

⁹ The Byrd amendment, Section 503 of the 1971 Military Procurement Act, permitted the United States to import Rhodesian chrome, thus circumventing U.N. trade sanctions imposed in 1965 against Southern Rhodesia. The amendment was not repealed until March 15, 1977, when Congress passed legislation (P.L. 95–12) giving President Carter authority to halt U.S. chrome imports from Rhodesia. (*Congress and the Nation*, volume V, 1977–1980, p. 47)

50. Memorandum of Conversation¹

Washington, January 8, 1975, 11 a.m.

PARTICIPANTS

President Gerald Ford
The Cabinet

SUBJECT

Secretary Kissinger's Presentation on Foreign Policy

[The Cabinet meeting began with discussions by Mr. Rumsfeld of the reorganization of the Executive Office of the President, by Mr. Marsh of the Congressional situation, and by Dr. Greenspan of the economic situation].²

President: Now, Henry will project the Foreign Policy problems for 1975.

Kissinger: In Cyprus, we now have political talks started and with good will we should get something in three to four months.

In the Middle East the possibility for moves still exists, and if we succeed, the chances of war will be greatly reduced and we can go to Geneva with a situation where our friends are having a success.

In our relations with the Soviets, we have a problem. The Soviet Union has had a massive shock over the MFN and Ex-Im legislation. Brezhnev's opponents can quote our '72 statements about economic relations to make him look like a fool. Obviously, there is a reevaluation going on. And to the extent that a deterioration with the Soviet Union takes place it will also with the PRC. This makes the Vladivostok hearings³ crucial, so they are not turned into another trade bill fiasco.

I am afraid the Soviet Union will turn down the trade bill,⁴ but don't talk about it.

¹ Source: Ford Library, National Security Adviser, Memoranda of Conversations, 1973–1977, Box 8, Memoranda of Conversations—Ford Administration, January 8, 1975—Cabinet Meeting. Secret; Sensitive. The meeting took place in the Cabinet Room at the White House from 11:11 a.m. to 12:14 p.m. In attendance were Ford, Kissinger, Simon, Schlesinger, Morton, Butz, Dent, Brennan, Weinberger, Lynn, Brinegar, Hartmann, Ash, Marsh, Rumsfeld, Scali, Seidman, Greenspan, Baroody, Friedersdorf, Scowcroft, Deputy Attorney General Lawrence Silberman, Buchen, Nessen and RNC Chairperson Mary Louise Smith. (Ibid., Staff Secretary's Office, White House Daily Diary)

² Brackets are in the original.

³ Reference is to the Congressional hearings on November 24, 1974, Vladivostok agreement. See footnote 6, Document 48.

⁴ The Soviet Union did reject the conditions in the trade bill. See Document 31.

But there is no deterioration of political relations with the Soviet Union.

Relations with the PRC are on course. There was not much movement on Taiwan, because we have little to gain from it. Our relations are basically doing well.

So much for the traditional foreign policy areas.

We are now facing for the whole world the situation which President Truman faced with Europe. There is a disintegration of old world patterns—it represents a danger and a great opportunity as new patterns become put together. In the past few years our relations with Europe have been very difficult. The Europeans have become provincial: only our efforts are seeking to restore to them a sense of competence to manage their own destinies.

A resurgent American economy will help us more in the world than anything we can do.

We have an historic opportunity to help construct a new political and economic world system. We have been making substantial progress in the whole energy/oil field. If we can move equally on food and raw materials, we may look back on this period on the structural side as having been an historic period of American foreign policy.

51. Address by President Ford¹

Washington, January 15, 1975.

[Omitted here is discussion of domestic policy.]

Now let me turn, if I might, to the international dimension of the present crisis. At no time in our peacetime history has the state of the Nation depended more heavily on the state of the world. And seldom, if ever, has the state of the world depended more heavily on the state of our Nation.

The economic distress is global. We will not solve it at home unless we help to remedy the profound economic dislocation abroad.² World trade and monetary structure provides markets, energy, food, and vital raw materials—for all nations. This international system is now in jeopardy.

This Nation can be proud of significant achievements in recent years in solving problems and crises. The Berlin agreement, the SALT agreements, our new relationship with China, the unprecedented efforts in the Middle East are immensely encouraging. But the world is not free from crisis. In a world of 150 nations, where nuclear technology is proliferating and regional conflicts continue, international security cannot be taken for granted.

So, let there be no mistake about it: International cooperation is a vital factor of our lives today. This is not a moment for the American people to turn inward. More than ever before, our own well-being depends on America's determination and America's leadership in the whole wide world.

We are a great Nation—spiritually, politically, militarily, diplomatically, and economically. America's commitment to international security has sustained the safety of allies and friends in many areas—in the Middle East, in Europe, and in Asia. Our turning away would unleash new instabilities, new dangers around the globe, which, in turn, would threaten our own security.

At the end of World War II, we turned a similar challenge into an historic opportunity and, I might add, an historic achievement. An old order was in disarray; political and economic institutions were shattered. In that period, this Nation and its partners built new institutions,

¹ Source: *Public Papers: Ford, 1975*, Book I, pp. 36–46. The President delivered his State of the Union address at 1:06 p.m. in the House Chamber at the Capitol. His remarks were broadcast live on nationwide radio and television networks.

² On January 13, Ford gave a televised address from the White House Lincoln Library, in which he briefed the public on his programs to address inflation and the energy crisis. The text is *ibid.*, pp. 30–35.

new mechanisms of mutual support and cooperation. Today, as then, we face an historic opportunity. If we act imaginatively and boldly, as we acted then, this period will in retrospect be seen as one of the great creative moments of our Nation's history.

The whole world is watching to see how we respond.

A resurgent American economy would do more to restore the confidence of the world in its own future than anything else we can do. The program that this Congress passes can demonstrate to the world that we have started to put our own house in order. If we can show that this Nation is able and willing to help other nations meet the common challenge, it can demonstrate that the United States will fulfill its responsibilities as a leader among nations.

Quite frankly, at stake is the future of industrialized democracies, which have perceived their destiny in common and sustained it in common for 30 years.

The developing nations are also at a turning point. The poorest nations see their hopes of feeding their hungry and developing their societies shattered by the economic crisis. The long-term economic future for the producers of raw materials also depends on cooperative solutions.

Our relations with the Communist countries are a basic factor of the world environment. We must seek to build a long-term basis for coexistence. We will stand by our principles. We will stand by our interests. We will act firmly when challenged. The kind of a world we want depends on a broad policy of creating mutual incentives for restraint and for cooperation.

As we move forward to meet our global challenges and opportunities, we must have the tools to do the job.

Our military forces are strong and ready. This military strength deters aggression against our allies, stabilizes our relations with former adversaries, and protects our homeland. Fully adequate conventional and strategic forces cost many, many billions, but these dollars are sound insurance for our safety and for a more peaceful world.

Military strength alone is not sufficient. Effective diplomacy is also essential in preventing conflict, in building world understanding. The Vladivostok negotiations with the Soviet Union represent a major step in moderating strategic arms competition. My recent discussions with the leaders of the Atlantic community, Japan, and South Korea have contributed to meeting the common challenge.

But we have serious problems before us that require cooperation between the President and the Congress. By the Constitution and tradition, the execution of foreign policy is the responsibility of the President.

In recent years, under the stress of the Vietnam war, legislative restrictions on the President's ability to execute foreign policy and military decisions have proliferated.³ As a Member of the Congress, I opposed some and I approved others. As President, I welcome the advice and cooperation of the House and the Senate.

But if our foreign policy is to be successful, we cannot rigidly restrict in legislation the ability of the President to act.⁴ The conduct of negotiations is ill-suited to such limitations. Legislative restrictions, intended for the best motives and purposes, can have the opposite result, as we have seen most recently in our trade relations with the Soviet Union.

For my part, I pledge this Administration will act in the closest consultation with the Congress as we face delicate situations and troubled times throughout the globe.

When I became President only 5 months ago, I promised the last Congress a policy of communication, conciliation, compromise, and cooperation. I renew that pledge to the new Members of this Congress.

[Omitted here are general concluding remarks.]

³ The Case-Zablocki Act of 1972 required the President to submit to Congress all international agreements within 60 days of their execution. The War Powers Resolution, passed in 1973 over Nixon's veto, more specifically mandated consultation between the executive and legislative branches prior to the commitment of U.S. forces into hostilities, prohibited the extension of troop commitments beyond 60 days without specific congressional authorization, and permitted Congress, via concurrent resolution, to direct the president to disengage U.S. troops in the absence of either a declaration of war or congressional authorization.

⁴ During the President's January 21 news conference, a reporter revisited this statement and inquired if Ford was making an oblique reference to the Jackson-Vanik amendment to the 1974 Trade Act. Ford responded: "I don't wish to get in any dispute with Members of Congress. I think that such restrictive amendments as the one that was imposed on the trade bill and the Eximbank legislation and the limitation that was imposed on several pieces of legislation involving the continuation of military aid to Turkey, those kinds of limitations, in my judgment, are harmful to a President in the execution and implementation of foreign policy." (*Public Papers: Ford, 1975, Book I, p. 69*)

52. Memorandum of Conversation¹

Washington, February 28, 1975, 6:15–7:30 p.m.

SUBJECT

Secretary's Meeting with House and Senate Wednesday Groups,
February 28, 1975—6:15–7:30 p.m.—Monroe Room

PARTICIPANTS

DEPARTMENT OF STATE

Secretary Kissinger
Deputy Secretary Ingersoll
Assistant Secretary McCloskey
Under Secretary Sisco
Larry Eagleburger
William B. Richardson (notetaker)

SENATE WEDNESDAY CLUB

Glenn Beall (Md.)
Henry Bellmon (Okla.)
Mark Hatfield (Ore.)
Robert Packwood (Ore.)
Richard Schweiker (Pa.)

HOUSE WEDNESDAY CLUB

John Anderson (Ill.)
Pete Biester (Pa.)
Thad Cochran (Miss.)
Bill Cohen (Maine)
Larry Coughlin (Pa.)
Jim Johnson (Colo.)
Phil Ruppe (Mich.)
Herman Schneebeli (Pa.)
Alan Steelman (Tex.)
Marvin Esch (Mich.)
Bill Frenzel (Minn.)
Frank Horton (N.Y.)
Barber Conable (N.Y.)
Alphonzo Bell (Calif.)

Patricia Goldman, Executive Director

The Secretary opened the meeting by stating that instead of making a presentation he would answer questions in order that the session be a more productive one for the Members.

¹ Source: National Archives, RG 59, Central Foreign Policy Files, P820123–0961. Secret; Nodis. Drafted by William B. Richardson (H) on March 12 and approved by David C. Gompert on May 11.

Congressman Steelman asked the Secretary what our oil policy was in view of the Administration's goal of a production reduction to \$1 million [1 million barrels] a day reduction. The Secretary responded that the United States needed a longer term strategy of a 4–5 year period. He stated that our policy had two objectives: (1) to bring oil prices down; and (2) to make sure that our dependence on foreign sources does not increase. The Secretary said that we are working towards (1) increasing the pressure on OPEC countries to reduce prices; and (2) finding the most effective consumer position directed at locating substitute sources of energy. He stated that the figure of one million barrels a day had been used as the recession figure. The Secretary said we should make every effort to achieve that strategy, so that we can dispel the notion that the U.S. is dragging others along only to save themselves. The upcoming energy conference of consumers, said the Secretary, was not decisive, but one that would set the general strategy and goals in addition to trying to break the oil cartel.

Congressman Conable stated that although he agreed that military aid was an appropriate weapon of diplomacy, that there was confusion as to when we should use it. The Congressman said that on this score their Democratic colleagues were criticizing them for our military assistance policies. He stated that we have recently decided to reinstate military aid to Pakistan and that we had just asked the Congress for supplemental assistance for Vietnam and Cambodia.² The Congressman asked the Secretary whether there was any rule of thumb on what was or was not a constructive policy on military aid.

The Secretary replied that the main problem in foreign policy was the lack of a national consensus on what the needs, goals, and direction of our foreign policy should be. The Secretary indicated that the objectives of military assistance could be linked to the Cyprus situation but not necessarily to trade negotiations. He stated that military aid can be

² On January 29, Ford met with Cabinet members to discuss the Vietnam and Cambodian supplemental and domestic budgetary matters. Both Ford and Kissinger underscored the importance of the \$522 million supplemental in relation to the administration's broader foreign policy aims. Failure to pass the measure, Kissinger argued, would "hurt our credibility world-wide. Our allies must know that we will stand by them and by any agreements we have with them. It will hurt our international negotiating power, if we do not stand in South Vietnam. Ford concurred: "Our global relationships are very important. It is necessary for people around the world to know that we will stand by our allies. As we deal internationally, what we say in the Middle East or Southeast Asia or in détente with Russia or China, that they can count on those statements as being backed by the American people, and the American Congress. It will impair our international negotiating ability if it always hinges on the domestic question of whether or not Congress will approve." (Notes of a Cabinet meeting, January 29; Ford Library, Cabinet Meetings, Box 1, 1/29/75)

given for many reasons, and that the obvious one was the protection of areas vital to our security; another obvious reason for military assistance, according to the Secretary, was for people like our allies for defense in their military purposes. The Secretary stated that if the Congress and the Executive Branch agreed that an area was vital, then there was no problem. Saudi Arabia, he said, was a key country in the Arab world for the following reasons: first, it had an enormous surplus production of oil; second, it had an unlimited surplus of petrodollars; third, it was the only country that could make an embargo stick. The Secretary said that Iran and Algeria could not afford to cut production, since most of their raw income was mortgaged for development projects. The Secretary maintained that the bilateral projects that we have initiated with the Saudis are for development purposes. One constant problem, said the Secretary, was the necessity to keep Saudi Arabia satisfied and on our side.

The Secretary stressed that we want a political relationship with the Saudis whereby they tie their conception of their security to ours. In this context, said the Secretary, we have agreed to sell them arms. The Secretary stated that if we did not do this, that France and Great Britain would step in there, thus reducing our influence. The objectives of the French and British, on the Middle East, said the Secretary, are different from ours. The Secretary stressed that the success of his upcoming negotiations depended on Faisal. The Secretary stated we would be in trouble if Faisal decided to back Syria and threatened to withhold money from Egypt. The Secretary then said that if Faisal stayed on the fence, then we would be okay. In all of the important Arab forums, according to the Secretary, King Faisal is decisive. The Bedouin society is extremely important, said the Secretary. The Secretary then stressed that France and Great Britain did not have the same political objectives that we had, and that their presence would not help matters. As for Iran, said the Secretary, they could not take the drastic foreign policy steps that Saudi Arabia could take.

The Pakistan case, said the Secretary, was an anomaly. Here was an ally of ours, he said, and yet we had been embargoing it at a time when its neighbor had been receiving one billion dollars a year in arms. The Secretary said he could not understand why we had embargoed Pakistan. As for the recent decision to resume arms sales to Pakistan, said the Secretary, we decided on the most minimal cash sale as strictly a symbolic step; there was no military mission involved, no escalation of the arms race which would alter the balance of power in the area. The Secretary stated that we just wanted to eliminate the political anomaly in that area. France and Great Britain, said the Secretary, sell arms to Pakistan. The Secretary stated that this sale will not affect our relations with India since we made clear to them what our objectives

were before we announced our decision. The local Indian Ambassador, said the Secretary, got carried away in his reaction. One goal of our foreign policy, stressed the Secretary, was not to get involved in an arms race in the subcontinent. We can regulate this matter by the amounts we sell to Pakistan as well as the amounts of ready cash that they have to pay for these arms, stated the Secretary.

The Secretary then stated that he wanted to discuss the supplemental requests for Vietnam and Cambodia. On the Indochina issue, said the Secretary, we have all been anguished for many years. It was an issue that was very hard on both him and the Congressmen present. The Secretary said that he received many letters on this topic also. He stated that he was saddened by the present rhetoric of the debate on this issue; he felt that the rhetoric being used at the present time was one of the past, and that this was an entirely new issue. With respect to Cambodia, the Secretary said, the issue was whether the United States would condemn the people and country that have stood by us by refusing to send them ammunition. The Secretary said that this responsibility of denying them these arms was very great to assume, even if the Cambodians lost. The Secretary said that in his judgment the U.S. had exhausted all of the peacekeeping possibilities; he said we consulted every Asian leader, focusing on progressive leaders and not military dictators, to help us towards our negotiating objectives. The Prime Minister of Singapore and other leaders that we consulted concluded that there were no prospects for negotiations in view of the military situation, said the Secretary. He stated that in December the French almost got negotiations started again. He said that the present Cambodian conflict had to be settled.

The Secretary said that with respect to Vietnam, the question of whether we should have gone in will be settled by history. He stated that a strong case could not be made in American society for helping the South Vietnamese yet there were millions of people in South Vietnam that we have propelled into this kind of situation. He said he always heard from everyone that we ought to get our troops and our prisoners out and then to let the South Vietnamese defend themselves. Never did he hear, the Secretary said, that we should give them aid to defend themselves with; the Secretary then stressed that by denying the military aid we were condemning them; that, the Secretary considered, was an immoral act. The Secretary stated that he could not honestly tell them (the Congressmen) that there was a terminal date to our providing this aid. The Secretary said that last summer he felt that there was no way the North Vietnamese could win militarily after efforts at further negotiations failed. He stated that his view was that the Congress should vote adequate aid as long as it was necessary, but that

one could not put a terminal date on it. If we did announce this terminal date, said the Secretary, it would jeopardize our security interests in the Middle East and all other areas of our interest. According to the Secretary, the perfect example of what has happened is the Jackson amendment,³ where you get chivvied, but it is simply the best one can get. The Jackson amendment was better than no trade bill at all; therefore, the Secretary said, a cut off is better than cutting it (the aid for South Vietnam) off completely. In Vietnam's case, the Secretary stated, it was better to go for three years with a maximum effort. He stated that there were different reasons for military aid in different parts of the world; in most cases, said the Secretary, American security depends on this.

Congressman Esch stated that he was a member of a Congressional group that met in this same room with the Secretary's predecessor in 1967 to discuss the issues that were being discussed at this meeting. Congressman Esch then asked if it was unrealistic to expect whether we can apply leverage to China and the USSR to halt their arms supplies into that area.

The Secretary replied that although the word leverage was easy to use that it was very hard to define. He then stated that he would like to get together with a few Congressmen and ask them to write down what leverage they feel we have. With the Soviet Union, the Secretary felt our leverage was economic. He said it was prestigious for them to have a close association in an economic partnership with us. Should the Russians kick up the arms race in the area, we just cannot retaliate by cutting off credits since our economic cards hardly exist anymore. There is no credible threat, said the Secretary, which indicates an increasing arms race in that area. Our total leverage, said the Secretary, was shrinking and thus détente was suffering. The Secretary said that every negotiation with the Soviets is tougher because we have less chips to offer.

The Secretary then stated that we have one source of leverage with China: they need us for a balance of power. He said that the press keeps saying that Taiwan is the key issue in blocking better relations. The Secretary stressed that it was not Taiwan that brought us together, but rather the Chinese desire to hold the ring around Russia.

According to the Secretary, the Turkey issue had done considerable damage to our relations with China. In this case, said the Secretary, here they see the United States cutting off aid to a country that stands

³ See footnote 3, Document 19 and Document 31.

between the Middle East and the USSR.⁴ The Secretary said the Chinese then question whether we can deliver; their factors, stated the Secretary, blunt off any effort by him in asking the Chinese to please cut off arms to Indochina. In the right circumstances, said the Secretary, we could go in with the Chinese. The Secretary stated that the South Vietnamese had to defend their northern frontier and that they were running short of ammunition. The North Vietnamese, said the Secretary, had to be strong to have taken the provincial capital.

Senator Hatfield asked the Secretary what our commitment was to the Cambodian government. He said that he recalled a hearing before his Appropriations Committee where Under Secretary Tarr reiterated that there was no commitment to Cambodia, that the purpose of our policy was only to protect American troops. Senator Hatfield stated that now he was not so sure, and said he wanted to know why the Secretary had requested the recent \$222 million aid package for Cambodia.

The Secretary stated that we do not have a formal commitment to Cambodia, but something deeper. The Secretary again stressed that the U.S. had no formal defense or political commitment to Cambodia, and that we have not said to them that we will defend them. What had to be distinguished, said the Secretary, was the nature of our relationship; in other words, stated the Secretary, how our actions vis-à-vis the Cambodians will be perceived in the world. Should we refuse to send them ammunition, said the Secretary, that would be morally wrong and inequitable.

Congressman Coughlin asked how much money it would take the Cambodians to get them through the monsoon. Coughlin stated that the Executive Branch had requested \$752 million for Indochina and now an additional \$222 million for Cambodia. Coughlin asked whether so much money was needed; wouldn't \$100 million be sufficient, he asked.

The Secretary replied that he was no expert at numbers, that what was requested was the minimum that was essentially needed.

⁴ Following the June 1974 Greek Cypriot overthrow of the Makarios government on Cyprus and declaration of enosis between Cyprus and Greece, the Nixon administration attempted to mediate an agreement among the Greeks, Cypriots, and Turks. Ultimately, Kissinger could not bring the parties to an agreement. The Ford administration subsequently sided with Turkey in the conflict in order to protect NATO's Southern Flank, much to the disapproval of many Greek-Americans. Members of Congress sought to curb U.S. involvement with two joint resolutions eliminating further U.S. military aid, initiatives that Ford vetoed. Ultimately the administration and Congress brokered a compromise: House Joint Resolution 1167 of October 17, 1974, P.L. 93-448, prohibited the administration from offering military assistance to Turkey until Ford certified that Turkey was in compliance with the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 and the Foreign Military Sales Act and progress in negotiations had been made. The embargo took effect on February 5, 1975, and lasted, with some modifications, until 1978.

Congressman Anderson stated that the U.S. engaged in nearly \$8 billion worth of arms sales around the world. He said that he was troubled at what the Secretary had said earlier; it seemed to him that our policy was based on keeping up with the Joneses, i.e. the fact that if France and Great Britain do it, we should do it too. The Congressman asked the Secretary whether the United States could exercise influence on developing countries to use their funds for development projects rather than for military purposes.

The Secretary stated that the biggest purchasers of arms were not impoverished nations, such as Iran, Saudi Arabia, etc. He said that with each of these countries we have set up economic commissions to promote economic development. The Secretary asked at what price could we keep some of these countries from buying arms to modernize their military forces for their own security purposes. The Secretary stated that we had suffered more by denying countries our sales; Peru, said the Secretary, was the perfect example of this short-sighted policy. The U.S., said the Secretary, refused to sell arms to the Peruvians so as to redirect their funds for development purposes. What happened next, said the Secretary, was that the Peruvians bought 200 Soviet tanks and brought in Cuban technicians. The Secretary stated that we hardly gained from this situation, and that we placed ourselves in a very difficult situation. In general, the Secretary said that we do encourage countries to put their funds into development rather than for arms.

Congressman Horton asked what the prospects were for a Middle East settlement.

The Secretary stated there were three problems in negotiations, (1) Egypt and Israeli relations; (2) relations between Egypt and other countries; and (3) the USSR and other nations in the area. He stated that Egypt and Israel were getting along better. With a little bit of luck, the Secretary said that chances for success were slightly better than 50/50. Tonight, the Secretary said, he and Joe Sisco had sent a message to all the countries that they would be visiting,⁵ asking everyone to do a little thinking on their own, that the U.S. is not going to do it all. One of the key issues, stated the Secretary, was whether Syria could mobilize Arab support to kill any kind of rapprochement between Egypt and Syria. The Secretary said that in Assad's view, for Assad to gain nothing while Egypt gains something was bad. He said that Assad was playing all his cards: Arab unity, flirtations with the Palestinians. If there is movement on the Golan Heights issue, said the Secretary, Assad will keep quiet. Whether he can mobilize pressure, said the Secretary, depended in large part on other countries and the Palestinians. With re-

⁵ Kissinger was in the Middle East March 8–18 to review the peace process and discuss the disengagement of Egyptian-Israeli forces.

spect to the USSR, stated the Secretary, they so far have been more obnoxious than obstructionist. Should the Soviets start a massive diplomatic campaign, said the Secretary, that will be a bad thing. The Secretary said that if the radical Arabs win, then it will mean the defeat of moderate Arabs, moderate programs, and the United States at Geneva. If the U.S. fails, said the Secretary, the Soviets and the radical Arabs will be successful, causing a nightmare. The end result, said the Secretary, would be that moderate Arabs would be discredited, the Soviets would win, and the worst results for Israel. The key issue, said the Secretary, is what position we are in when we go to Geneva.

Congressman Ruppe stated that it was his understanding that King Faisal would not be content until he got to pray in Jerusalem. Since the Secretary seemed to indicate that Faisal was the linchpin of the Middle East, didn't this factor have to be taken into account.

The Secretary stated that in one sense Saudi Arabia was a linchpin, in another sense it was not. The Secretary said that when one first perceives Faisal, he appears as a real fanatic. The Secretary stated, however, that Faisal was a very canny operator. He sits, said the Secretary, on \$200 billion worth of reserves and 8 million Bedouins, and makes the rounds successfully with his ambiguous postures. Faisal, said the Secretary, gets the conservatives by appearing as a religious fanatic, and then gets the support of the radicals by espousal of the Palestinian issue. The Secretary stated that Faisal never exposes himself, and talks in riddles to keep all his options open. A colleague of his, said the Secretary, once told me (HAK) that if Faisal would tell the Secretary that he would not go ahead with an embargo, then he would do it. The Secretary said that Faisal was a very complicated man, and that he probably does want to die in Jerusalem. The mistake people make about Faisal, however, said the Secretary, is that they think he wants to hear about Jerusalem. In all the conversations that he has ever had with Faisal, stated the Secretary, Faisal has never raised the Jerusalem issue nor the '67 borders issue. He is an extremely practical man, said the Secretary, and on the Syrian front, he will go along. How he will come down on the totality of issues, said the Secretary, nobody knows. Sadat, said the Secretary, may ask him to support him, and Faisal may go ahead and do it. If you want to talk philosophy with Faisal, the Secretary stated, he has a standard 45 minute speech on Zionism and Communism.

Senator Schweiker then said that our problem with Cambodia was that we were playing a Catch 22 policy there. It seems, said the Senator, that we have to prove our virility and our manhood and that we are using the old Cold War logic that we have to do it if the Commies do it. Then our only policy, said Schweiker, is to respond to that Cold War logic and to the eventual neglect of other areas.

The Secretary stated that before we get involved in something again, that we will think it over extremely carefully, since the Indochina experience has shown how hard it is to disengage. A total refusal to the Cambodians, said the Secretary, was condemnatory and the wrong way to end the war, a big mistake. The U.S. action in Cambodia, said the Secretary, when we became involved with the sanctuaries, saved thousands of lives. At the present time, stated the Secretary, the Cambodian situation was an extremely dangerous one, and it may get worse when the rainy season starts again.

Congressman Cohen stated that in recent days, former President Nixon and Chuck Colson had said that the Secretary was one of the more dangerous and unstable men in the world.

The Secretary said that it was a lucky thing that Colson had converted to Christianity, otherwise he (HAK) would hate to speculate what Colson would have said if he had not.

Congressman Cohen then said that the Secretary had talked about Congressional intervention in foreign policy in several forums.⁶ Would the Secretary elaborate on this point.

The Secretary replied that it was disastrous to operate a foreign policy without the support of Congress and the public. He stated that he strongly believed in Congressional consultation. When he was at the White House as Assistant to the President, he often met with the Senate Foreign Relations Committee and especially Chairman Fulbright. There was nothing in it for him (HAK) at the time, said the Secretary, yet he did it. The Secretary said he was extremely concerned with establishing a partnership with Congress, yet it was technically difficult to consult with this Congress. The Secretary said he meets three times a week with groups like these, yet he did not know which of the Congressmen he meets with can deliver. Consultation with the Congress, said the Secretary, is a technical problem, which is the Congress' problem, not his. The Secretary stated that he was perplexed at what was happening to the Committee structure, but that it was not affecting him.

⁶ During a January 24 address to the Los Angeles World Affairs Council, Kissinger noted: "The growing tendency of the Congress to legislate in detail the day-to-day or week-to-week conduct of our foreign affairs raises grave issues. American policy—given the wide range of our interests and responsibilities—must be a coherent and a purposeful whole. The way we act in our relations with one country almost inevitably affects our relationship with others. To single out individual countries for special legislative attention has unintended but inevitable consequences and risks unraveling the entire fabric of our foreign policy." For the complete text of Kissinger's speech, see Department of State *Bulletin*, February 17, 1975, pp. 197–204. The Secretary also offered remarks in this vein during his February 25 news conference, stressing that "there can only be an American foreign policy, not an executive or a legislative foreign policy." (*Ibid.*, March 17, 1975, p. 322)

The Secretary asked what the role of Congress should be in foreign policy-making. Trying to mess in the day-to-day conduct is often dangerous and destructive. Foreign policy was a series of moods, nuances, and continuity, and there is a loss if there is a day-to-day intrusion in its conduct. Foreign policy, said the Secretary, is like a chess game; one can knock out yards than wonder if it disintegrates. What Congress can do, stated the Secretary, has not been figured out; the Congress, said the Secretary can make important inputs in longer term trends. With respect to Cambodia and Vietnam, the Secretary stated that he had not complained of the Congressional prerogative of appropriating funds. Congress, said the Secretary, exercises the right of supervision in this field.

The Secretary then stressed that the aid cut off to Turkey, however, was a calamity for all of the U.S. Congress, and that the chief victim will be the democratic Greek government. What happens is that Turkey is driven away from NATO, said the Secretary, and the situation does not help Cyprus. Congress' action was an unnecessary move, a very serious interference, stated the Secretary. Negotiations had to be given a chance to develop on the Greek-Turk issue, but then the ax fell. The impact of this action, stated the Secretary, on the perception of other countries towards our ability to honor commitments is in the long term disastrous.

The Secretary then referred to the Jackson Amendment and stated that he agreed with Jackson's intent and his objectives. Congress can tell us its concerns, said the Secretary, and then we can get together. Should these trends continue, stated the Secretary, these interferences will create a lack of confidence in the ability of the United States to deliver, resulting in a disintegration of our foreign policy.

Congressman Ruppe then stated that the average guy in his district asks why we give all these funds and credits to the Communists.

The Secretary replied that Europe had given over 7½ billion credits to the USSR, creating a leverage on the Russians. Perhaps, stated the Secretary, we did not explain our strategy adequately. In terms of the Middle East crisis, said the Secretary, there are few obstacles for the Soviet Union: the only danger for them is the threat of our military involvement and thus they have little to lose in the whole process.

Congressman Anderson adjourned the session and thanked the Secretary.

The Secretary then told Anderson, Cohen, Ruppe, and Horton (as they were leaving) that he wished he could find five key people in the Congress that could deliver, and let them read cables so that they form a partnership. Congressman Anderson agreed that there was a vacuum of leadership.

53. Editorial Note

On March 31, 1975, Secretary of State Henry Kissinger met with Dean Rusk, Cyrus Vance, McGeorge Bundy, George Shultz, Douglas Dillon, W. Averell Harriman, Robert McNamara, David Rockefeller, George Ball, William Scranton, Peter G. Peterson, David K.E. Bruce, John McCloy, Lawrence Eagleburger, and Joseph Sisco. According to a memorandum of conversation prepared by L. Paul Bremer, Kissinger expounded on the difficulties facing the implementation and execution of U.S. foreign policy:

"Now, if we might spend 20 minutes on some other problems. I want to say a few things about my very profound concern about the paralysis which we are inflicting upon ourselves on a global basis. You know most foreign policy setbacks are inflicted by foreigners. Ours instead are being inflicted by ourselves. We probably can't settle anything about this today and maybe we ought to meet again next week."

After a brief discussion of the domestic political climate in Portugal, Kissinger turned to the role of intelligence in the conduct of American policy:

"A superpower in this world without effective intelligence machinery is in deep trouble. If these congressional investigations don't come to a quick end, it will unravel every covert activity over the past twenty years. In fact, many more were conducted before 1969 than after. If these come out separated from their context, it will lead to the destruction of any intelligence capacity."

Following a brief description of U.S.-Portuguese relations, Kissinger continued:

"We have inflicted a serious setback on ourselves. There have been no new Forty Committee actions since the Ryan amendment, since the President must certify it is in the national interest to undertake a covert activity, and since we must also brief about 50 congressmen on each activity. Now you gentlemen know that no covert operation has ever been ordered which the President wasn't informed of. He always had a chance to disapprove it if he wanted. But it makes a very big difference if it is done in a disavowable mode where, if something goes wrong, the blame goes to the Assistant to the President or to the CIA Director instead of having something on file which the President has signed. And you simply cannot brief 50 congressmen on a covert activity and expect it to be kept covert.

"This group should know. Perhaps there have been excesses in the past and perhaps covert operations need to be more tightly controlled. But in the last three months we've had no Forty Committee meetings and the only thing we've even discussed was that damn ship.

"Even though the myth is that the Assistant to the President generates covert proposals, this is simply not true. He does nothing without proposals and I'll tell you we are getting none today. Take Saudi Arabia—I would dearly like to know what is going on in the national guard, and in the army and in the court, but I can't.

"I'm raising national problems here with you. We've had eight years of Vietnam and two years of Watergate and these have made this a national problem."

Kissinger referred to the Hughes-Ryan amendment to the Foreign Assistance Act of 1974, signed December 30, 1974 (P.L. 93–559), which required explicit approval by the President for covert actions and expanded Congressional oversight and control of the CIA.

After a brief discussion of Cyprus, Kissinger returned to this theme:

"With the exception of Vietnam which I would like to discuss at some point, in all of your experiences foreign policy has been discussed in terms of our overall policy. It is now being handled like domestic policy with every pressure group going up there [to Congress] with their own projects. I had our people look into the restrictions which now operate on foreign policy and I was given a list 21 pages long of restrictions.

"At one point I even showed [Representative John] Brademas all of our cables just to show him we were serious and all he did was second-guess each one of the cables. This policy obviously leads to the disintegration of a coherent foreign policy. We're not even talking here about the Jackson amendment. The price we paid to promote Jewish emigration from the Soviet Union which in my view is not a legitimate goal of U.S. policy anyway is unbelievable, especially since we had already gotten emigration to go up from 4,000 to 30,000 per year.

"I am profoundly worried about how we now appear to other countries. Our authority has for 30 years preserved the peace of the world. If we behave like the French governments of the Third and Fourth Republics, the peace of the world will be in the most severe jeopardy.

"We can argue how to handle the Cyprus thing, but at some point the administration simply has to be in charge of the tactics of foreign policy. If we do a lousy job, either get us out in the next election or attack the general direction of the policy.

"There is one problem which is that there is no one in Congress we can talk to.

"Mr. Shultz: The broader point is very powerful. Looking at the domestic side of life now, which is being governed by very narrow often noble little cutup groups of people, policy makers are not allowed

to make a balanced judgment, but must make narrow ones confined to specific issues. This leads to an incapacity for leadership and to disorganization.

“Secretary Kissinger: Since the Second World War whether you agree or not there has been a basic agreement that the U.S. stands for something. Now people wonder if anything we say or undertake can be carried out.

“Mr. Dillon: Our performance domestically is really just as bad and it too is similar to the Third and Fourth Republics.

“Secretary Kissinger: This group here has given structure to our policy over a long time.

“Ambassador Bruce: I see this only from the NATO perspective. The decline of U.S. prestige is almost humiliating. The causes are not what they appear to be. Many Europeans don’t understand it because they’re accustomed to the parliamentary system in Europe. They continue to say that only the United States can give leadership, but they don’t trust that it will be given at all or that it will be given wisely. Also, we are speaking in a much too defeatist way about ourselves, both in the news or among our congressmen. If you read about the seven senators, all of whom are on the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, who are traveling in Europe, their questions are simply not absorbable. The Europeans are confused about who these people are. One of the men in Brussels I asked said I would be glad to brief these people, but they don’t understand the problems.

“Secretary Kissinger: It seems to me that we are almost inviting some misbehavior from the Soviets. From what I know of the Chinese, there is no sentimentality there. They want us to hold the ring with the Soviets. If they get contempt for us, they could get very tough with Japan, and the Third World. We have to pull ourselves together fast.

“Vietnam is another problem. I’d be prepared to and even eager to meet again with this group on that. I am profoundly worried. I think my basic analysis about the state of the world is right. And I think I can use your help on the Middle East.” (National Archives, RG 59, Records of Henry A. Kissinger, 1973–77, Lot 91D414, Box 22, Classified External Memcons December 1974–April 1975)

The suspension of negotiations between the Egyptians and Israelis during Kissinger’s latest round of shuttle diplomacy precipitated his reference to the Middle East. During a March 26 Cabinet meeting, he sketched out the parameters of the negotiating strategy he had utilized during the previous year and a half:

“In 1973, all of the Arabs were lined up against Israel, the radicals were in the ascendancy, there was an oil embargo, the Europeans had come out for the 1967 frontiers, and the Soviet Union was deeply in-

volved. The United States was in the position where we were completely isolated, and any war and its impact over the world would be ascribed to American and Israeli intransigence. With Sadat's cooperation, we moved to the step-by-step approach. We kept the Soviet Union and Europeans on the sidelines and we kept the moderates in control. We recommended to Israel that it seek movement with Jordan and in the Sinai. The delays in this process brought about the result of Rabat, replacing Hussein with the PLO as spokesman for the West Bank, and Asad was trying to force global consideration of all the issues.

"So there were two elements in these negotiations: the substance itself and the continuation of a process which would preserve the situation and [*that*] we had been able to develop. Throughout this period we worked closely with the Israelis and indeed followed their timetable. It brought us to this negotiation." (Ford Library, National Security Adviser, Memoranda of Conversations, 1973–77, Box 10, Memoranda of Conversations—Ford Administration, March 26, 1975—Cabinet Meeting)

Prior to his March 31 meeting with the members of the foreign policy establishment, Kissinger transmitted a paper, drafted by Deputy Assistant Secretary of State for Near Eastern and South Asian Affairs Harold Saunders on March 25, to Ford. In the March 27 covering memorandum, Kissinger noted that the paper was "designed to lay out systematically for your further reflection the issues and choices we face in the Middle East." He added, "My own tentative inclination is that we will want to develop a strategy which carefully capitalizes on mounting pressures to build domestic support and to move the negotiations forward. This will require a thoughtful though not necessarily high-pressure U.S. role from the start, although we will have to recognize that it is unrealistic to expect major accomplishments very early in the process." (Ford Library, National Security Council, Institutional Files, Box 9, Institutional Files—Meetings, NSC Meeting 3/28/75—Middle East Policy (2))

54. Memorandum From the Counselor of the Department of State (Sonnenfeldt) and the Director of the Bureau of Intelligence and Research (Hyland) to Secretary of State Kissinger¹

Washington, April 4, 1975.

SUBJECT

Foreign Policy in the Next Phase²

In examining both the short and longer term implications of the current crisis we start from the proposition that Indochina will fall under communist control and be subject to the influence and direction of Hanoi.³

Three interlocking sets of implications need to be considered: (1) internally, how a defeat in Vietnam, whatever its form, will impact on the present American mood and what the consequences are likely to be for national policy; (2) externally, how it will impact in Asia, especially on major power relations; and (3) finally, what it means for our global posture.

The Domestic Perspective

As disappointing and frustrating as it may be, the hard political fact is that the popular mood and the dominant Congressional opinion are to accept the defeat of SVN as historically inevitable. It is not all that surprising that, given the polarization of opinion, the trend that has prevailed is one of disinterest and disengagement.

Seen in a longer term perspective, we are reaping in the harvest of the abatement of American predominance in the postwar era: as we return to a period of retrenchment and consolidation, which was articulated in the Nixon Doctrine,⁴ it follows that there will be those countries who either cannot or will not help themselves, and will therefore collapse. Southeast Asia, an area in almost constant turmoil since the Japa-

¹ Source: National Archives, RG 59, Records of the Office of the Counselor Helmut Sonnenfeldt, Lot 81D286, Box 3, HS Chron, Official—Apr–June, 1975. Secret; Sensitive. Kissinger's initials appear on the memorandum alongside his handwritten comment: "Excellent—Let's discuss soonest." Notations in the upper right hand corner of the first page read: "direct to C" and "Secto 3."

² We have given this memo to W. Lord and P. Habib, but wanted you to have this draft before you leave for California. [Footnote is in the original. Kissinger accompanied Ford to California.]

³ North Vietnam began a major military offensive in March; by early April, North Vietnamese troops were approaching Saigon.

⁴ See footnote 2, Document 9.

nese invasion, is a classic vacuum of power, where indigenous forces have had only an outside chance of organizing a cohesive political, economic and military structure.

Our involvement in Southeast Asia was a particular historical distortion, if only because our general posture in Asia has oscillated between period of moralizing accompanied by inaction or bursts of quasi-imperialism followed by lapses into passivity. In particular, we have never resolved the historical debate over whether the US should ever become engaged on the Asian mainland.

The net result has been that our Asian-Pacific policy has been characterized by incoherence or ambivalence. Moreover, the very sources of domestic support that insisted on a crusading mission in the postwar period were among the first to become disenchanted when that policy finally encountered a problem incapable of immediate resolution. With growing nostalgia Truman is lauded for the Marshall Plan and the Korea intervention, but Kennedy and Johnson and Nixon are damned for Vietnam, though the political-ideological rationale was the same in each instance.

In short, the agony of Vietnam coincides with and contributes to another massive swing of opinion toward a kind of utopian revolt against power politics in Asia, disguised as a moral preference for humanitarianism and interdependence. The Tonkin Gulf resolution was the zenith of the previous era, and the vote of the Democratic Caucus inaugurates a new period.⁵

If this is so, then the domestic problem is not to allow the final phase of Vietnam to escalate into such a national trauma that the result will be a total paralysis of policy-making. We cannot galvanize this country into a new attitude on Vietnam; we cannot afford a period of national mourning over the defeat, nor can we afford to treat it as a cause for a permanent split between the White House and the Congress.

The real danger is that the catharsis of Vietnam will lead to a permanent coalition of domestic forces that will block policies we may

⁵ The Gulf of Tonkin Resolution, P.L. 88–408 (78 Stat. 384), signed by President Johnson on August 10, 1964, authorized the President to take necessary steps, including armed force, to repel any armed attack against the forces of the United States and prevent future aggression. The *New York Times* reported on March 14, 1975, that both Senate and House Democrats voted in party caucuses against further military aid to Vietnam and Cambodia. (John Finney, "Aid to Cambodia Is Set Back Anew in Congress Votes," p. 1) The joint resolution, a response to torpedo attacks on the USS *Maddox* and C. *Turner Joy*, passed the Senate (88–2) and House (416–0) on August 7, 1964. Johnson signed Joint Resolution 1145 into law on August 10. For additional information surrounding the Gulf of Tonkin incident and Resolution, see *Foreign Relations, 1964–1968*, volume I, Vietnam, 1964, Documents 255–308.

have to undertake in the aftermath, and that every foreign policy issue will become a partisan-political confrontation.

We have to take an unqualified stand on questions of aid and on the moral issues of deserting a friend, *but* at the same time, it is extremely important that we not transform an inevitable failure into the collapse of the general design of policies that have been developed and pursued since 1969.

In sum, we have to begin limiting the damage. We must be careful in our rhetoric not to exaggerate what happens in Vietnam for two reasons: (1) the balance of power is not yet changed in any fundamental sense, and (2) if we are bent on convincing ourselves that we have suffered a monumental setback, others will almost certainly believe it.

The Asian Perspective

The climax in Indochina will no doubt lead to endless analyses and debates about our Asian-Pacific policy, and for now we can only set forth some preliminary possibilities.

First of all, we should be careful not to overestimate the immediate consequences. There is a kernel of truth to the argument about self-inflicted dominoes. No doubt the other states of Asia, and particularly Southeast Asia, will begin to accommodate themselves to the new realities; but, in fact, each of them had already begun this process: certainly Burma, Thailand, and Malaysia, and to a lesser extent Singapore, the Philippines, Indonesia and Australia.

Given the attitudes in this country and the realities of our power position, we should be very chary of reinforcing a series of undefined commitments, simply to offset the failure in Vietnam. If we are destined for a policy of more selective commitment and a redefinition of our security perimeter, then we cannot be tempted into a policy of total engagement, only to face still another failure.

Thus, in Thailand, if there is a move to force or ask us out, we should be wary of trying to persuade the Thais to take a stand which we will not support when challenged.

At the same time, we should now give major attention to some neglected aspects of our policies—particularly the Philippines and Indonesia, since by almost any definition these countries will play a role in our security and in the balance of power in Southeast Asia.

But the heart of our policy is still Northeast Asia: the power relationships of China, the USSR, Japan and the US.

In reexamining this relationship, we should bear in mind that the present correlation evolved over at least the last decade, beginning with the split between Peking and Moscow. Thus, it is not a transitional arrangement, but one in which each of the participants arrived at their present position after a careful consideration of national interests. For

this reason it is reasonably stable—and events in Vietnam, as such, will not be likely to disrupt it.

Of course, there will be fluctuations and nuances; one party can move slightly closer to another. And there are elements of particular instability, in Russian and Chinese leaderships, and the power balance of a relatively weak China, which will also change over time.

In the short term—the coming decade—certain facts will prevail: the Soviet Union's power will increase enormously compared to both Japan and China; ours will recede relatively, if not absolutely. Russia also has more flexibility than the other actors: while maintaining a relationship with us, it is quite conceivable for the Soviets either to reconcile themselves to China, or opt for a Japanese axis (more likely). It is also conceivable that Japan will either be forced, or decide to choose between Moscow and Peking.

Our problem, therefore, is to consider how we wish the four power relationship to develop: the inescapable conclusion seems to be that for the next decade we will want a Sino-Japanese-American relationship arrayed tacitly against the USSR, even though in the decade that follows we may well have to choose a Soviet-American coalition.

In this sense—based on an assumption that the Soviet Union will be an expanding power in Asia—it also follows that we do not wish to see accretions to that power, whether through links to communist movements, economic ties, or political influence. It also follows that we will wish to see a more normalized relationship between China and the non-communist Asian countries. And, finally, we will want to involve Japan in relationships outside Northeast Asia and deliverately use Japan as a means of exerting indirect American influence.

In this general context two major problems arise:

—*In Korea*, we must find a new opportunity to define our security guarantee, lest there be an inclination for the North Koreans to misread our position, and emulating Ho Chi Minh, use Chinese and Russian competitiveness to commit those countries to a Korean adventure.

—How to manage the *Taiwan problem* in the wake of Vietnam? Will China be tempted to profit at our expense by hardening its position, on the calculation that domestic opinion in the US will abandon Taiwan (e.g., Senator Jackson); can we really continue a slow disengagement? This may be more complicated now because the Taiwan question will be read in Asia, not only as an extension of our China policy, but as conveying a frame of mind in the US.

In sum, are our security guarantees in Asia still valid, and which ones: in Korea, Japan, the Philippines, Taiwan, SEATO? À la Dean Acheson we will be called on in the coming period to define our forward line of defense. In doing so, we also will want to keep in mind we

may be defining a legacy for another Administration, a legacy that should contain certain well defined commitments and strong points that will not be repudiated. And this means more rather than less Congressional involvement in working out a post-Vietnam posture in Asia.

Global Perspectives

The question of our credibility in the world cannot be dealt with in this particular memorandum in any detail. It is a matter of demonstrating by our behavior that we are not in headlong retreat. This will have to be applied to minor issues as well as major ones. But the following problems are more urgent:

—*In the Middle East*, we have to guard against over-reacting to Israeli irresponsibility; we are in some danger of persuading the Arabs that not only are we “reassessing” against Israel, but that our Indochina performance suggests we will eventually abandon Israel under pressure.

—*The USSR*: Fortunately, we have reassurance of the CSCE in the short run, and perhaps SALT in the longer term, so that our immediate problem is tactical: not to be panicked into concessions, but also not to be excessively intransigent simply to show our toughness of pique.

—*In China*, it is difficult to know what precise efforts would impress Peking, and restore our credibility. Given China’s obsession with a strong Western front against the USSR, an effort to regenerate NATO, including Spanish admission, and even Portuguese exclusion, might be the most immediately impressive; also British entry into the EEC should help, but we might want to reconsider MBFR, as well as any unilateral drawdowns of weapons under the Schlesinger plan.

—Finally, *there is the NPT*, and our drive to strengthen it. Do we want to pressure Japan at this particular time; if India is destined to become a nuclear power of sorts, can we insist that Japan become a permanent non-nuclear power, given our own declining position in Asia.

—*In South Asia*, we will be confronted with Diego Garcia in the Congress, and demands that we negotiate with the USSR, etc. We have to decide whether to take a stand on this. It is a particularly important token of our policy in the eyes of Peking.

Vietnam

It is fruitless to speculate in this particular memorandum whether Vietnam is overrun, collapses for lack of leadership and will, negotiates an accommodation, or even survives through another year.

—In our policy we will have to give some new consideration to the tired, semi-phony argument of Asian Titoism. It was totally erroneously applied to a country that had not fulfilled its revolution, but it may have some validity if there is one Vietnam.

—We have two possible interests: (1) we should encourage, as possible, tensions between the Vietnamese and the Chinese, simply because we do not want any basis for the revival of a communist movement spreading across Asia; (2) on the other hand, we do not want the Asians to look to Moscow for reassurance against Vietnamese hegemony; we should prefer that they look to China. Operationally this means that we should encourage some role for Sihanouk, to the degree we will have any influence, and we should be prepared to deal with one Vietnam if it is established.

Which brings us back to the operational problem of what our political position will be in the current crisis. If it should come to negotiations, what are our interests? Not to be involved at all, to become involved and try to salvage what we can, or even to face the inevitability of a communist dominance and work for a separate communist entity in South Vietnam? Given the problems of Korea, and the insurgencies in other parts of Asia, we have to be very careful not to gain the reputation for playing the honest broker between communists and non-communists in Asia.

55. Address by President Ford¹

Washington, April 10, 1975.

Mr. Speaker, Mr. President, distinguished guests, my very good friends in the Congress, and fellow Americans:

I stand before you tonight after many agonizing hours in very solemn prayers for guidance by the Almighty. In my report on the state

¹ Source: *Public Papers: Ford, 1975*, Book I, pp. 459–473. The President delivered his address reporting on U.S. foreign policy to a joint session of Congress at 9:04 p.m. The address was broadcast live on nationwide radio and television networks. Earlier that evening, Kissinger briefed several network television reporters on the content of the President's address, commenting: "We have two problems: The tragedy of Vietnam and the conduct of United States' foreign policy in the face of the difficulties of Vietnam. There are two problems—the management of Vietnam and keeping our foreign policy so that it is carried out with design, conviction and purpose. We cannot avoid the tragedy of Vietnam by denying that it has any foreign policy importance. But we can assure that the basic structure and conduct of our foreign policy remain strong." He later added: "Vietnam will have an effect, but if we come together, we can accomplish our goals of moving the world toward a global and lasting peace. That is the philosophy and background of the speech." (Ford Library, National Security Adviser, Memoranda of Conversations, 1973–1977, Box 10, Memoranda of Conversations—Ford Administration, April 10, 1975—Kissinger, TV Network Representatives)

of the Union in January,² I concentrated on two subjects which were uppermost in the minds of the American people—urgent actions for the recovery of our economy and a comprehensive program to make the United States independent of foreign sources of energy.

I thank the Congress for the action that it has taken thus far in my response [*request?*] for economic recommendations. I look forward to early approval of a national energy program to meet our country's long-range and emergency needs in the field of energy.

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

The leadership of the United States of America since the end of World War II has sustained and advanced the security, well-being, and freedom of millions of human beings besides ourselves. Despite some setbacks, despite some mistakes, the United States has made peace a real prospect for us and for all nations. I know firsthand that the Congress has been a partner in the development and in the support of American foreign policy, which five Presidents before me have carried forward with changes of course but not of destination.

The course which our country chooses in the world today has never been of greater significance for ourselves as a nation and for all mankind. We build from a solid foundation. Our alliances with great industrial democracies in Europe, North America, and Japan remain strong with a greater degree of consultation and equity than ever before.

With the Soviet Union we have moved across a broad front toward a more stable, if still competitive, relationship. We have begun to control the spiral of strategic nuclear armaments.

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

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

We have opened a new dialog with Latin America, looking toward a healthier hemispheric partnership. We are developing closer relations

² Document 51.

with the nations of Africa. We have exercised international leadership on the great new issues of our interdependent world, such as energy, food, environment, and the law of the sea.

The American people can be proud of what their Nation has achieved and helped others to accomplish, but we have from time to time suffered setbacks and disappointments in foreign policy. Some were events over which we had no control; some were difficulties we imposed upon ourselves.

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

I recall quite vividly the words of President Truman to the Congress when the United States faced a far greater challenge at the end of the Second World War. If I might quote: “If we falter in our leadership, we may endanger the peace of the world, and we shall surely endanger the welfare of this Nation.”

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

A vast human tragedy has befallen our friends in Vietnam and Cambodia. Tonight I shall not talk only of obligations arising from legal documents. Who can forget the enormous sacrifices of blood, dedication, and treasure that we made in Vietnam?

Under five Presidents and 12 Congresses, the United States was engaged in Indochina. Millions of Americans served, thousands died, and many more were wounded, imprisoned, or lost. Over \$150 billion have been appropriated for that war by the Congress of the United States. And after years of effort, we negotiated, under the most difficult circumstances, a settlement which made it possible for us to remove our military forces and bring home with pride our American prisoners.³ This settlement, if its terms had been adhered to, would have permitted our South Vietnamese ally, with our material and moral support, to maintain its security and rebuild after two decades of war.

The chances for an enduring peace after the last American fighting man left Vietnam in 1973 rested on two publicly stated premises: first, that if necessary, the United States would help sustain the terms of the Paris accords it signed 2 years ago, and second, that the United States would provide adequate economic and military assistance to South Vietnam.

³ See footnote 3, Document 1.

Let us refresh our memories for just a moment. The universal consensus in the United States at that time, late 1972, was that if we could end our own involvement and obtain the release of our prisoners, we would provide adequate material support to South Vietnam. The North Vietnamese, from the moment they signed the Paris accords, systematically violated the cease-fire and other provisions of that agreement. Flagrantly disregarding the ban on the infiltration of troops, the North Vietnamese illegally introduced over 350,000 men into the South. In direct violation of the agreement, they sent in the most modern equipment in massive amounts. Meanwhile, they continued to receive large quantities of supplies and arms from their friends.

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

Encouraged by these developments, the North Vietnamese, in recent months, began sending even their reserve divisions into South Vietnam. Some 20 divisions, virtually their entire army, are now in South Vietnam.

The Government of South Vietnam, uncertain of further American assistance, hastily ordered a strategic withdrawal to more defensible positions. This extremely difficult maneuver, decided upon without consultations, was poorly executed, hampered by floods of refugees, and thus led to panic. The results are painfully obvious and profoundly moving.

In my first public comment on this tragic development,⁴ I called for a new sense of national unity and purpose. I said I would not engage in recriminations or attempts to assess the blame. I reiterate that tonight.

In the same spirit, I welcome the statement of the distinguished majority leader of the United States Senate earlier this week, and I quote: "It is time for the Congress and the President to work together in the area of foreign as well as domestic policy."

So, let us start afresh.

⁴ Reference is to Ford's remarks at the White House Conference on Domestic and Economic Affairs, held in San Diego on April 3. Ford commented: "As it always has, adversity is creating a new sense of national unity among Americans in these sad and troubled times. I will not engage in recriminations or attempts to assess the blame, nor should any of us. Not all of the facts are known. When they are, the American people will be the jury for the present and historians will write the story for the future. What is essential now is that we keep our nerve and our essential unity as a powerful but peace-loving nation." (*Public Papers: Ford, 1975*, Book I, p. 425)

I am here to work with the Congress. In the conduct of foreign affairs, Presidential initiative and ability to act swiftly in emergencies are essential to our national interest.

With respect to North Vietnam, I call upon Hanoi—and ask the Congress to join with me in this call—to cease military operations immediately and to honor the terms of the Paris agreement.

The United States is urgently requesting the signatories of the Paris conference to meet their obligations to use their influence to halt the fighting and to enforce the 1973 accords. Diplomatic notes to this effect have been sent to all members of the Paris conference, including the Soviet Union and the People's Republic of China.⁵

The situation in South Vietnam and Cambodia has reached a critical phase requiring immediate and positive decisions by this Government. The options before us are few and the time is very short.

On the one hand, the United States could do nothing more; let the Government of South Vietnam save itself and what is left of its territory, if it can; let those South Vietnamese civilians who have worked with us for a decade or more save their lives and their families, if they can; in short, shut our eyes and wash our hands of the whole affair—if we can.

Or, on the other hand, I could ask the Congress for authority to enforce the Paris accords with our troops and our tanks and our aircraft and our artillery and carry the war to the enemy.

There are two narrower options:

First, stick with my January request that Congress appropriate \$300 million for military assistance for South Vietnam and seek additional funds for economic and humanitarian purposes.⁶

Or, increase my requests for both emergency military and humanitarian assistance to levels which, by best estimates, might enable the South Vietnamese to stem the onrushing aggression, to stabilize the military situation, permit the chance of a negotiated political settlement between the North and South Vietnamese, and if the very worst were to happen, at least allow the orderly evacuation of Americans and endangered South Vietnamese to places of safety.

Let me now state my considerations and my conclusions.

⁵ The notes were sent on April 10 to Hungary, Indonesia, the United Kingdom, the Soviet Union, France, Poland, the People's Republic of China, Vietnam, and Iran and to UNSC, to be delivered just prior to the President's speech. Documentation on the final dénouement of the war in Indochina is in *Foreign Relations, 1969–1976*, volume X, Vietnam, January 1973–July 1975.

⁶ See footnote 2, Document 52.

I have received a full report from General Weyand,⁷ whom I sent to Vietnam to assess the situation. He advises that the current military situation is very critical, but that South Vietnam is continuing to defend itself with the resources available. However, he feels that if there is to be any chance of success for their defense plan, South Vietnam needs urgently an additional \$722 million in very specific military supplies from the United States. In my judgment, a stabilization of the military situation offers the best opportunity for a political solution.

I must, of course, as I think each of you would, consider the safety of nearly 6,000 Americans who remain in South Vietnam and tens of thousands of South Vietnamese employees of the United States Government, of news agencies, of contractors and businesses for many years whose lives, with their dependents, are in very grave peril. There are tens of thousands of other South Vietnamese intellectuals, professors, teachers, editors, and opinion leaders who have supported the South Vietnamese cause and the alliance with the United States to whom we have a profound moral obligation.

I am also mindful of our posture toward the rest of the world and, particularly, of our future relations with the free nations of Asia. These nations must not think for a minute that the United States is pulling out on them or intends to abandon them to aggression.

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

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

I am therefore asking the Congress to appropriate without delay \$722 million for emergency military assistance and an initial sum of \$250 million for economic and humanitarian aid for South Vietnam.

The situation in South Vietnam is changing very rapidly, and the need for emergency food, medicine, and refugee relief is growing by the hour. I will work with the Congress in the days ahead to develop humanitarian assistance to meet these very pressing needs.

Fundamental decency requires that we do everything in our power to ease the misery and the pain of the monumental human crisis which has befallen the people of Vietnam. Millions have fled in the face

⁷General Frederick C. Weyand, U.S. Army Chief of Staff. [Footnote is in the original.]

of the Communist onslaught and are now homeless and are now destitute. I hereby pledge in the name of the American people that the United States will make a maximum humanitarian effort to help care for and feed these hopeless victims.

And now I ask the Congress to clarify immediately its restrictions on the use of U.S. military forces in Southeast Asia for the limited purposes of protecting American lives by ensuring their evacuation, if this should be necessary. And I also ask prompt revision of the law to cover those Vietnamese to whom we have a very special obligation and whose lives may be endangered should the worst come to pass.

I hope that this authority will never have to be used, but if it is needed, there will be no time for Congressional debate. Because of the gravity of the situation, I ask the Congress to complete action on all of these measures not later than April 19.

In Cambodia, the situation is tragic. The United States and the Cambodian Government have each made major efforts, over a long period and through many channels, to end that conflict. But because of their military successes, steady external support, and their awareness of American legal restrictions, the Communist side has shown no interest in negotiation, compromise, or a political solution. And yet, for the past 3 months, the beleaguered people of Phnom Penh have fought on, hoping against hope that the United States would not desert them, but instead provide the arms and ammunition they so badly needed.

I have received a moving letter from the new acting President of Cambodia, Saukham Khoy, and let me quote it for you:

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

"To find a peaceful end to the conflict we need time. I do not know how much time, but we all fully realize that the agony of the Khmer people cannot and must not go on much longer. However, for the immediate future, we need the rice to feed the hungry and the ammunition and the weapons to defend ourselves against those who want to impose their will by force [of arms].⁸ A denial by the American people of the means for us to carry on will leave us no alternative but inevitably abandoning our search for a solution which will give our citizens some freedom of choice as to their future. For a number of years now the Cambodian people have placed their trust in America. I cannot believe that this confidence was misplaced and that suddenly America

⁸ Brackets are in the original.

will deny us the means which might give us a chance to find an acceptable solution to our conflict.”

This letter speaks for itself. In January, I requested food and ammunition for the brave Cambodians, and I regret to say that as of this evening, it may be soon too late.⁹

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

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

We cannot, in the meantime, abandon our friends while our adversaries support and encourage theirs. We cannot dismantle our defenses, our diplomacy, or our intelligence capability while others increase and strengthen theirs.

Let us put an end to self-inflicted wounds. Let us remember that our national unity is a most priceless asset. Let us deny our adversaries the satisfaction of using Vietnam to pit Americans against Americans. At this moment, the United States must present to the world a united front.

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

Let no potential adversary believe that our difficulties or our debates mean a slackening of our national will. We will stand by our friends, we will honor our commitments, and we will uphold our country's principles.

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

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

⁹ On April 11, Khmer Rouge troops entered Phnom Penh. In advance of such action, the United States instituted its evacuation plan, Operation Eagle Pull, to remove Embassy personnel and top Cambodian officials from Phnom Penh. Although the United States planned to evacuate close to 300 Cambodians, the final number was substantially lower. During an April 14 meeting with the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, Ford commented that few left “because the gutsy Cambodians chose to stay and die rather than leave.” (Ford Library, National Security Adviser, Memoranda of Conversations,

We must, first of all, face the fact that what has happened in Indochina has disquieted many of our friends, especially in Asia. We must deal with this situation promptly and firmly. To this end, I have already scheduled meetings with the leaders of Australia, New Zealand, Singapore, and Indonesia, and I expect to meet with the leaders of other Asian countries as well.

A key country in this respect is Japan. The warm welcome I received in Japan last November¹⁰ vividly symbolized for both our peoples the friendship and the solidarity of this extraordinary partnership. I look forward, as I am sure all of you do, with very special pleasure to welcoming the Emperor when he visits the United States later this year.

We consider our security treaty with Japan the cornerstone of stability in the vast reaches of Asia and the Pacific. Our relations are crucial to our mutual well-being. Together, we are working energetically on the international multilateral agenda—in trade, energy, and food. We will continue the process of strengthening our friendship, mutual security, and prosperity.

Also, of course, of fundamental importance is our mutual security relationship with the Republic of Korea, which I reaffirmed on my recent visit.

Our relations with Europe have never been stronger. There are no peoples with whom America's destiny has been more closely linked. There are no peoples whose friendship and cooperation are more needed for the future. For none of the members of the Atlantic community can be secure, none can prosper, none can advance unless we all do so together. More than ever, these times demand our close collaboration in order to maintain the secure anchor of our common security in this time of international riptides, to work together on the promising negotiations with our potential adversaries, to pool our energies on the great new economic challenge that faces us.

In addition to this traditional agenda, there are new problems involving energy, raw materials, and the environment. The Atlantic nations face many and complex negotiations and decisions. It is time to take stock, to consult on our future, to affirm once again our cohesion and our common destiny. I therefore expect to join with the other leaders of the Atlantic Alliance at a Western summit in the very near future.¹¹

1973–1977, Box 10, Memoranda of Conversations—Ford Administration, April 14, 1975—Ford, Kissinger, Schlesinger, Senate Foreign Relations Committee)

¹⁰ Ford visited Japan, South Korea, and the Soviet Union November 17–24, 1974.

¹¹ Ford attended the NATO summit meeting in Brussels May 29–30. See footnote 3, Document 60.

Before this NATO meeting, I earnestly ask the Congress to weigh the broader considerations and consequences of its past actions on the complex Greek-Turkish dispute over Cyprus.¹² Our foreign policy cannot be simply a collection of special economic or ethnic or ideological interests. There must be a deep concern for the overall design of our international actions. To achieve this design for peace and to assure that our individual acts have some coherence, the Executive must have some flexibility in the conduct of foreign policy.

United States military assistance to an old and faithful ally, Turkey, has been cut off by action of the Congress. This has imposed an embargo on military purchases by Turkey, extending even to items already paid for—an unprecedented act against a friend.

These moves, I know, were sincerely intended to influence Turkey in the Cyprus negotiations. I deeply share the concern of many citizens for the immense human suffering on Cyprus. I sympathize with the new democratic government in Greece. We are continuing our earnest efforts to find equitable solutions to the problems which exist between Greece and Turkey. But the result of the Congressional action has been to block progress towards reconciliation, thereby prolonging the suffering on Cyprus, to complicate our ability to promote successful negotiations, to increase the danger of a broader conflict.

Our longstanding relationship with Turkey is not simply a favor to Turkey; it is a clear and essential mutual interest. Turkey lies on the rim of the Soviet Union and at the gates of the Middle East. It is vital to the security of the eastern Mediterranean, the southern flank of Western Europe, and the collective security of the Western alliance. Our U.S. military bases in Turkey are as critical to our own security as they are to the defense of NATO.

I therefore call upon the Congress to lift the American arms embargo against our Turkish ally by passing the bipartisan Mansfield-Scott bill¹³ now before the Senate. Only this will enable us to work with Greece and Turkey to resolve the differences between our allies. I accept and indeed welcome the bill's requirement for monthly reports to the Congress on progress toward a Cyprus settlement, but unless this is done with dispatch, forces may be set in motion within and between the two nations which could not be reversed.

¹² See footnote 4, Document 52.

¹³ The Scott-Mansfield bill, S. 846, would restore grant assistance and credit and commercial sales to Turkey as long as the Turks observed the Cyprus cease-fire and provided the President reported monthly to Congress on progress in the Cyprus negotiations. Documentation on the Cyprus crisis is in *Foreign Relations, 1969–1976*, volume XXX, Greece; Cyprus; Turkey, 1973–1976.

At the same time, in order to strengthen the democratic government of Greece and to reaffirm our traditional ties with the people of Greece, we are actively discussing a program of economic and military assistance with them. We will shortly be submitting specific requests to the Congress in this regard.

A vital element of our foreign policy is our relationship with the developing countries in Africa, Asia, and Latin America. These countries must know that America is a true, that America is a concerned friend, reliable both in word and deed.

As evidence of this friendship, I urge the Congress to reconsider one provision of the 1974 trade act¹⁴ which has had an unfortunate and unintended impact on our relations with Latin America, where we have such a long tie of friendship and cooperation. Under this legislation, all members of OPEC were excluded from our generalized system of trade preferences. This, unfortunately, punished two South American friends, Ecuador and Venezuela, as well as other OPEC nations, such as Nigeria and Indonesia, none of which participated in last year's oil embargo. This exclusion has seriously complicated our new dialog with our friends in this hemisphere. I therefore endorse the amendments which have been introduced in the Congress to provide executive authority to waive those restrictions on the trade act that are incompatible with our national interest.

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

Because we are in the unique position of being able to deal with all the parties, we have, at their request, been engaged for the past year and a half in the peacemaking effort unparalleled in the history of the region. Our policy has brought remarkable successes on the road to peace. Last year, two major disengagement agreements were negotiated and implemented with our help.¹⁵ For the first time in 30 years, a process of negotiation on the basic political issues was begun and is continuing.

Unfortunately, the latest efforts to reach a further interim agreement between Israel and Egypt have been suspended. The issues dividing the parties are vital to them and not amenable to easy and to quick solutions. However, the United States will not be discouraged.

¹⁴ See Document 31.

¹⁵ Ford was referring to the Egyptian-Israeli disengagement agreement of January 18, 1974, and the Syrian-Israeli disengagement agreement of May 31, 1974.

The momentum toward peace that has been achieved over the last 18 months must and will be maintained. The active role of the United States must and will be continued. The drift toward war must and will be prevented.

I pledge the United States to a major effort for peace in the Middle East, an effort which I know has the solid support of the American people and their Congress. We are now examining how best to proceed. We have agreed in principle to reconvene the Geneva conference. We are prepared as well to explore other forums. The United States will move ahead on whatever course looks most promising, either towards an overall settlement or interim agreements, should the parties themselves desire them. We will not accept stagnation or stalemate with all its attendant risks to peace and prosperity and to our relations in and outside of the region.

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

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

As long as I am President, America will maintain its strength, its alliances, and its principles as a prerequisite to a more peaceful planet. As long as I am President, we will not permit détente to become a license to fish in troubled waters. Détente must be—and, I trust, will be—a two-way relationship.

Central to U.S.-Soviet relations today is the critical negotiation to control strategic nuclear weapons. We hope to turn the Vladivostok agreements¹⁶ into a final agreement this year at the time of General Secretary Brezhnev's visit to the United States. Such an agreement would, for the first time, put a ceiling on the strategic arms race. It would mark a turning point in postwar history and would be a crucial step in lifting from mankind the threat of nuclear war.

Our use of trade and economic sanctions as weapons to alter the internal conduct of other nations must also be seriously reexamined. However well-intentioned the goals, the fact is that some of our recent

¹⁶ See footnote 6, Document 48.

actions in the economic field have been self-defeating, they are not achieving the objectives intended by the Congress, and they have damaged our foreign policy.

The Trade Act of 1974 prohibits most-favored-nation treatment, credit and investment guarantees and commercial agreements with the Soviet Union so long as their emigration policies fail to meet our criteria. The Soviet Union has therefore refused to put into effect the important 1972 trade agreement between our two countries.

As a result, Western Europe and Japan have stepped into the breach. Those countries have extended credits to the Soviet Union exceeding \$8 billion in the last 6 months. These are economic opportunities, jobs, and business which could have gone to Americans.

There should be no illusions about the nature of the Soviet system, but there should be no illusions about how to deal with it. Our belief in the right of peoples of the world freely to emigrate has been well demonstrated. This legislation, however, not only harmed our relations with the Soviet Union but seriously complicated the prospects of those seeking to emigrate. The favorable trend, aided by quiet diplomacy, by which emigration increased from 400 in 1968 to over 33,000 in 1973 has been seriously set back. Remedial legislation is urgently needed in our national interest.

With the People's Republic of China, we are firmly fixed on the course set forth in the Shanghai communiqué.¹⁷ Stability in Asia and the world require our constructive relations with one-fourth of the human race. After two decades of mutual isolation and hostility, we have, in recent years, built a promising foundation. Deep differences in our philosophy and social systems will endure, but so should our mutual long-term interests and the goals to which our countries have jointly subscribed in Shanghai. I will visit China later this year to reaffirm these interests and to accelerate the improvement in our relations. And I was glad to welcome the distinguished Speaker and the distinguished minority leader of the House back today from their constructive visit to the People's Republic of China.

Let me talk about new challenges. The issues I have discussed are the most pressing of the traditional agenda on foreign policy, but ahead of us also is a vast new agenda of issues in an interdependent world. The United States, with its economic power, its technology, its zest for new horizons, is the acknowledged world leader in dealing with many of these challenges.

If this is a moment of uncertainty in the world, it is even more a moment of rare opportunity.

¹⁷ See footnote 5, Document 3.

We are summoned to meet one of man's most basic challenges—hunger. At the World Food Conference last November in Rome, the United States outlined a comprehensive program to close the ominous gap between population growth and food production over the long term.¹⁸ Our technological skill and our enormous productive capacity are crucial to accomplishing this task.

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

The world's oceans, with their immense resources and strategic importance, must become areas of cooperation rather than conflict. American policy is directed to that end.

Technology must be harnessed to the service of mankind while protecting the environment. This, too, is an arena for American leadership.

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

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

But the fate of all of these programs depends crucially on what we do at home. Every month that passes brings us closer to the day when we will be dependent on imported energy for 50 percent of our requirements. A new embargo under these conditions could have a devastating impact on jobs, industrial expansion, and inflation at home. Our economy cannot be left to the mercy of decisions over which we have no control. And I call upon the Congress to act affirmatively.

In a world where information is power, a vital element of our national security lies in our intelligence services. They are essential to our Nation's security in peace as in war. Americans can be grateful for the important but largely unsung contributions and achievements of the intelligence services of this Nation.

It is entirely proper that this system be subject to Congressional review. But a sensationalized public debate over legitimate intelligence

¹⁸ See Document 47.

activities is a disservice to this Nation and a threat to our intelligence system. It ties our hands while our potential enemies operate with secrecy, with skill, and with vast resources. Any investigation must be conducted with maximum discretion and dispatch to avoid crippling a vital national institution.

Let me speak quite frankly to some in this Chamber and perhaps to some not in this Chamber. The Central Intelligence Agency has been of maximum importance to Presidents before me. The Central Intelligence Agency has been of maximum importance to me. The Central Intelligence Agency and its associated intelligence organizations could be of maximum importance to some of you in this audience who might be President at some later date. I think it would be catastrophic for the Congress or anyone else to destroy the usefulness by dismantling, in effect, our intelligence systems upon which we rest so heavily.

Now, as Congress oversees intelligence activities, it must, of course, organize itself to do so in a responsible way. It has been traditional for the Executive to consult with the Congress through specially protected procedures that safeguard essential secrets. But recently, some of those procedures have altered in a way that makes the protection of vital information very, very difficult. I will say to the leaders of the Congress, the House and the Senate, that I will work with them to devise procedures which will meet the needs of the Congress for review of intelligence agency activities and the needs of the Nation for an effective intelligence service.

Underlying any successful foreign policy is the strength and the credibility of our defense posture. We are strong and we are ready and we intend to remain so. Improvement of relations with adversaries does not mean any relaxation of our national vigilance. On the contrary, it is the firm maintenance of both strength and vigilance that makes possible steady progress toward a safer and a more peaceful world.

The national security budget that I have submitted is the minimum the United States needs in this critical hour.¹⁹ The Congress should review it carefully, and I know it will. But it is my considered judgment that any significant reduction, revision, would endanger our national security and thus jeopardize the peace.

¹⁹ President Ford submitted his FY 1976 budget to Congress on February 3. The section of his transmittal message concerning national security begins: "The ultimate goal of American foreign policy is to ensure the freedom, security, and well-being of the United States as part of a peaceful and prosperous international community." For the full text of the message, see *Public Papers: Ford, 1975*, Book I, pp. 146–163.

Let no ally doubt our determination to maintain a defense second to none, and let no adversary be tempted to test our readiness or our resolve.

History is testing us today. We cannot afford indecision, disunity, or disarray in the conduct of our foreign affairs. You and I can resolve here and now that this Nation shall move ahead with wisdom, with assurance, and with national unity.

The world looks to us for the vigor and for the vision that we have demonstrated so often in the past in great moments of our national history. And as I look down the road, I see a confident America, secure in its strengths, secure in its values, and determined to maintain both. I see a conciliatory America, extending its hand to allies and adversaries alike, forming bonds of cooperation to deal with the vast problems facing us all. I see a compassionate America, its heart reaching out to orphans, to refugees, and to our fellow human beings afflicted by war, by tyranny, and by hunger.

As President, entrusted by the Constitution with primary responsibility for the conduct of our foreign affairs, I renew the pledge I made last August to work cooperatively with the Congress.²⁰ I ask that the Congress help to keep America's word good throughout the world. We are one Nation, one government, and we must have one foreign policy.

In an hour far darker than this, Abraham Lincoln told his fellow citizens, and I quote: "We cannot escape history. We of this Congress and this Administration will be remembered in spite of ourselves. No personal significance or insignificance can spare one or another of us."

We who are entrusted by the people with the great decisions that fashion their future can escape neither responsibilities nor our consciences. By what we do now, the world will know our courage, our constancy, and our compassion.

The spirit of America is good and the heart of America is strong. Let us be proud of what we have done and confident of what we can do.

And may God ever guide us to do what is right.

Thank you.

²⁰ See Document 41.

56. Memorandum From the President's Deputy Assistant for National Security Affairs (Scowcroft) to the President's Assistant for National Security Affairs (Kissinger)¹

Washington, April 15, 1975.

SUBJECT

Schlesinger's Speech to the Overseas Press Club

Schlesinger will deliver the speech at Tab A before the Overseas Press Club in New York at 6:00 tonight.² His purpose in the speech—"to discuss the historic ebb and flow of American sentiment regarding the proper role and responsibility of the United States in international affairs"—takes some interesting twists. At the outset Schlesinger refers to the current slump through which the American society is passing and expresses the hope for a rapid transition through it in order to recover "... internal health and cohesion" as well as to continue "the American impact on the stability, security and well-being of other free states around the world." Schlesinger states further that "there is no acceptable alternative to deep and steady American support of and participation in the security of other free states." In the latter context Schlesinger then focuses on Vietnam and states that while the outcome of the current struggle remains in doubt, "the Vietnamese deserve not only our hope for their success but our continued support." Schlesinger then addresses Vietnam as a notable example of "the historic misunderstanding regarding the necessary role that force plays in the settlement of international disputes, on the one hand, and the role of noble intentions supported by moralizing but unsupported by physical force on the other." He refers to the history of North Vietnamese violations of the Paris Accords as "an object lesson regarding how much constraint on the actions of at least one Communist state such pledged treaty obligations have when the force balance becomes unfavorable." Schlesinger does not, however, carry the point forward to define whether the responsibility for not using the necessary force was rooted in the faulty

¹ Source: Ford Library, National Security Adviser, Presidential Agency Files, Box 6, Defense, Department of, 3/11/75–4/30/75. Administratively Confidential. A notation on the memorandum by Scowcroft indicates Kissinger saw it.

² Tab A, attached but not printed, is a copy of Schlesinger's speech. According to a published description: "Much of Mr. Schlesinger's speech was devoted to what seemed to be a history lesson for listeners overseas. He traced the oscillations of American feeling about overseas involvement from the Spanish-American War until the present, pointing out that public opinion had swung from enthusiastic physical participation in world affairs to such 'high-flown moral' commitments as the Kellogg-Briand pact of the twenties." ("U.S. to Honor Pacts, Schlesinger Says," *New York Times*, April 16, 1975, p. 19)

premise of détente, which he implies, or elsewhere, i.e. legislative restriction.

Schlesinger then turns to a rather sophomoric treatment of the cycle of American sentiment toward foreign policy as between moralistic enthusiasm and disenchanted isolationism. In the process, he includes the hypocritical but soul salving statement that “American society . . . is for a democracy, remarkably tenacious of purpose, as I think the overall history of the war in Southeast Asia would indicate.” Schlesinger then warms to his subject, however, by asking rhetorically where this historical cycle leaves us today. Keeping his remarks in the abstract, he states that “that admixture of idealism and disenchantment has historically resulted in a quest for novelty in foreign policy. But in foreign policy novelty is not available. Given the underlying realities of the single strategic stage on which world politics is now played, the United States will be obliged either to support its more or less permanent interests (by essentially military means) or withdraw into the North American continent. There are matters of degree, of course, but . . . there are no novelties suddenly to be discovered.” (Parenthetical comment added by Scowcroft.) Schlesinger then cites George Kennan’s statement of the fundamental necessity that no single continental land power come to dominate the Eurasian landmass³ as a pragmatic guide to overall policy and as explaining “why no novel discoveries will suddenly eliminate the continuing responsibility of the United States as the mainstay and cohesive force among free nations,” and further with regard to U.S. forces in Europe that “there is no novel way in which those forces can be withdrawn and the military balance in Europe be preserved.” He then goes on to focus upon the essentiality of maintaining the U.S. commitment to NATO, Japan, and Korea with whom we have treaty commitments (no reference to the Philippines, the OAS or CENTO).

My remarks may be too severe. The speech may be read as a call for a strong national defense and nothing more. I believe, however, that there are enough rationalizations on Vietnam and exclusive references to wherein the United States’ interests really lie to present a disquieting statement to many of our allies by an official who ought to know better. Moreover, Schlesinger’s repeated references to the search for “novelties” in foreign policy is a scarcely veiled reference to détente. His fundamental distortion of the concept is bad enough. When viewed in the context of his own actions, e.g. to unilaterally withdraw warheads from Europe and general purpose forces from many other locations, it becomes downright disgusting.

³ Presumably a reference to Kennan’s “The Sources of Soviet Conduct,” published in the July 1947 issue of *Foreign Affairs* under the pseudonym “X.”

57. Address by President Ford¹

New Orleans, April 23, 1975.

[Omitted here are introductory remarks.]

Today, America can regain the sense of pride that existed before Vietnam. But it cannot be achieved by refighting a war that is finished as far as America is concerned.² As I see it, the time has come to look forward to an agenda for the future, to unify, to bind up the Nation's wounds, and to restore its health and its optimistic self-confidence.

In New Orleans, a great battle was fought after a war was over. In New Orleans tonight, we can begin a great national reconciliation. The first engagement must be with the problems of today, but just as importantly, the problems of the future. That is why I think it is so appropriate that I find myself tonight at a university which addresses itself to preparing young people for the challenge of tomorrow.

I ask that we stop refighting the battles and the recriminations of the past. I ask that we look now at what is right with America, at our possibilities and our potentialities for change and growth and achievement and sharing. I ask that we accept the responsibilities of leadership as a good neighbor to all peoples and the enemy of none. I ask that we strive to become, in the finest American tradition, something more tomorrow than we are today.

Instead of my addressing the image of America, I prefer to consider the reality of America. It is true that we have launched our Bicentennial celebration without having achieved human perfection, but we have attained a very remarkable self-governed society that possesses the flexibility and the dynamism to grow and undertake an entirely new agenda, an agenda for America's third century.

So, I ask you to join me in helping to write that agenda. I am as determined as a President can be to seek national rediscovery of the belief in ourselves that characterized the most creative periods in our Nation's history. The greatest challenge of creativity, as I see it, lies ahead.

¹ Source: *Public Papers: Ford, 1975*, Book I, pp. 568–573. The President delivered his remarks, entitled “An Agenda for America's Third Century,” at 8:07 p.m. in the Tulane University Fieldhouse.

² On April 21, South Vietnamese President Nguyen Van Thieu resigned. During an April 22 breakfast meeting with the Republican congressional leadership, Kissinger termed the military situation in Vietnam “clearly hopeless”; in that light, the American objective was to “achieve the most controlled situation possible for evacuation of Americans and Vietnamese.” (Ford Library, National Security Adviser, Memoranda of Conversations, 1973–1977, Box 11, Memoranda of Conversations—Ford Administration, April 22, 1975—Ford, Kissinger, Schlesinger, Republican Congressional Leadership, 4/22/75) The U.S. evacuation—code-named Frequent Wind—commenced on April 29.

We, of course, are saddened indeed by the events in Indochina. But these events, tragic as they are, portend neither the end of the world nor of America's leadership in the world.

Let me put it this way, if I might. Some tend to feel that if we do not succeed in everything everywhere, then we have succeeded in nothing anywhere. I reject categorically such polarized thinking. We can and we should help others to help themselves. But the fate of responsible men and women everywhere, in the final decision, rests in their own hands, not in ours.

America's future depends upon Americans—especially your generation, which is now equipping itself to assume the challenges of the future, to help write the agenda for America.

Earlier today, in this great community, I spoke about the need to maintain our defenses.³ Tonight, I would like to talk about another kind of strength, the true source of American power that transcends all of the deterrent powers for peace of our Armed Forces. I am speaking here of our belief in ourselves and our belief in our Nation.

Abraham Lincoln asked, in his own words, and I quote, "What constitutes the bulwark of our own liberty and independence?" And he answered, "It is not our frowning battlements or bristling seacoasts, our Army or our Navy. Our defense is in the spirit which prized liberty as the heritage of all men, in all lands everywhere."

It is in this spirit that we must now move beyond the discords of the past decade. It is in this spirit that I ask you to join me in writing an agenda for the future.

I welcome your invitation particularly tonight, because I know it is at Tulane and other centers of thought throughout our great country that much consideration is being given to the kind of future Americans want and, just as importantly, will work for. Each of you are preparing yourselves for the future, and I am deeply interested in your preparations and your opinions and your goals. However, tonight, with your indulgence, let me share with you my own views.

I envision a creative program that goes as far as our courage and our capacities can take us, both at home and abroad. My goal is for a co-operative world at peace, using its resources to build, not to destroy.

As President, I am determined to offer leadership to overcome our current economic problems. My goal is for jobs for all who want to work and economic opportunity for all who want to achieve.

³ Ford discussed naval strength and readiness in light of reduced Department of Defense expenditures in a speech at 1:55 p.m. to the members of the Navy League of the United States. See *Public Papers: Ford, 1975*, Book I, pp. 562–567.

I am determined to seek self-sufficiency in energy as an urgent national priority. My goal is to make America independent of foreign energy sources by 1985.

Of course, I will pursue interdependence with other nations and a reformed international economic system. My goal is for a world in which consuming and producing nations achieve a working balance.

I will address the humanitarian issues of hunger and famine, of health and of healing. My goal is to achieve—or to assure basic needs and an effective system to achieve this result.

I recognize the need for technology that enriches life while preserving our natural environment. My goal is to stimulate productivity, but use technology to redeem, not to destroy our environment.

I will strive for new cooperation rather than conflict in the peaceful exploration of our oceans and our space. My goal is to use resources for peaceful progress rather than war and destruction.

Let America symbolize humanity's struggle to conquer nature and master technology. The time has now come for our Government to facilitate the individual's control over his or her future—and of the future of America.

But the future requires more than Americans congratulating themselves on how much we know and how many products that we can produce. It requires new knowledge to meet new problems. We must not only be motivated to build a better America, we must know how to do it.

If we really want a humane America that will, for instance, contribute to the alleviation of the world's hunger, we must realize that good intentions do not feed people. Some problems, as anyone who served in the Congress knows, are complex. There are no easy answers. Willpower alone does not grow food.

We thought, in a well-intentioned past, that we could export our technology lock, stock, and barrel to developing nations. We did it with the best of intentions. But we are now learning that a strain of rice that grows in one place will not grow in another; that factories that produce at 100 percent in one nation produce less than half as much in a society where temperaments and work habits are somewhat different.

Yet, the world economy has become interdependent. Not only food technology but money management, natural resources and energy, research and development—all kinds of this group require an organized world society that makes the maximum effective use of the world's resources.

I want to tell the world: Let's grow food together, but let's also learn more about nutrition, about weather forecasting, about irrigation,

about the many other specialties involved in helping people to help themselves.

We must learn more about people, about the development of communities, architecture, engineering, education, motivation, productivity, public health and medicine, arts and sciences, political, legal, and social organization. All of these specialties and many, many more are required if young people like you are to help this Nation develop an agenda for our future—your future, our country's future.

I challenge, for example, the medical students in this audience to put on their agenda the achievement of a cure for cancer. I challenge the engineers in this audience to devise new techniques for developing cheap, clean, and plentiful energy, and as a byproduct, to control floods. I challenge the law students in this audience to find ways to speed the administration of equal justice and make good citizens out of convicted criminals. I challenge education, those of you as education majors, to do real teaching for real life. I challenge the arts majors in this audience to compose the great American symphony, to write the great American novel, and to enrich and inspire our daily lives.

America's leadership is essential. America's resources are vast. America's opportunities are unprecedented.

As we strive together to prefect a new agenda, I put high on the list of important points the maintenance of alliances and partnerships with other people and other nations. These do provide a basis of shared values, even as we stand up with determination for what we believe. This, of course, requires a continuing commitment to peace and a determination to use our good offices wherever possible to promote better relations between nations of this world.

The new agenda, that which is developed by you and by us, must place a high priority on the need to stop the spread of nuclear weapons and to work for the mutual reduction in strategic arms and control of other weapons. And I must say, parenthetically, the successful negotiations at Vladivostok, in my opinion, are just a beginning.

Your generation of Americans is uniquely endowed by history to give new meaning to the pride and spirit of America. The magnetism of an American society, confident of its own strength, will attract the good will and the esteem of all people wherever they might be in this globe in which we live. It will enhance our own perception of ourselves and our pride in being an American. We can, we *can*—and I say it with emphasis—write a new agenda for our future.

I am glad that Tulane University and other great American educational institutions are reaching out to others in programs to work with developing nations, and I look forward with confidence to your participation in every aspect of America's future.

And I urge Americans of all ages to unite in this Bicentennial year, to take responsibility for themselves as our ancestors did. Let us resolve tonight to rediscover the old virtues of confidence and self-reliance and capability that characterized our forefathers two centuries ago. I pledge, as I know you do, each one of us, to do our part.

Let the beacon light of the past shine forth from historic New Orleans and from Tulane University and from every other corner of this land to illuminate a boundless future for all Americans and a peace for all mankind.

Thank you very much.

58. Telegram From the Department of State to All Diplomatic and Consular Posts¹

Washington, May 15, 1975, 0021Z.

113000. Subject: The US Response to Recent Developments in Southeast Asia and Elsewhere.

1. I want to share with each of you my thoughts on where we stand and how we should comport ourselves in light of recent developments, particularly the events in Indochina. The President first addressed these issues broadly in his State of the World message on April 10.² My remarks to the American Society of Newspaper Editors on April 15³ were likewise devoted to these problems. Since then the President and I have spoken out on other occasions, including my St. Louis speech of May 12.⁴ I hope you and your staff have had a chance to read these various statements.

¹ Source: National Archives, RG 59, Central Foreign Policy File, D750170–0109. Confidential; Priority. Drafted by Lord and Michael Armacost, cleared by Eagleburger and R.E. Woods (S/S), and approved by Kissinger. Lord and Armacost sent a draft to Kissinger on May 5. In a covering memorandum, they characterized the telegram as a “personal message from you that lays out the basic posture and tone we should adopt in the wake of recent events, particularly in Indochina.” David G. Gompert initialed Kissinger’s approval on May 13. An additional handwritten comment reads: “as amended.” (Library of Congress, Manuscript Division, Kissinger Papers, Box CL 325, Department of State, Bureaus, Policy Planning, History Project, Selected Papers, Vol. 8 (global, new multilateral issues, and miscellany), 1974–76)

² Document 55.

³ For Kissinger’s remarks, actually delivered on April 17, see Department of State *Bulletin*, May 5, 1975, p. 557–563.

⁴ For Kissinger’s speech, see *ibid.*, June 2, 1975, pp. 705–712.

2. There is no denying that we have experienced serious setbacks and disappointments in recent weeks. Some were beyond our control. Some we inflicted upon ourselves. As a consequence, we must be prepared to face tests of our own resolve and staying power in the weeks and months to come. Many here are inclined to discount the impact of the events in Southeast Asia on our international role. They look upon the termination of the North-South conflict with apparent relief. They emphasize that the recent defeats are a consequence of shortcomings in the capabilities of our friends. They underscore the unique features of the Indochina conflict, and hope that other governments will not regard our actions there as indicative of a general retreat from overseas responsibilities. They argue that the closing of this chapter of our Southeast Asia policy will permit a more effective deployment of our resources and commitments in the world.

3. While there is some validity to many of these views, it would be idle and dangerous to leave the situation at that. We cannot ignore the fact that we have, indeed, suffered some major reverses and proceed as if nothing had really happened. America is a strong nation that can—and will—solve its problems only by facing up to them. Even those governments that have been most critical of our involvement in Vietnam, which have most earnestly regretted the diversion of our resources and attention which our involvement produced, and which most fervently hoped for an end to the fractious divisions in American opinion which it spawned, now harbor questions about our ability and willingness to make those difficult decisions which are the lot of a great power. We would be deluding ourselves if we discounted the evidence that what has happened in Indochina—and in Washington—has disquieted many of our friends, especially in Asia. We will have to respond to many of these concerns promptly and firmly. Also we must recognize the fact that these events have serious implications for how we as a people see our role in the world. We will have to do some major rethinking and work hard to shore up the domestic foundations of our policy. Rhetoric alone will not do the job. The impact of recent events will be measured by how we as a nation meet our challenges in the coming months.

4. In our dealings with foreign officials and leaders our conduct must be guided by several general considerations:

A. We must not dwell excessively on the past. We need to look ahead. That is the tone we intend to set here. The President and I have made it clear that we intend to avoid a divisive national debate designed to apportion blame for developments in Indochina. Recriminations are a luxury we can ill afford. There is enough anguish and blame to go around. Americans, at home and abroad, must conduct their na-

tional foreign policy debate with moderation, tolerance, and mutual respect.

B. Without ignoring or denying past setbacks we must retain a sense of proportion about them. This is no time to be apologetic or defensive about our role in the world. A display of self-doubt and timidity at this juncture would further undermine the confidence of our friends and diminish our adversaries' incentives for restraint. If we demonstrate a loss of national nerve now we will merely compound our future difficulties. Thus, we must convey with unmistakable clarity to potential adversaries that our current difficulties imply no slackening of our resolve to meet our commitments or to respond to challenges. We will not be bellicose, but neither will we be pushed around. Above all we must convey to both adversaries and allies an impression of confidence in our purposes and steadiness in their implementation.

C. We need to stand up for our views both in our bilateral contacts and in international forums. Silence or defensiveness in the face of attacks on our motives and our record bear little place under normal circumstances; they have no place now. We need not apologize for our system, our record of magnanimity to others, or the major initiatives which we have taken in recent years to promote greater stability in global political relationships and to cope with structural problems in the world economy. Our role in Indochina particularly is not a fitting subject for public self-criticism. We undertook our obligations there with honorable intent. We endured major sacrifices on behalf of a country in which we sought no territorial, economic or political advantage. And our efforts helped to buy time for our Asian friends to strengthen their security and prosperity.

D. The essentials of our foreign policy design remain intact. Our relations with Japan and the Western European democracies are extraordinarily free of bilateral problems; they are marked by greater equity and more intensive consultation than ever before. The premises of our détente strategy toward Moscow and Peking remain valid. We will work to see that détente continues to yield a balance of advantages and that potential adversaries do not seek to exploit what they may perceive as opportunities. We expect further progress this year in limiting strategic arms deployments and expanding commercial and other bilateral exchanges with the Soviets, and in proceeding on our course of normalization with the Chinese. Despite a temporary setback in our Middle East diplomacy, the parties to that conflict still recognize us as the only outside power capable of facilitating a settlement, and we intend to persevere. Our efforts to design a longer term response to key structural problems facing the global economy are bearing fruit. We now possess flexible negotiating authority for the multilateral trade negotiations. We have achieved a gratifying degree of solidarity with

other consuming countries in the energy field; the measures we have thus far taken are producing real shifts in the supply and demand picture for oil. Our food initiatives have been well received and we expect to elaborate on them further in the months ahead. We are beginning to develop a network of intensive and mutually beneficial ties with some of the more assertive and powerful resource-rich countries. And we are prepared to search with compassion for solutions to the issues raised by the developing countries—assuming that realism and mutual cooperation infuse the international dialogue. In short, given this record of substantial accomplishment there is no excuse for masochistic self-doubt and self-flagellation. And given our military, economic, and technological strength we have an indispensable role to play in furthering global stability and prosperity.

5. Clearly reassurances from members of the executive branch, however indispensable in conveying an impression of confidence and constancy, will not put to rest all questions about our reliability. There is no doubt that the public consensus underlying our policies needs extensive rebuilding. There are significant forces preaching retrenchment. Widespread skepticism does exist about the efficacy of military force to buttress our diplomacy. The tendency to generalize and simplify foreign policy problems on the basis of our experience in Vietnam alone is evident in much of the media's commentary. The Congress has become more assertive on foreign policy issues at precisely the moment when power on the Hill has become exceedingly diffuse. The result of all these factors can be drift, frustration, and accommodation of special interests at the expense of the integrity of our larger foreign policy design and purposes.

6. Without ignoring these problems, they must be placed in context for foreign audiences. Recent disappointments have not demoralized the American public. Our people retain a fundamental strength, buoyancy, optimism, and magnanimity which has not been shaken by recent events. In the face of a convulsive dozen years Americans, and their institutions, have shown a remarkable resiliency. Nor is there any disposition to retreat from global responsibilities. Recent polls on US public attitudes toward foreign policy issues indicate that most Americans recognize that the reality of interdependence is inescapable. There remains remarkably strong support for the kind of cooperative international relationships and peacekeeping activities which have characterized US foreign policy for a generation. I am convinced that the American people will continue to support a dynamic, responsible role in world affairs, grounded in policies that serve well-defined American interests. Partly as a result of this, I am also confident that over time we will be able to rebuild our partnership with Congress along the lines

that I set forth in my Los Angeles speech of January 24.⁵ The Congress has a vital role to play in our foreign policy in line with its constitutional responsibilities and the need to reflect the popular will in a democracy. The administration is determined to forge a cooperative relationship with the legislative branch.

7. As we succeed in putting behind us the effects of Indochina we can display the effective and unified national policy that we and the world so badly need. Realistically, however, we must accept the fact that we have difficult days ahead of us. Since our national problems are on such wide international view, you and your staff will have special responsibility to project the real values and interests of the United States in this difficult interim period. I know that I can count on you to do so in the best traditions of the Foreign Service. With your help I am confident that the United States will continue to be a major force for building a more peaceful, prosperous and humane world.

Kissinger

⁵ See footnote 6, Document 52.

59. Address by Secretary of State Kissinger¹

Bloomington, Minnesota, July 15, 1975.

THE MORAL FOUNDATIONS OF FOREIGN POLICY

Distinguished Guests, Ladies and Gentlemen: I have long looked forward to coming to Minnesota because it is the home of a man I admire enormously, the one man who likes to talk almost as much as I do—Senator Humphrey. At the hearings on my nomination as Secretary of State, Senator Humphrey instructed me with much wisdom on the difficult job ahead. His advice was right on the mark, and has been ever since. He is a good friend, and a great statesman. Minnesotans can

¹ Source: National Archives, RG 59, Policy Planning Council (S/PC), Policy Planning Staff (S/P), Director's Files (Winston Lord) 1969–77, Lot 77D112, Box 355, JUL 1–15 1975. No classification marking. All brackets are in the original. Kissinger delivered his address to the Upper Midwest Council. The speech is printed in Department of State *Bulletin*, August 4, 1975, pp. 161–168. The previous day, Kissinger addressed a dinner meeting of the University of Wisconsin Institute of World Affairs in Milwaukee. The speech, entitled “The Global Challenge and International Cooperation,” is *ibid.*, pp. 149–157.

be proud that he represents them in the United States Senate, for he is an example of the spirit of our country—its decency, its humanity, and its strength.

America has now entered upon its 200th year as a free nation. In those 2 centuries our country has grown from a small agricultural nation with very few responsibilities beyond its borders to a world power with global responsibilities. Yet, while the range of interests has changed massively, our commitment to the values that gave birth to our nation has remained unaltered.

These are the aspects of our national experience I would like to address today: the pursuit of America's values as a humane and just example to others; and the furthering of America's interests in a world where power remains the ultimate arbiter. How do we reconcile and advance both aspects of our national purpose? What, in our time, is the significance of the age-old quandary of the relationship between principle and power?

Through the greater part of our history we have been able to avoid the issue. A fortunate margin of safety and an unexplored continent produced the impression that principle and power automatically coalesced, that no choice was necessary or that only one choice was possible.

But now for nearly a decade our nation has been weighed down by uncertainty and discord. We have found ourselves doubtful of our virtue and uncertain of our direction largely because we have suddenly realized that like other nations before us we must now reconcile our principles with our necessities. Amid frustration, many Americans questioned the validity of our involvement in the international arena; in the wake of our disappointments, some abroad now doubt our resolve.

We are, I believe, emerging from this period with a renewed sense of confidence. Recent events have brought home to us—and to the rest of the world—that a purposeful, strong, and involved America is essential to peace and progress. These same events have also reminded us of the contribution this country made in the 30 years since World War II—and what is at stake in the next 30 years.

The United States can look back on an extraordinary generation of achievement. We have maintained a stable balance of power in the world; we have preserved peace and fostered the growth of the industrial democracies of North America, Western Europe, and Japan. We helped shape the international trade and monetary system which has nourished global prosperity. We promoted decolonization and pioneered in development assistance for the new nations. We have taken major initiatives to forge more reliable and positive relationships with the major Communist powers.

In a planet shrunk by communications and technology, in a world either devastated by war or struggling in the first steps of nationhood, in an international system not of empire but of scores of independent states, the global contribution of one nation—the United States—has been without precedent in human history. Only a nation of strong conviction and great idealism could have accomplished these efforts. We shall not turn our backs on this legacy.

The Modern Agenda

Today we face a new agenda. Our accomplishments over the past generation have changed the world and defined our tasks for the coming decades:

- Our allies, the major industrial democracies, have recovered their vigor and influence. We are transforming our alliances into more equal partnerships. We shall act in harmony with friends whose security and prosperity is indispensable to our own and whose cooperation is essential for progress and justice.

- The incredible destructiveness of modern weapons has transformed international politics. We must maintain our military strength. But we have an obligation, in our own interest as well as the world's, to work with other nations to control both the growth and the spread of nuclear weapons.

- In our relations with the Communist powers we must never lose sight of the fact that in the thermonuclear age general war would be disastrous to mankind. We have an obligation to seek a more productive and stable relationship despite the basic antagonism of our values.

- Thirty years of economic and political evolution have brought about a new diffusion of power and initiative. At the same time, interdependence imposes upon all nations the reality that they must prosper together or suffer together. The destinies of the world's nations have become inevitably intertwined. Thus, the capacity of any one nation to shape events is more limited, and consequently our own choices are more difficult and complex.

The Legacy of Our Past

To deal with this agenda we require strength of purpose and conviction. A nation unsure of its values cannot shape its future. A people confused about its direction will miss the opportunity to build a better and more peaceful world. This is why perhaps our deepest challenge is our willingness to face the increasing ambiguity of the problem of ends and means.

We start with strong assets. Throughout our history we have sought to define and justify our foreign policy in terms of principle. We have never seen ourselves as just another nation-state pursuing selfish

aims. We have always stood for something beyond ourselves—a beacon to the oppressed from other lands—from the first settlers to the recent refugees from Indochina. This conviction of our uniqueness contributed to our unity, gave focus to our priorities, and sustained our confidence in ourselves. It has been, and is, a powerful force.

But the emphasis on principle has also produced a characteristic American ambivalence. Relations with a world of nations falling short of our ideal have always presented us with dilemmas. As a people, we have oscillated between insistence on our uniqueness and the quest for broad acceptance of our values; between trying to influence international developments and seeking to isolate ourselves from them; between expecting too much of our power and being ashamed of it; between optimistic exuberance and frustration with the constraints practicality imposes.

Through most of our history we have sought to shield our country and hemisphere from outside intrusion, to shun involvement in balance-of-power politics. Soldiers and diplomats—the practitioners of power—have always been looked upon with suspicion. We considered generosity in relief efforts, the encouragement of free international trade, and the protection of our economic interests abroad as the only wholesome forms of international involvement.

Our founding fathers were sophisticated men who understood the European balance of power and knew how to profit from it. For the succeeding century and a half, our security was assured by favorable circumstances over which we had little influence. Shielded by two oceans, and enriched by a bountiful nature, we proclaimed our special situation as universally valid to nations whose narrower margin of survival meant that their range of choices was far more limited than our own.

Indeed, the concern of other nations for security reinforced our sense of uniqueness. We were a haven for millions, a place where the injustices, inequities, privations, and abridgements of human dignity which the immigrants had suffered were absent, or amenable to rapid redress. As our strength and size expanded, we remained uncomfortable with the uses and responsibilities of power and involvement in day-to-day diplomacy. At the turn of the century, for example, there were soul-searching debates over the Spanish-American War and our first acquisition of noncontiguous territories. While many saw our policies as dictated by our interests, others considered them our entrance into a morally questionable world.

Our tradition of law encouraged repeated attempts to legislate solutions to international conflicts. Arbitration, conciliation, international legal arrangements, neutrality legislation, collective security systems—all these were invoked to banish the reality of power. And when our involvement in conflict became unavoidable in 1917, Woodrow Wilson

translated our geopolitical interest in preventing any nation's hegemony in Europe into a universal moral objective. We fought to "make the world safe for democracy."

The inevitable disillusionment with an imperfect outcome led to a tide of isolationist sentiment. The Great Depression drew our energies further inward, as we sought to deal with the problems of our own society—even as that same depression simultaneously generated real dangers abroad.

We were stirred from isolation only by external attack and we sustained our effort because of the obvious totalitarian evil. We opposed all-out war, and total victory further strengthened our sense of moral rectitude—and ill prepared us for the aftermath. Of all the nations involved, we alone emerged essentially unscathed from the ravages of conflict—our military power, economic strength, and political confidence intact. And in the postwar bipolar world of cold war confrontation we believed we faced a reincarnation of the just defeated foe—an apparently monolithic and hostile ideological empire whose ambitions and values were antithetical to our own.

Our success and the preeminent position it brought convinced us that we could shape the globe according to American design. Our preponderant power gave us a broad margin for error so we believed that we could overwhelm problems through the sheer weight of resources. No other nation possessed so much insurance against so many contingencies; we could afford to be imprecise in the definition of our interests. Indeed, we often imagined that we had nothing so selfish as interests—only obligations and responsibilities. In a period of seemingly clear-cut, black-and-white divisions, we harbored few doubts about the validity of our cause.

America's Role

We no longer live in so simple a world. We remain the strongest nation and the largest single factor in international affairs. Our leadership is perhaps even more essential than before. But our strategic superiority has given way to nuclear balance. Our political and economic predominance has diminished as others have grown in strength and our dependence on the world economy has increased. Our margin of safety has shrunk.

Today we find that—like most other nations in history—we can neither escape from the world nor dominate it. Today we must conduct diplomacy with subtlety, flexibility, maneuver, and imagination in the pursuit of our interests. We must be thoughtful in defining our interests. We must prepare against the worst contingency and not plan only for the best. We must pursue limited objectives and many objectives simultaneously. In this effort, the last decade has taught us:

- That our power will not always bring preferred solutions; but we are still strong enough to influence events, often decisively.

- That we cannot remedy all the world's ills; but we can help build an international structure that will foster the initiative and cooperation of others.

- That we can no longer expect that moral judgments expressed in absolute terms will command broad acceptance; but as the richest and most powerful nation, we still have a special responsibility to look beyond narrow definitions of our national interests and to serve as a sponsor of world order.

- That we cannot banish power politics from international affairs, but we can promote new and wider communities of interest among nations; we can mute the use and threat of force; we can help establish incentives for restraint and penalties for its absence; we can encourage the resolution of disputes through negotiation; and we can help construct a more equitable pattern of relations between developed and developing nations.

This new complexity has produced in some a rebellion against contemporary foreign policy. We are told that our foreign policy is excessively pragmatic, that it sacrifices virtue in the mechanical pursuit of stability. Once attacked as cold-war oriented, we are now criticized by some as insensitive to moral values. Once regarded as naive in the use of power, we are now alleged to rely too much on the efficacy of force. Once viewed as the most generous of nations, we now stand accused by some of resisting a more equitable international economic system.

It is time to face the reality of our situation. Our choice is not between morality and pragmatism. We cannot escape either, nor are they incompatible. This nation must be true to its own beliefs or it will lose its bearings in the world. But at the same time it must survive in a world of sovereign nations and competing wills.

We need moral strength to select among often agonizing choices and a sense of purpose to navigate between the shoals of difficult decisions. But we need as well a mature sense of means, lest we substitute wishful thinking for the requirements of survival.

Clearly we are in need of perspective. Let me state some basic principles:

Foreign policy must start with security. A nation's survival is its first and ultimate responsibility; it cannot be compromised or put to risk. There can be no security for us or for others unless the strength of the free countries is in balance with that of potential adversaries; and no stability in power relationships is conceivable without America's active participation in world affairs.

The choices in foreign policy are often difficult and the margins are frequently narrow; imperfect solutions are sometimes unavoidable. In

the Second World War, for example, we joined forces with countries whose values we did not share in order to accomplish the morally worthy objective of defeating Nazism. Today we cooperate with many nations for the purpose of regional stability and global security, even though we disapprove of some of their internal practices. These choices are made consciously, and based on our best assessment of what is necessary.

At the same time, security is a means not an end. The purpose of security is to safeguard the values of our free society. And our survival is not always at stake in international issues. Many of our decisions are not imposed on us by events. Where we have latitude we must seize the moral opportunity for humanitarian purposes.

Our assistance to developing nations, for example, serves both foreign policy and humanitarian ends. It strengthens political ties to other nations. It contributes to expanded trade; close to 90 percent of our foreign assistance is eventually spent in this country. And our assistance reflects our values as a people, because we cannot close our eyes to the suffering of others. Because of history and moral tradition, we cannot live with ourselves as an island of plenty in a world of deprivation.

In the whole field of foreign aid, and particularly in food aid, America's record is unsurpassed. We and the world owe much to leaders with vision and compassion like Senator Humphrey who drafted the Food for Peace legislation² some 20 years ago.

Finally, our values link the American people and their government. In a democracy the conduct of foreign policy is possible only with public support. Therefore your government owes you an articulation of the purposes which its policies are designed to serve; to make clear our premises, to contribute to enlightened debate, and to explain how our policies serve the American people's objectives. And those principles—freedom, the dignity of the individual, the sanctity of law—are at the heart of our policy; they are also the foundation of our most basic and natural partnerships with the great industrial democracies which are essential to our safety and well-being.

Morality and Policy

The relation of morality to policy is thus not an abstract philosophical issue. It applies to many topics of the current debate. It applies to relations with the Communist powers, where we must manage a conflict of moral purposes and interests in the shadow of nuclear peril; and

² The Agricultural Trade Development and Assistance Act of 1954 (P.L. 480) established the Food for Peace program. Under the provisions of the law, the United States could make concessional sales of surplus grains to friendly nations, earmark commodities for domestic and foreign disaster relief, and barter surplus for strategic materials.

it applies in our political ties with nations whose domestic practices are inconsistent with our own.

Our relationship with the Communist powers has raised difficult questions for Americans since the Bolshevik Revolution. It was understood very early that the Communist system and ideology were in conflict with our own principles. Sixteen years passed before President Franklin Roosevelt extended diplomatic recognition to the Soviet Government. He did so in the belief, as he put it, that *“through the resumption of normal relations the prospects of peace over all the world are greatly strengthened.”*

Today again courageous voices remind us of the nature of the Soviet system and of our duty to defend freedom. About this there is no disagreement.

There is, however, a clear conflict between two moral imperatives which is at the heart of the problem. Since the dawn of the nuclear age, the world’s fears of holocaust and its hopes for a better future have both hinged on the relationship between the two superpowers. In an era of strategic nuclear balance—when both sides have the capacity to destroy civilized life—there is no alternative to coexistence. In such conditions the necessity of peace is itself a moral imperative. As President Kennedy pointed out: *“In the final analysis our most basic common link is that we all inhabit this small planet. We all breathe the same air. We all cherish our children’s future. And we are all mortal.”*

It is said, correctly, that the Soviet perception of “peaceful coexistence” is not the same as ours, that Soviet policies aim at the furthering of Soviet objectives. In a world of nuclear weapons capable of destroying mankind, in a century which has seen resort to brutal force on an unprecedented scale and intensity, in an age of ideology which turns the domestic policies of nations into issues of international contention, the problem of peace takes on a profound moral and practical difficulty. But the issue, surely, is not whether peace and stability serve Soviet purposes, but whether they also serve our own. Constructive actions in Soviet policy are desirable *whatever* the Soviet motives.

This Government has stated clearly and constantly the principles which *we* believe must guide U.S.-Soviet relations and international conduct and which are consistent with both our values and our interests:

- We will maintain a strong and flexible military posture to preserve our security. We will as a matter of principle and national interest oppose attempts by any country to achieve global or regional predominance.
- We will judge the state of U.S.-Soviet relations not by atmospherics but by whether concrete problems are successfully resolved.

- All negotiations will be a two-way street, based on reciprocity of benefit and reliable observance of agreements.
- We will insist, as we always have, that progress in U.S.-Soviet economic relations must reflect progress toward stable political relationships.
- We will never abandon our ideals or our friends. We will not negotiate over the heads of, or against the interests of, other nations.
- We will respond firmly to attempts to achieve unilateral advantage, or to apply the relaxation of tensions selectively.

Beyond the necessities of coexistence there is the hope of a more positive relationship. The American people will never be satisfied with simply reducing tension and easing the danger of nuclear holocaust. Over the longer term, we hope that firmness in the face of pressure and the creation of incentives for cooperative action may bring about a more durable pattern of stability and responsible conduct.

Today's joint manned mission in space—an area in which 15 years ago we saw ourselves in almost mortal rivalry—is symbolic of the distance we have traveled.³ Practical progress has been made on a wide range of problems. Berlin has been removed as a source of conflict between East and West; crises have been dampened; the frequency of U.S.-Soviet consultation on bilateral and multilateral problems is unprecedented; the scope of bilateral exchanges and cooperation in many fields is in dramatic contrast to the state of affairs 10, even 5, years ago. The agreements already achieved to limit strategic armament programs—the central weapons of our respective military arsenals—are unparalleled in the history of diplomacy. Your Senator [Walter F.] Mondale is a strong and constructive advocate of such strategic arms control efforts.

Our immediate focus is on the international actions of the Soviet Union not because it is our only moral concern, but because it is the sphere of action that we can most directly and confidently affect. As a consequence of improved foreign policy relationships, we have successfully used our influence to promote human rights. But we have done so quietly, keeping in mind the delicacy of the problem and stressing results rather than public confrontation.

Therefore, critics of détente must answer: What is the alternative that they propose? What precise policies do they want us to change? Are they prepared for a prolonged situation of dramatically increased international danger? Do they wish to return to the constant crises and

³ Reference is to the Apollo-Soyuz Test Project (ASTP), the first U.S.-Soviet manned spaceflight. On July 15, the United States and the Soviet Union launched the Apollo and Soyuz spacecrafts, respectively. The two crafts docked on July 17, allowing American and Soviet astronauts to conduct joint scientific experiments.

high arms budgets of the cold war? Does détente encourage repression—or is it détente that has generated the ferment and the demands for openness that we are now witnessing? Can we ask our people to support confrontation unless they know that every reasonable alternative has been explored?

In our relations with the Soviet Union, the United States will maintain its strength, defend its interests, and support its friends with determination and without illusion. We will speak up for our beliefs with vigor and without self-deception. We consider détente a means to regulate a competitive relationship—not a substitute for our own efforts in building the strength of the free world. We will continue on the course on which we are embarked because it offers hope to our children of a more secure and a more just world.

These considerations raise a more general question: To what extent are we able to affect the internal policies of other governments and to what extent is it desirable?

There are some 150 nations in the world, and barely a score of them are democracies in any real sense. The rest are nations whose ideology or political practices are inconsistent with our own. Yet we have political relations and often alliances with some of these countries in Asia, Latin America, Africa, and Europe.

Congressman [Donald M.] Fraser has raised this issue with great integrity and concern, and I have profited from many discussions with him. We do not and will not condone repressive practices. This is not only dictated by our values but is also a reflection of the reality that regimes which lack legitimacy or moral authority are inherently vulnerable. There will therefore be limits to the degree to which such regimes can be congenial partners. We have used, and we will use, our influence against repressive practices. Our traditions and our interests demand it.

But truth compels also a recognition of our limits. The question is whether we promote human rights more effectively by counsel and friendly relations where this serves our interest, or by confrontational propaganda and discriminatory legislation. And we must also assess the domestic performance of foreign governments in relation to their history and to the threats they face. We must have some understanding for the dilemmas of countries adjoining powerful, hostile, and irreconcilable totalitarian regimes.

Our alliances and political relationships serve mutual ends; they contribute to regional and world security, and thus support the broader welfare. They are not favors to other governments, but reflect a recognition of mutual interests. They should be withdrawn only when our interests change and not as a punishment for some act with which we do not agree. In many countries, whatever the internal structure, the

populations are unified in seeking our protection against outside aggression. In many countries our foreign policy relationships have proved to be no obstacle to the forces of change. And in many countries—especially in Asia—it is the process of American disengagement that has eroded the sense of security and created a perceived need for greater internal discipline, and at the same time diminished our ability to influence domestic practices.

The attempt to deal with those practices by restrictive American legislation raises a serious problem, not because of the moral view it expresses—which we share—but because of the mistaken impression it creates that our security ties are acts of charity. And beyond that, such acts—because they are too public, too inflexible, and too much a stimulus to nationalistic resentment—are almost inevitably doomed to fail.

There are no simple answers. Painful experience should have taught us that we ought not exaggerate our capacity to foresee, let alone to shape, social and political change in other societies. Therefore let me state the principles that will guide our action:

- Human rights are a legitimate international concern and have been so defined in international agreements for more than a generation.
- The United States will speak up for human rights in appropriate international forums and in exchanges with other governments.
- We will be mindful of the limits of our reach; we will be conscious of the difference between public postures that satisfy our self-esteem and policies that bring positive results.
- We will not lose sight of either the requirements of global security or what we stand for as a nation.

The Domestic Dimension

For Americans, then, the question is not whether our values should affect our foreign policy, but how. The issue is whether we have the courage to face complexity and the inner conviction to deal with ambiguity; whether we will look behind easy slogans and recognize that our great goals can only be reached by patience, and in imperfect stages.

The question is also whether we will use our moral convictions to escape reality or as a source of courage and self-confidence. We hear too often assertions that were a feature of our isolationist period: That a balance of power is a cynical game; that secret conspiratorial intentions lurk behind open, public policies; that weapons are themselves the sources of conflict; that intelligence activities are wicked; that humanitarian assistance and participation in the economic order are an adequate substitute for political engagement.

These are the counsels of despair. I refuse to accept the premise that our moral values and policy objectives are irreconcilable. The ends we seek in our foreign policy must have validity in the framework of our beliefs or we have no meaningful foreign policy. The maintenance of peace is a moral as well as a practical objective: Measures to limit armaments serve a moral as well as practical end; the cohesion of our alliances with the great industrial democracies makes our way of life and our principles more secure; cooperation to improve the world economic system enhances the well-being of peoples; policies to reconcile the rich nations and the poor, and to enhance the progress of both, serve a humane as well as a political end.

We live in a secular age which prides itself on its realism. Modern society is impersonal and bureaucratized. The young, who in every generation crave a sense of purpose, are too often offered cynicism and escapism instead of a faith that truly inspires. All modern democracies are beset by problems beyond the margin of governments' ability to control. Debunking of authority further drains democratic government of the ability to address the problems that beset it. A world of turmoil and danger cries out for structure and leadership. The opportunities that we face as a nation to help shape a more just international order depend more than ever on a steady, resolute, and self-assured America.

This requires confidence—the leaders' confidence in their values, the public's confidence in its government, and the nation's collective confidence in the worth of its objectives.

Thus, for this nation to contribute truly to peace in the world it must make peace with itself. It is time to put aside the cynicism and distrust that have marked, and marred, our political life for the better part of the past decade. It is time to remind ourselves that while we may disagree about means, as Americans we all have the same ultimate objective—the peace, prosperity, and tranquillity of our country and of the world.

And most of all, it is time we recognized that as the greatest democracy the world has ever known, we are a living reminder that there is an alternative to tyranny and oppression. The revolution that we began 200 years ago goes on, for most of the world still lives without the freedom that has for so long been ours. To them we remain a beacon of hope and an example to be emulated.

So let us come together for the tasks that our time demands. We have before us an opportunity to bring peace to a world that awaits our leadership.

60. Draft Memorandum From Secretary of State Kissinger to President Ford¹

Washington, July 18, 1975.

SUBJECT

Foreign Policy in Your First Year in Office

You asked for a candid assessment of foreign policy during your first 12 months in office. I know it has not been an easy year given the situation you inherited. We continue to face many challenges and problems. But I believe you can rightfully feel that you have dealt successfully with the burden of events and trends which predate your stewardship; and that you have taken initiatives that moved our policy forward and promise much for the future.

The Setting

You came to office in the midst of a situation as difficult in its own way as any in our history:

—Vietnam and Watergate and the turbulence of a decade had sapped public confidence in our institutions and leaders—and undermined cooperation between Executive and Legislative.

—The nation and the world were already moving deeper into the most severe economic down-turn since the Depression.

—A legacy of crisis in Indochina, the Middle East, and Cyprus mortgaged the prospects for peace and stability in areas important to us—and resulted in Indochina in the most serious defeat in the history of our foreign relations.

—And the circumstances of your accession to office added a unique dimension of difficulty and uncertainty to the task of establishing your Presidential authority and competence here and abroad.

These elements combined in a major challenge to our ability to play a purposeful and powerful role abroad.

—Doubt and disillusion threatened to turn the American public toward some new form of selfish isolation.

¹ Source: National Archives, RG 59, Policy Planning Council (S/PC), Policy Planning Staff (S/P), Director's Files (Winston Lord) 1969–77, Lot 77D112, Box 355, JUL 16–31, 1975. Confidential; Nodis. Drafted by Bartholomew and Lord on July 18. The memorandum is not marked as a draft but there is no indication that either Kissinger or Ford saw it. Lord sent it to Scowcroft under a July 18 covering memorandum. Lord offered to “rework this for you [Scowcroft] in any way,” as he was “not sure this is precisely on the mark. We have assumed that it is strictly for internal consumption.”

—The strains in our institutions and patterns of authority between Executive and Congress threatened to undermine the coherence and constancy a strong world role requires.

—Other nations began to ask themselves whether American strength and leadership would be maintained or steadily decline—and to examine the consequences and options for themselves.

This has been the fundamental issue you have had to contend with in your stewardship of foreign policy in the past 12 months. I cannot in all honesty say that it has been laid to rest. But I believe that you can rightfully claim to have weathered the worst of it in the past year and to have brought the nation a considerable distance on the road to new self-confidence.

You have had some major assets to work with in this crucial effort.

—The basic soundness of the overall structure of our foreign policy, and several important initiatives in the preceding years.

—The strong material assets of this nation—military, economic, technological.

—Somewhat ironically—the very uncertainty of other nations about our role has been leading them to a fresh appreciation and reaffirmation of their stake in a strong American world presence.

—Above all, the strength of the American people. They have displayed once again their basic good sense and steadfastness and a will to sustain a responsible American role abroad.

With this said, your leadership has been a critical element in recreating the conditions for effective American leadership. *Mayaguez*² was part of a broader pattern of steady international action that has been felt here and overseas. Your diplomacy and personal contact with the leaders of other nations have established you as a President who will put his own personality and imprint on the conduct of our foreign policy. Certainly other nations are more sure today than they were a year ago that the United States will continue to be a constructive force in world affairs.

Finally, your growing strength and authority at home has done much to enhance our ability to conduct an effective policy abroad. This is felt by public and Congress alike, and perceived abroad.

² Cambodian patrol boats seized the crew of the SS *Mayaguez*, en route from Hong Kong to Thailand, on May 12. In response, U.S. ships and planes attacked Cambodian bases and ships. The Cambodians released the *Mayaguez* and its sailors on May 14. See *Foreign Relations, 1969–1976*, volume X, Vietnam, January 1973–July 1975, Documents 284–301.

The Record

Against this background, the measure both of what has been achieved in your first year in office and what remains to be done can be grouped under four broad headings.

—Resolving crises that threaten war and jeopardize important policies and positions.

—Enhancing our basic alliance relationships.

—Pursuing détente with potential adversaries.

—Meeting the new demands of interdependence and relations with the developing countries.

Crises: The inherited crises of Indochina, the Middle East, and Cyprus have each placed special burdens on our foreign policy in the past year.

—The collapse of *Indochina* certainly hurt us here and abroad. Yet the country has not been deeply torn by the denouement. Nor have other nations seen in it the end—or even the beginning of the end—of a powerful and purposeful American presence on the world scene. If the Indochina collapse has not taken on these proportions, it is in good part because of the steadiness and firmness you conveyed in the face of it—and the sense that the collapse was a legacy stretching back for more than a decade and precipitated in part by Congress' action on aid. Our reassuring public pronouncements and your talks with many Asian leaders, as well as the passage of time, have calmed the Asian scene since the early days of deep concern. With this said, no nation can absorb a defeat of the proportions of Indochina and assume that it will not raise questions and affect attitudes in the minds of others, particularly in Asia. This will place a continuing premium on steadiness and forcefulness in asserting our purposes and protecting our interests in Asia and elsewhere in the months ahead.

—In the *Middle East* it is no small achievement to have had another year of peace for the area and time to continue the hard pursuit of negotiating progress. We suffered a setback this spring in our efforts to negotiate a third Arab-Israeli disengagement agreement. But we now have a chance for one that would carry us a step further toward peace and stability in the area and give us time to work for more progress. You have established yourself with both Arabs—particularly Sadat—and Israelis as your own man, one sympathetic to both sides, but firm on your own concept of what is required to bring peace to the area and on your own definition of where America's interests lie. Indeed your frank and forthright approach—particularly on the Israeli front—is essential in giving us the strength for a constructive role between the two sides.

—The *Cyprus* issue erupted just as you took office and has squeezed us between Greeks and Turks, damaging our political and military relations with both, shaking the structure of NATO in the area, and threatening to open the way to enhancement of Soviet power. We have not yet succeeded in making much progress toward a resolution. As you know, the action of Congress on aid to Turkey has deprived us of our most meaningful lever for progress. Your own direct efforts with the Congress—which are now bearing fruit—are essential to remove this mortgage on our diplomatic position.

Alliances: You have in the past year taken several steps to reassure our allies of the priority we place on continuing partnership with them. In both substance and atmosphere our relations with our allies are healthier than they have been in several years.

—Your participation in the NATO Summit in May³ and your many personal meetings with European leaders helped enhance the solidarity of the Alliance. Our allies were, in fact, much reassured by the strong stance you took on our stake in the continuing vitality of the Transatlantic connection and the agenda you sketched for our common action. Your participation in the CSCE Summit will afford us an opportunity to reassert our intent to continue a constructive role in European security and in the process of building détente and stability on the continent. Our biggest alliance problem, of course, is the Southern Flank of NATO where serious trends and uncertainties have set in and we cannot control events.

—We have also moved in the past year to put our crucial relationship with *Japan* on a more confident and mature footing. Your visit to Japan in November, 1974,⁴ was of great import to the Japanese in establishing our will to enhance our relationship. I believe it helped consolidate Japanese confidence in us and our commitment in a manner that mitigated the effects of the subsequent events in Vietnam. The speech I made on your behalf on June 18,⁵ in effect chronicled the road we have traveled with the Japanese in enhancing our relationship and an agenda for common action. The Miki visit next month and the Emperor's October visit will give us an opportunity to make progress.

³ The NATO summit took place in Brussels May 29–30. Ford addressed the members of the North Atlantic Council the evening of May 29, affirming the American commitment to the Atlantic Alliance; for text, see *Public Papers: Ford, 1975*, Book I, pp. 737–742. For the text of the communiqué released at the conclusion of the summit, see Department of State *Bulletin*, June 30, 1975, pp. 889–890.

⁴ Ford visited Japan and Korea before traveling to Vladivostok to meet with Brezhnev.

⁵ Kissinger addressed the Japan Society, a non-profit cultural exchange organization, in New York on June 18. For the text of his address, entitled “The United States and Japan in a Changing World,” see Department of State *Bulletin*, July 7, 1975, pp. 1–8.

—Your trip to *South Korea* also served to reaffirm our commitment to that nation. South Korea has been rocked hardest by the Indochina collapse. The growing debate in this country over Park's repressive practices both adds to the problem and hampers our ability to deal with it. We have moved to reassure the Koreans but we have a serious problem brewing on the Hill. The Korean peninsula remains however the single most dangerous area in Asia.

Our effort to establish a new *hemispheric dialogue* has been complicated by the impact on our relations of the new economic and political demands of the developing countries; and by specific problems in our bilateral relations. On the latter front, a successful outcome to the Panama negotiation will require a major effort with Congress. If we fail, we face a possible insurgency in Panama and severe problems throughout the hemisphere. As for Cuba, we have succeeded in limiting the damage the issue has caused to hemispheric relations without moving too far ahead of opinion in this country. We have at the same time been conditioning public opinion for any new turn in our bilateral relations and are well positioned for this vis-à-vis Castro.

Adversaries: We have consolidated and advanced détente with the Soviet Union in the face of substantial uncertainty and pressure. And we have kept our lines open to China—lines we will be pursuing in your visit later this year.

—Your Vladivostok meeting with Brezhnev established your authority and personal relations with the Soviet leaders and settled the main outlines for a SALT II agreement.⁶ We are now reasonably well placed to secure this agreement and advance our relationship in Brezhnev's visit here. This autumn we will also very likely engage the Soviets in a serious search for an MBFR agreement with the tabling of our nuclear proposal. The absence of a viable alternative to détente gives us strength in dealing with the criticism that is heard across the political spectrum. But the backlash on détente from both left and right is serious and could hamper support for measures such as reopening the MFN and credits issue as well as the SALT agreement.

—On China policy, we have essentially been on a plateau in our relations. The most important factor in our position with the Chinese and in the success of your visit will be their perception of our strength and steadfastness which they value as a counterweight to Soviet power. The international scene is much more important to them than the Taiwan issue, and they seem even more nervous about Moscow in the wake of the Indochina debacle. There will be some domestic criticism here over

⁶ See footnote 6, Document 48.

the lack of spectacular results from your trip but this should be manageable.

Interdependence and Developing Countries: This has been one of the most ground-breaking and creative areas in our foreign policy in the last year.

—The International Energy Agency is a landmark in institution-building among the developed countries and a new dimension of solidarity in our relations with Europe and Japan. The momentum in IEA is slowing down, however, and our own domestic disarray on energy policy is hurting us. We have jointly taken steps to reduce our vulnerability to OPEC actions, including agreements on emergency oil-sharing and a financial safety net. But much remains to be settled, including agreement on cooperative development of alternative energy supplies and the floor price. On a broader front, both in your bilateral contacts and in the OECD context, we have begun better coordination of economic policies among the developed countries to enhance prospects for growth and stability.

—After one false start, the producer/consumer dialogue is beginning to get back on track as the result of a U.S. initiative. Our proposal for three commissions—dealing with oil, raw materials, and development—has achieved a large measure of acceptance, but there are still some differences, particularly over the linkage of the commissions to an overall conference and whether to discuss monetary matters. Our objectives in the dialogue are to build a web of mutual interests with the producers, particularly the Saudis and Iranis. Our good bilateral relations with those two countries and our negotiating role in the Middle East should help us. However, our overall strategy could be threatened by a sharp OPEC price rise this autumn.

—At the World Food Conference in 1974 we framed the international agenda for dealing with food problems.⁷ We have made good on food aid, on a fertilizer institute, and on aid to food production in LDCs. A critical element of our policy, negotiation of a grain reserves agreement may lag because the European Community wants the negotiations in the context of the multilateral trade negotiations in Geneva while we want separate negotiations in London.

—On relations with developing countries generally, we have moved steadily to show our sympathy to their aspirations and our resolve to work toward practical and mutually beneficial solutions to problems that make our relations difficult, such as raw materials. At the same time, we have drawn lines against unrealistic demands and

⁷ See Document 47.

steam-roller tactics. The UNGA seventh special session in September⁸ will be a trial for our policy—and the General Assembly itself will be up against our clear warning of the damage to the UN of irresponsible bloc actions such as expulsion of Israel.

—Finally, a problem of world concern is potential proliferation of nuclear weapons particularly among developing countries. We have made some progress toward multilateral agreement among major nuclear exporters to enhance the effectiveness of export controls and safeguards and to exercise restraint in particularly sensitive regional situations. But the spread of nuclear technology (spurred by the energy crisis) and political aspirations combine to make nuclear proliferation one of the largest problems of the coming decades.

The Balance Sheet

In sum, this has been a year of solid accomplishments in foreign policy. Yet as always much remains to be done and much could go wrong—and this deserves to be underscored:

—relations between executive and congress will continue to be a major problem and a key area for constant effort.

—the Middle East could erupt at almost any time with devastating global impact.

—instability and tension threatens the southern flank of NATO from Portugal to Cyprus and the trend of events is worrisome.

—we face a backlash on détente that could assume proportions that would seriously handicap our ability to pursue the policies.

—we face a difficult challenge in the new—and in important aspects unrealistic—demands of the developing countries for power and participation in the world political and economic order.

With this said, I think we are emerging from the past year with restored momentum, validating the overall structure of our foreign policy, and laying the foundation for future accomplishments.

⁸ The Seventh Special Session of the U.N. General Assembly took place September 1–16 and focused on global development and economic issues. During a June 17 meeting with Senators and Department of State officials, Kissinger explained the purpose of the session: “This involves our policies toward the Third World and the politics of the interdependence. The Third World countries have escalated their economic concerns into a political confrontation. There is a danger we will be confronted in the Session by rigid ideological positions. We probably can’t completely avoid confrontation, but in any case we will try hard. We intend to obtain the cooperation of the Third World in the fields of food and raw materials and perhaps even energy. The problem calls for recognition that we all live in the same world and that we could destroy each other by policies which pursue narrow national interests.” (National Archives, RG 59, Records of Joseph Sisco, 1951–76, Lots 74D131 and 76D251, Box 19, JJS Memcons (Memos and Telegrams) 1975)

61. Memorandum of Conversation¹

Helsinki, July 30, 1975, 9:35 a.m.

PARTICIPANTS*USSR:*

Leonid I. Brezhnev, General Secretary of the Central Committee of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union
Andrei A. Gromyko, Member of the Politburo of the Central Committee of the CPSU and Minister of Foreign Affairs of the USSR
Georgi M. Kornienko, Director of the USA Department and Member of the Collegium, Ministry of Foreign Affairs
Andrei M. Aleksandrov-Agentov, Assistant to the General Secretary
Viktor M. Sukhodrev, Counsellor, Second European Department, Ministry of Foreign Affairs (Interpreter)
Andrei Vavilov, USA Department, Ministry of Foreign Affairs

US:

President Ford
Dr. Henry A. Kissinger, Secretary of State and Assistant to the President for National Security Affairs
Amb. Walter J. Stoessel, Ambassador to the USSR
Lt. Gen. Brent Scowcroft, Deputy Assistant to the President for National Security Affairs
Helmut Sonnenfeldt, Counselor, Department of State
William G. Hyland, Director of the Bureau of Intelligence and Research, Department of State
Alexander Akalovsky, Bureau of Political-Military Affairs
Peter W. Rodman, NSC Staff

SUBJECTS

US-Soviet Relations; Middle East; Emigration; Nuclear War

[Omitted here are introductory comments and discussion of the Apollo-Soyuz Test Project.]

Ford: Mr. General Secretary, I'd like to make some comments first about détente.

Brezhnev: Please.

Ford: In the United States, there is a very encouraging overall attitude as to the progress we have made, the Soviet Union and the United

¹ Source: Ford Library, National Security Adviser, Kissinger Reports on USSR, China, and Middle East Discussions, 1974–76, Box 1, USSR Memcons and Reports, July 20–August 2, 1975—Ford/Brezhnev Meetings in Helsinki (Conference on Security and Cooperation in Europe). Secret; Nodis. Initialed by Rodman. All brackets, with the exception of those describing omitted material, are in the original. The meeting took place at the U.S. Ambassador's residence. Ford and Brezhnev met during the summit held at the conclusion of the Conference on Security and Cooperation in Europe. The full memorandum of conversation is printed in *Foreign Relations, 1969–1976*, volume XVI, Soviet Union, August 1974–December 1976, Document 171.

States, in moving in the right direction on détente. On the other hand, I think it is fair—and I want to be frank: we have those on the right as well as on the left, who for various reasons, political and otherwise, would like to undermine what we have tried to implement and to destroy détente.

[Mr. Hyland comes in to join the meeting.]

And critics of détente are Democrats as well as Republicans.² They would like to slow down or destroy the benefits that come from détente. But I can tell you very forcefully I am committed to détente, and the American people agree with me. I strongly feel our negotiations and our agreements in Vladivostok³ were pluses, were very successful. I believe the CSCE negotiations, the documents we will sign here, are pluses, and I am confident as we talk about SALT II, we can achieve success in this area. Perhaps as in our country, you have some critics in your own government who don't believe that Vladivostok, CSCE, and SALT II are in the best interests of your country. But I can tell you in my term of office—and I expect that to be the next 5½ years—my aim, objective and total effort on my part will be to narrow our differences and achieve the benefits for your people, for our people, and I believe for the world as a whole.

Brezhnev: [interrupts translation at reference to critics of détente:] The only two people who are against détente are Kissinger and Gromyko. [Laughter].

Kissinger: Because as long as there is no détente, we can keep meeting. [Laughter].

Brezhnev: [interrupts translation at reference to 5½ years:] Why do you say only five years in office? Why not eight years?

[Mr. Akalovsky joins the meeting.]

Ford: Mr. Secretary, of course we have these critics of Vladivostok, the European Security Conference, and SALT, who would like me to have a term of office for 1½ years. But I am convinced beyond any doubt, if we can move the Vladivostok agreement beyond SALT and implement the atmosphere in which CSCE took place, I believe the critics will be pushed aside and the American people will support what you and I want to achieve. If we can make the kind of progress [we seek] on SALT, today and Saturday, it would be a great delight for me

² Republican critics of détente included former Secretary of Defense and Counselor to the President for Domestic Affairs Melvin Laird. Laird published an article entitled "Is This Détente?" in the July 1975 issue of *Reader's Digest* magazine, purporting to outline the "unpleasant facts about the true status of détente." A copy of Laird's article is attached to an undated memorandum from Kissinger to Ford. (Ford Library, National Security Adviser, Presidential Name File, Box 2, Laird, Melvin)

³ See footnote 6, Document 48.

to have you visit the United States this fall. I was up in Camp David two weeks ago and Mrs. Ford and I were discussing what a beautiful place it was. I know you enjoyed your visit there before.⁴ But the main point is to make headway that will result in a fruitful agreement, that will be of benefit to your country and mine, and will make possible a meeting in the United States between us some time in 1975.

Brezhnev: [interrupts Sukhodrev's translation at reference to Camp David:] I did like Camp David.

Ford: It is beautiful in the fall.

Brezhnev: Quiet and relaxing.

[Omitted here is discussion of Brezhnev's meetings with European leaders, SALT II, and the Middle East.]

Brezhnev: All right. Maybe we could talk about this: We complete the European Security Conference. But we should not stop at that. We should make further headway. Relaxation of tensions doesn't stop with Europe, the U.S. and Canada. We should extend further. Maybe we should talk about that. I think it was you who said *détente* is useful not only for Europe but for all the world, and I certainly associate myself fully with those words.

Ford: I agree. In this connection, I want to note that the United States Senators who met with you in Moscow came back with very favorable reactions to the discussions they had with you, Mr. Secretary. And the Senators join with me in the view that *détente* is the way our two countries should proceed. They were impressed with the very frank discussions they had with you on energy, economy, trade and other areas. Their impression was that there are distinct possibilities for cooperation in these areas. And I was greatly impressed by the hospitality extended by you and your associates during that visit and the frankness and spirit of cooperation with which these were discussed at the time of their visit.

Brezhnev: In Washington, Mr. President, when I met with a large group of Senators and Congressmen and answered some of their questions, there was one man who sat in the back and asked a question about something. He asked the question in a delicate way, and I said "You are not bold enough. You are obviously referring to the Jewish population in the Soviet Union." When they were in the Soviet Union, he admitted: "It was me." It was Senator Javits, and we then had an interesting discussion with him.

Ford: Javits sitting in the back of the room? [Laughter]

Gromyko: He admitted it was him. He was sitting to one side.

⁴ See Document 14.

Brezhnev: [To Kissinger] Were you present in Washington during the meeting?

Kissinger: No. I knew about your meeting. You presented some figures to the Senators in that meeting.

Brezhnev: I have some figures on that for this meeting too. It is soon going to be a veritable tragedy!

Ford: Let me say on that point, Mr. General Secretary. I have indicated to you that I intend to submit legislation as to trade and also as to credits. The handling of Congress is a very delicate problem. As you know, it is dominated in our system by the opposition party, so I have influence but not necessarily control. So the matter of timing when to submit legislation on trade and credits is very important. It is my hope this fall to submit remedial amendments so that we can have trade relations as initially contemplated. I think it was very unfortunate that you were forced to cancel the trade agreement,⁵ although I understand the action in Congress might have compelled you to do this. Perhaps by some appropriate action you could help me convince the Congress to approve the changes we will recommend. That would be a very important step, so détente can proceed and we can move in trade relations forward as we anticipated in a constructive way.

Brezhnev: Mr. President, on the whole let me say, there has been no change in our policy. We want as before to have good relations with the United States.

Ford: Mr. General Secretary, a few moments ago you said you had some figures in mind to discuss. I would be most interested.

Brezhnev: I will look. I do have somewhere a brief on this question. We have already added Solzhenitsyn to the list! [Laughter]

Gromyko: What we won't do for the sake of friendship!

Ford: I have heard the name before.

Brezhnev: [Reads over his talking paper and confers with Gromyko] Here are some data. In 1972—the first figures are the number of requests for exit permits—in 1972, there were 26,800 requests. In 1973, there were approximately 26,000. In 1974, there were 14,000. In the first six months of 1975, there were 5,000 requests to leave.

As regards the number of people who actually left for Israel—actually some went elsewhere—in 1972, there were 29,000. In 1973, 33,000. In 1974, 19,000. And in the first six months of 1975, 6,000. Some were carryovers from the past year; there were only 5,000 requests.

I have another figure. From the start of the emigration of Jews from the Soviet Union, which dates back to 1945, until July 1, 1975, a total of

⁵ See Document 31.

116,000 persons left the Soviet Union. This amounts to 98.4 percent of all requests submitted, 98.4 percent were met. You see, at present there is a process of falling off of requests, and probably it will continue. In your country, there are some to whom you don't give permission on security grounds; we also have such people.

[Secretary Kissinger gets up to leave briefly.]

Ford: I must say Mr. General Secretary, Mr. Solzhenitsyn has aligned himself—

Kissinger: I am not leaving because you mentioned that name. [Laughter]

Ford: Mr. Solzhenitsyn aligned himself with those who are very severe critics of the policy I and you believe in, détente. Senator Jackson, Mr. George Meany, President of the American Federation of Labor, have spoken out critically. Meany has embraced Mr. Solzhenitsyn. Some of these critics encouraged Mr. Solzhenitsyn to continue his criticism of détente.⁶ As I said before, it is my firm belief that détente must continue and become irreversible if we want to achieve that kind of world which is essential for peace. The figures you mentioned, of course, are very disappointing to those who criticize détente. And any improvement there—in the requests or the figures of those who get permission to leave—would undercut some of the criticism and enhance our ability to proceed with détente as we want to do. But I repeat: détente can and will work and can be made irreversible—particularly if this Saturday we can make headway on SALT.

Brezhnev: I mentioned Solzhenitsyn just in passing. There was some information that he wanted to change his way of life and become a monk or something. Reportedly there was some priest going around with him at some point. He is nothing more than a zero for the Soviet Union. But why do you feel these figures will be disappointing to the people you mentioned?

Ford: In the case of Senator Javits, and Senator Ribicoff, they want to be helpful in Congress to approve the legislation I want to recommend, legislation that will permit trade, to extend credits, that will be very beneficial. If the figures were more encouraging, Mr. General Secretary, they would provide them with arguments for revising legislation that was so harmful to the continuation of détente.

Brezhnev: Mr. President, maybe you didn't understand me correctly. I said we are reaching the point where there will be a tragedy. But what are we to do? Start talking people into leaving? I merely made a factual statement: The number of applications has been decreasing.

⁶ See Bernard Gwertzman, "Détente Scored by Solzhenitsyn: In a Talk in Washington, He Says Moscow Dupes U.S.," *New York Times*, July 1, 1975, p. 6.

The number of applications we have been receiving since I was in Washington has been declining. I am sure you and Dr. Kissinger realize this is so. I know virtually dozens of people of Jewish origin. Am I to go to Dymshits, the Deputy Prime Minister of the Soviet Union, and say “You’ve got to leave?” And Leibman of the Moscow Soviet—should I grab him by the hand and tell him to go?

Ford: Certainly the figure of 98 percent is a good record.

Gromyko: Ninety-eight point four percent.

Ford: That is certainly a good batting average, as we say in the United States. I am not suggesting ways for increasing the number of applications. All I want to say is that Ribicoff, Javits and others must be made to understand that if the revised legislation is adopted, there will be the possibility, if not the certainty—that the figures will be like those of 1974 or 1973. I understand you can’t take people by the hand and tell them to leave, but the perception, the appearance, makes a difference.

Brezhnev: I really can’t understand what I can do in this regard.

Ford: Let me summarize the situation as I see it from the point of view of *détente*. I came here, Mr. General Secretary, despite the criticism in the United States, because I believe in *détente*. The portions I have been connected with—Vladivostok and here—have been concrete forward steps, meaningful progress. As I said, the criticism at home has come from elements in America that can be, as I said, brushed aside. Coming here will contribute to *détente* despite the *détente* critics. I hope we will achieve in Helsinki what we talked about in Vladivostok. Thinking people in the U.S. know that Vladivostok was a success which serves the interests of both sides. The American people, the majority of the population, hopes for more progress. The majority feels the same way about this conference, and the implementation of the document we sign will be the most conclusive proof that we are on the right track. So I hope we can make progress in SALT. This will be a good preliminary discussion for what we discuss on Saturday. But I repeat with quiet emphasis, *détente* must be made irreversible. It was my conviction at Vladivostok. I hope we can leave Helsinki with the same feeling, leading hopefully to a visit by you to the United States this fall.

Brezhnev: [Interrupts the translation] And I appreciate very highly the fact that you came here despite the criticism in the U.S.

[Interrupts the translation at statement that *détente* is beneficial:] And I agree with you on that.

[Omitted here is discussion of upcoming meetings.]

62. Address by President Ford¹

Helsinki, August 1, 1975.

[Omitted here are the President's introductory remarks.]

I have not come across the Atlantic to say what all of us already know—that nations now have the capacity to destroy civilization and, therefore, all our foreign policies must have as their one supreme objective the prevention of a thermonuclear war. Nor have I come to dwell upon the hard realities of continuing ideological differences, political rivalries, and military competition that persist among us.

I have come to Helsinki as a spokesman for a nation whose vision has always been forward, whose people have always demanded that the future be brighter than the past, and whose united will and purpose at this hour is to work diligently to promote peace and progress not only for ourselves but for all mankind.

I am simply here to say to my colleagues: We owe it to our children, to the children of all continents, not to miss any opportunity, not to mangle for one minute, not to spare ourselves or allow others to shirk in the monumental task of building a better and a safer world.

The American people, like the people of Europe, know well that mere assertions of good will, passing changes in the political mood of governments, laudable declarations of principles are not enough. But if we proceed with care, with commitment to real progress, there is now an opportunity to turn our peoples' hopes into realities.

In recent years, nations represented here have sought to ease potential conflicts. But much more remains to be done before we prematurely congratulate ourselves.

Military competition must be controlled. Political competition must be restrained. Crises must not be manipulated or exploited for unilateral advantages that could lead us again to the brink of war. The process of negotiation must be sustained, not at a snail's pace, but with demonstrated enthusiasm and visible progress.

Nowhere are the challenges and the opportunities greater and more evident than in Europe. That is why this Conference brings us all

¹ Source: *Public Papers: Ford, 1975*, Book II, pp. 1074–1081. Ford addressed the delegates to the Conference on Security and Cooperation in Europe at 10:30 a.m. in Finlandia Hall. Prior to arriving in Helsinki, Ford traveled to the Federal Republic of Germany to meet with Scheel and Schmidt and to Poland for discussions with First Secretary Gierek. Ford also met with several European leaders prior to the opening of the conference on July 30, including Brezhnev (see Document 61). For documentation on the CSCE and Ford and Kissinger's subsequent discussions with Romanian President Nicolae Ceaușescu in Bucharest, see *Foreign Relations, 1969–1976*, volume XXXIX, European Security, Documents 319–339.

together. Conflict in Europe shakes the world. Twice in this century we have paid dearly for this lesson; at other times, we have come perilously close to calamity. We dare not forget the tragedy and the terror of those times.

Peace is not a piece of paper.

But lasting peace is at least possible today because we have learned from the experiences of the last 30 years that peace is a process requiring mutual restraint and practical arrangements.

This Conference is a part of that process—a challenge, not a conclusion. We face unresolved problems of military security in Europe; we face them with very real differences in values and in aims. But if we deal with them with careful preparation, if we focus on concrete issues, if we maintain forward movement, we have the right to expect real progress.

The era of confrontation that has divided Europe since the end of the Second World War may now be ending. There is a new perception and a shared perception of a change for the better, away from confrontation and toward new possibilities for secure and mutually beneficial cooperation. That is what we all have been saying here. I welcome and I share these hopes for the future.

The postwar policy of the United States has been consistently directed toward the rebuilding of Europe and the rebirth of Europe's historic identity. The nations of the West have worked together for peace and progress throughout Europe. From the very start, we have taken the initiative by stating clear goals and areas for negotiation.

We have sought a structure of European relations, tempering rivalry with restraint, power with moderation, building upon the traditional bonds that link us with old friends and reaching out to forge new ties with former and potential adversaries.

In recent years, there have been some substantial achievements.

We see the Four-Power Agreement on Berlin of 1971 as the end of a perennial crisis that on at least three occasions brought the world to the brink of doom.

The agreements between the Federal Republic of Germany and the states of Eastern Europe and the related intra-German accords enable Central Europe and the world to breathe easier.

The start of East-West talks on mutual and balanced force reductions demonstrate a determination to deal with military security problems of the continent.

The 1972 treaty between the United States and the Soviet Union to limit antiballistic missiles and the interim agreement limiting strategic offensive arms were the first solid breakthroughs in what must be a continuing, long-term process of limiting strategic nuclear arsenals.

I profoundly hope that this Conference will spur further practical and concrete results. It affords a welcome opportunity to widen the circle of those countries involved in easing tensions between East and West.

Participation in the work of détente and participation in the benefits of détente must be everybody's business—in Europe and elsewhere. But détente can succeed only if everybody understands what détente actually is.

First, détente is an evolutionary process, not a static condition. Many formidable challenges yet remain.

Second, the success of détente, of the process of détente, depends on new behavior patterns that give life to all our solemn declarations. The goals we are stating today are the yardstick by which our performance will be measured.

The people of all Europe and, I assure you, the people of North America are thoroughly tired of having their hopes raised and then shattered by empty words and unfulfilled pledges. We had better say what we mean and mean what we say, or we will have the anger of our citizens to answer.

While we must not expect miracles, we can and we do expect steady progress that comes in steps—steps that are related to each other that link our actions with words in various areas of our relations.

Finally, there must be an acceptance of mutual obligation. Détente, as I have often said, must be a two-way street. Tensions cannot be eased by one side alone. Both sides must want détente and work to achieve it. Both sides must benefit from it.

Mr. Chairman, my colleagues, this extraordinary gathering in Helsinki proves that all our peoples share a concern for Europe's future and for a better and more peaceful world. But what else does it prove? How shall we assess the results?

Our delegations have worked long and hard to produce documents which restate noble and praiseworthy political principles. They spell out guidelines for national behavior and international cooperation.²

² Reference is to the CSCE Final Act, comprised of four "baskets" or categories. For the text of the Final Act, signed on August 1, see Department of State *Bulletin*, September 1, 1975, pp. 323–350. Kissinger referenced the Final Act during an August 8 Cabinet meeting, noting: "All the new things in the document are in our favor—peaceful change, human contacts, maneuver notification. At the Conference, it was the President who dominated the Conference and it was the West which was on the offensive." For the full memorandum of conversation, see *Foreign Relations, 1969–1976*, volume XXXIX, European Security, Document 339.

But every signatory should know that if these are to be more than the latest chapter in a long and sorry volume of unfulfilled declarations, every party must be dedicated to making them come true.

These documents which we will sign represent another step—how long or short a step only time will tell—in the process of détente and reconciliation in Europe. Our peoples will be watching and measuring our progress. They will ask how these noble sentiments are being translated into actions that bring about a more secure and just order in the daily lives of each of our nations and its citizens.

The documents produced here represent compromises, like all international negotiations, but these principles we have agreed upon are more than the lowest common denominator of governmental positions.

They affirm the most fundamental human rights: liberty of thought, conscience, and faith; the exercise of civil and political rights; the rights of minorities.

They call for a freer flow of information, ideas, and people; greater scope for the press, cultural and educational exchange, family reunification, the right to travel and to marriage between nationals of different states; and for the protection of the priceless heritage of our diverse cultures.

They offer wide areas for greater cooperation: trade, industrial production, science and technology, the environment, transportation, health, space, and the oceans.

They reaffirm the basic principles of relations between states: non-intervention, sovereign equality, self-determination, territorial integrity, inviolability of frontiers, and the possibility of change by peaceful means.

The United States gladly subscribes to this document because we subscribe to every one of these principles.

Almost 200 years ago, the United States of America was born as a free and independent nation. The descendants of Europeans who proclaimed their independence in America expressed in that declaration a decent respect for the opinions of mankind and asserted not only that all men are created equal but they are endowed with inalienable rights to life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness.

The founders of my country did not merely say that all Americans should have these rights but all men everywhere should have these rights. And these principles have guided the United States of America throughout its two centuries of nationhood. They have given hopes to millions in Europe and on every continent.

I have been asked why I am here today.

I am here because I believe, and my countrymen believe, in the interdependence of Europe and North America—indeed in the interdependence of the entire family of man.

I am here because the leaders of 34 other governments are here—the states of Europe and of our good neighbor, Canada, with whom we share an open border of 5,526 miles, along which there stands not a single armed soldier and across which our two peoples have moved in friendship and mutual respect for 160 years.

I can say without fear of contradiction that there is not a single people represented here whose blood does not flow in the veins of Americans and whose culture and traditions have not enriched the heritage which we Americans prize so highly.

When two centuries ago the United States of America issued a declaration of high principles, the cynics and doubters of that day jeered and scoffed. Yet 11 long years later, our independence was won and the stability of our Republic was really achieved through the incorporation of the same principles in our Constitution.

But those principles, though they are still being perfected, remain the guiding lights of an American policy. And the American people are still dedicated, as they were then, to a decent respect for the opinions of mankind and to life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness for all peoples everywhere.

To our fellow participants in this Conference: My presence here symbolizes my country's vital interest in Europe's future. Our future is bound with yours. Our economic well-being, as well as our security, is linked increasingly with yours. The distance of geography is bridged by our common heritage and our common destiny. The United States, therefore, intends to participate fully in the affairs of Europe and in turning the results of this Conference into a living reality.

To America's allies: We in the West must vigorously pursue the course upon which we have embarked together, reinforced by one another's strength and mutual confidence. Stability in Europe requires equilibrium in Europe. Therefore, I assure you that my country will continue to be a concerned and reliable partner. Our partnership is far more than a matter of formal agreements. It is a reflection of beliefs, traditions, and ties that are of deep significance to the American people. We are proud that these values are expressed in this document.

To the countries of the East: The United States considers that the principles on which this Conference has agreed are a part of the great heritage of European civilization, which we all hold in trust for all mankind. To my country, they are not clichés or empty phrases. We take this work and these words very seriously. We will spare no effort to ease tensions and to solve problems between us. But it is important that you recognize the deep devotion of the American people and their

Government to human rights and fundamental freedoms and thus to the pledges that this Conference has made regarding the freer movement of people, ideas, information.

In building a political relationship between East and West, we face many challenges.

Berlin has a special significance. It has been a flashpoint of confrontation in the past; it can provide an example of peaceful settlement in the future. The United States regards it as a test of détente and of the principles of this Conference. We welcome the fact that, subject to Four-Power rights and responsibilities, the results of CSCE apply to Berlin as they do throughout Europe.

Military stability in Europe has kept the peace. While maintaining that stability, it is now time to reduce substantially the high levels of military forces on both sides. Negotiations now underway in Vienna on mutual and balanced force reductions so far have not produced the results for which I had hoped. The United States stands ready to demonstrate flexibility in moving these negotiations forward, if others will do the same. An agreement that enhances mutual security is feasible—and essential.

The United States also intends to pursue vigorously a further agreement on strategic arms limitations with the Soviet Union. This remains a priority of American policy. General Secretary Brezhnev and I agreed last November in Vladivostok on the essentials of a new accord limiting strategic offensive weapons for the next 10 years. We are moving forward in our bilateral discussions here in Helsinki.

The world faces an unprecedented danger in the spread of nuclear weapons technology. The nations of Europe share a great responsibility for an international solution to this problem. The benefits of peaceful nuclear energy are becoming more and more important. We must find ways to spread these benefits while safeguarding the world against the menace of weapons proliferation.

To the other nations of Europe represented at this Conference: We value the work you have done here to help bring all of Europe together. Your right to live in peace and independence is one of the major goals of our effort. Your continuing contribution will be indispensable.

To those nations not participating and to all the peoples of the world: The solemn obligation undertaken in these documents to promote fundamental rights, economic and social progress, and well-being applies ultimately to all peoples.

Can we truly speak of peace and security without addressing the spread of nuclear weapons in the world or the creation of more sophisticated forms of warfare?

Can peace be divisible between areas of tranquillity and regions of conflict?

Can Europe truly flourish if we do not all address ourselves to the evil of hunger in countries less fortunate than we? To the new dimensions of economic and energy issues that underline our own progress? To the dialog between producers and consumers, between exporters and importers, between industrial countries and less developed ones?

And can there be stability and progress in the absence of justice and fundamental freedoms?

Our people want a better future. Their expectations have been raised by the very real steps that have already been taken—in arms control, political negotiations, and expansion of contacts and economic relations. Our presence here offers them further hope. We must not let them down.

If the Soviet Union and the United States can reach agreement so that our astronauts can fit together the most intricate scientific equipment, work together, and shake hands 137 miles out in space,³ we as statesmen have an obligation to do as well on Earth.

History will judge this Conference not by what we say here today, but by what we do tomorrow—not by the promises we make, but by the promises we keep.

Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman.

³ See footnote 3, Document 59.

63. Briefing Memorandum From the Director of the Policy Planning Staff (Lord) and the Assistant Secretary of State for Inter-American Affairs (Rogers) to Secretary of State Kissinger¹

Washington, September 19, 1975.

The Lesson of the New Dialogue

We face a curious paradox: our relations with Latin America have improved significantly in the past 18 months—yet the renewed “inter-

¹ Source: National Archives, RG 59, Policy Planning Council (S/PC), Policy Planning Staff (S/P), Director's Files (Winston Lord) 1969–77, Lot 77D112, Box 354, SEPT 16–30 1975. Confidential; Exdis.

American solidarity” promised at Tlatelolco in February 1974² remains as elusive as ever. In fact, the New Dialogue meetings themselves have been dropped, the MFM Working Groups disbanded.³

Underlying this paradox, we believe, is the fact that *regionalism can no longer serve as the primary focus of US-Latin American relations*. Our inability to translate generally positive bilateral relationships into a similarly positive regional environment stems from the ambiguity of the “special relationship” between Latin America and the United States, and the hemisphere’s growing diversity. So long as we approach Latin America primarily as a unit, we will engender a suspicious common front against us—and diversity will paralyze action.

This is not an insoluble dilemma. Regionalism does provide a convenient mode of interaction with the smaller countries and is an unavoidable and convenient rationale for specific initiatives. As a practical matter, however, the increasingly varied interests of the hemisphere’s more powerful countries—including our own—requires a mix of relationships tailored to specific needs and situations, most of which are not susceptible to “regional” solutions. Two of the most striking developments of the past decade—the rise of sub-regional politics and the proliferation of extra-hemispheric linkages—are a direct reflection of the growing industrial power and diversification of key countries, particularly Brazil and Mexico, which is driving them to seek capital, technology and markets in a manner reminiscent of 19th century European competitions.

The implication is clear: *we should approach individual countries and groups of countries in Latin America in a differentiated fashion, placing greater emphasis on bilateral and sub-regional relationships, and attempting whenever possible to implement our global economic policies in a way that will engage Latin America’s new middle powers in productive commercial relationships and contain the inevitable conflicts their global emergence will entail.*

² See Document 28.

³ Lord and Rogers sent Kissinger a briefing memorandum on January 14 entitled “Why Has the New Dialogue Soured?” Characterizing the New Dialogue as “old wine in new bottles,” Lord and Rogers wrote: “Like all the earlier U.S. initiatives, it aroused some expectations which could not be met, at least in the short term. The New Dialogue was launched by a unique Secretary of State, one who had just assumed office fresh from enormous foreign policy triumphs. You asked the Latin Americans to tell you what was wrong with U.S. policy. They had fantasies that you would work some special magic to set wrongs aright. Culturally predisposed to believe in heroic leaders, the Latin Americans did not understand that in our political system foreign policy issues increasingly involve a process—usually lengthy—of negotiation and compromise between two branches and two parties.” (Library of Congress, Manuscript Division, Kissinger Papers, Box CL 326, Department of State, Bureaus, Policy Planning, History Project, Selected Papers, Vol. 10 (Additional papers: European Affairs/Inter-American Affairs/Near Eastern and South Asian Affairs), 1973–76)

This conclusion is more easily stated than implemented. The classic instrumentalities of bilateralism in the hemisphere—US military and economic assistance programs—are not only declining and hedged with restrictions, but are either inappropriate or simply unavailable. The three countries where our interests are greatest: Brazil, Mexico and Venezuela, are rightly no longer eligible for concessional AID programs, just as they have received no grant military equipment since 1968. US responsiveness to their clamor for “trade, not aid” has been limited by competing domestic and international pressures. But we have also limited ourselves conceptually by searching for nonexistent “regional” solutions.

We thus face in Latin America a situation similar to the one you described in your September 1 Special Session speech:⁴ “no panaceas, only challenges.” But if we deemphasize regional multilateralism, we will limit the occasions for generalized confrontations. And if we focus instead on two or three pressing specific issues in addition to Panama and Cuba, such as resolving trade conflicts with Brazil, or developing positive interactions with the Andean Pact,⁵ we have a solid chance of consolidating the more favorable climate generated by your UN Special Session initiatives, which have great potential significance for many Latin American countries—whose growth, though substantial, remains fragile, and thus both vulnerable to uncontrolled fluctuations and susceptible to positive influence.

Your September 30 luncheon with Latin American Foreign Ministers in New York is a classic exercise in “regionalism.”⁶ But it, and your separate bilaterals, will move us in the right directions should you:

- specify our openness to implementing the Special Session approach in a manner beneficial to the concerns of particular Latin American countries and groups of countries;

- stress our interest in Latin America in contemporary rather than traditional terms (e.g., interdependence and trade rather than special relationship and aid); and

⁴ Kissinger’s speech, entitled “Global Consensus and Economic Development,” was delivered to the Seventh Special Session of the UNGA by U.S. Representative to the United Nations Daniel Patrick Moynihan. At the time, Kissinger was in Israel for the signing of the second Israeli-Egyptian disengagement agreement. The text of the speech is printed in Department of State *Bulletin*, September 22, 1975, pp. 425–441.

⁵ A trade bloc founded in 1969 by Bolivia, Chile, Colombia, Ecuador, and Peru. Venezuela joined the Andean Pact in 1973.

⁶ Kissinger met with the Foreign Ministers during the regular U.N. General Assembly session. The text of his luncheon toast is in telegram 4648 from USUN, October 1. (National Archives, RG 59, Central Foreign Policy File)

—ascribe to the New Dialogue experience a major role in the development of the United States proposals at the UN Special Session, reemphasizing the need to work out hemispheric problems in global as well as regional fora.

Some details of such an approach are set forth at the conclusion of this memorandum following a review of some of the reasons that lead us to recommend it.

[Omitted here is the body of the memorandum.]

64. Editorial Note

On November 9, 1975, President Gerald Ford participated in an interview marking the 28th anniversary of the NBC news program “Meet the Press.” During the course of the interview, conducted by host Lawrence Spivak, the President was asked to provide his definition of *détente* and an explanation of what *détente* personally meant to him and what it should mean to the American public. Ford responded:

“I am not sure that is the best word but that is the word that is being used. *Détente* means to me that two super powers who are strong militarily and economically, who represent differing political and governmental views, instead of confronting one another, can consult one another on a wide variety of areas of potential dispute, whether it is trade, whether it is military potential conflict, whether it is a number of other things.

“Now, *détente* is not always going to mean that we solve every problem, because some of them are very complex and very controversial. It does mean it is a mechanism for the relaxation of tension, so that instead of glaring at one another and opening the potential of conflict, you can sit down and discuss differences of opinion and hope to accomplish a relaxation and progress without military conflict.” (*Public Papers: Ford, 1975, Book II, page 1834*)

Secretary of State Henry Kissinger echoed these themes during a November 24 speech delivered in Detroit, Michigan. Addressing the Economic Club of Detroit and other local groups, Kissinger proposed to discuss “what is right with America’s foreign policy.” Highlighting the diplomatic successes of the Nixon and Ford administrations, Kissinger noted a sea change in U.S.-Soviet relations: “In place of continual crises there are continuing negotiations—on arms control, economic relations, and international issues—which give both sides a stake in

peace and have lessened the chances that great-power confrontation will lead to nuclear Armageddon.”

However, new realities threatened to complicate détente, Kissinger acknowledged, including the three-party competition for political control of the former Portuguese colony of Angola: the Popular Front for the Liberation of Angola (MPLA) backed by the Soviet Union and Cuba, the National Front for the Liberation of Angola (FNLA) supported by China and Zaire (although the Ford administration also backed FNLA leader Holden Roberto), and the U.S.-supported National Union for the Total Independence of Angola (UNITA). Continued Kissinger:

“But the easing of tensions cannot endure if we relax our vigilance. We must understand the need for both defense *and* relaxation of tension, both firm action in crises *and* willingness to resolve problems on a realistic and fair basis. We must be prepared for either course; the choice rests with our adversaries.

“We cannot ignore, for example, the substantial Soviet buildup of weapons in Angola, which has introduced great-power rivalry into Africa for the first time in 15 years. This Soviet involvement is resented by African nations most of all. But the United States cannot be indifferent while an outside power embarks upon an interventionist policy—so distant from its homeland and so removed from traditional Russian interests. The Soviet Union still has an opportunity for a policy of restraint which permits Angolans to resolve their own differences without outside intervention. We would be glad to cooperate in such a course. But time is running out; continuation of an interventionist policy must inevitably threaten other relationships.

“Nor can we ignore the thousands of Cubans sent into an African conflict. In recent months the United States has demonstrated, by deed as well as word, its readiness to improve relations with Cuba. We have cooperated with steps to ease the inter-American boycott against Cuba and to restore a more normal relationship between the nations of the Americas and Cuba. But let there be no illusions: a policy of conciliation will not survive Cuban meddling in Puerto Rico or Cuban armed intervention in the affairs of other nations struggling to decide their own fate.

“To Cuba, as to other nations with whom our relations have been strained, I say this: the United States has no higher goal than to ease the conflicts that have torn the globe for nearly a generation. We will be flexible and cooperative in settling conflicts. But we will never permit détente to turn into a subterfuge for unilateral advantage. The policy of relaxation of tensions is designed to promote peace, not surrender; we will be flexible, but we shall insist on reciprocity and restraint.” For the full text of Kissinger’s remarks, see Department of State *Bulletin*, December 15, 1975, pages 841–850.

During the President's November 26 news conference, reporters asked Ford if the Soviet involvement in Angola was "consistent" with the President's understanding of détente. Ford responded: "I agree with the content of the speech made by Secretary Kissinger in Detroit last night [November 24], where he said that the Soviet actions in Angola were not helpful in the continuation of détente. I agree with that, and I hope and trust that there will be proper note taken of it."

When asked if he planned to "do anything about it" other than offering the statement, Ford asserted, "I don't want to get into the method or procedure. I said that I agree with the statement made by the Secretary, and I believe that the Soviet Union is not helping the cause of détente by what they are doing. And I hope the message comes across." (*Public Papers: Ford, 1975, Book II, page 1914*)

The Ford administration covertly supported UNITA and the FNLA during the Angolan civil war. Congressional opposition to this financial support culminated in an amendment to the FY 1976 Defense Appropriations bill sponsored by Senator John Tunney (D-California), which aimed to terminate the covert support (S. Res. 337). Despite a compromise approach pursued by Kissinger and members of the Senate leadership, the measure passed the Senate on December 19, prompting Ford to comment to reporters: "How can the United States, the greatest power in the world, take the position that the Soviet Union can operate with impunity many thousands of miles away with Cuban troops and massive amounts of military equipment, while we refuse any assistance to the majority of the local people who ask only for military equipment to defend themselves?" (*Ibid.*, page 1981) The next day, Ford touched upon the implications of this decision:

"And the problem that I foresee on a broader basis is a good many countries throughout the world consider the United States friendly and helpful, and we have over a period of time helped to maintain free governments around the world. Those countries that have depended on us—and there are many—can't help but have some misgivings, because the Congress has refused any opportunity for us in Angola to help a majority of the people. And they can't help but feel that the same fate might occur as far as they are concerned in the future." (*Ibid.*, page 1986) Despite a last-minute appeal by the Ford administration, the House passed the Defense Appropriations Act with the Tunney amendment on January 27, 1976, and Ford signed it on February 9 (P.L. 94–212). His February 10 signing statement reads in part: "I am deeply disappointed that the Congress has acted in this bill to deprive the people of Angola of the assistance needed to resist Soviet and Cuban military intervention in their country. I believe this provision is an extremely undesirable precedent that could limit severely our ability to play a positive and effective role in international affairs." (*Ibid.*,

1976–77, Book I, p. 242) Documentation on U.S. assistance during the Angolan civil war is printed in *Foreign Relations*, 1969–1976, volume XXVIII, Southern Africa, Documents 137–191.

65. Address by President Ford¹

Honolulu, December 7, 1975.

[Omitted here are introductory remarks.]

But it is good to be home again in the United States. I have just completed, as many of you know, a 7-day trip to the State of Alaska, to the People's Republic of China, to our good friends Indonesia and the Philippines, and now I am obviously happy to be home in our 50th State, Hawaii.

This morning I reflected on the past at the shrine of Americans who died on Sunday morning 34 years ago. I came away with a new spirit of dedication to the ideals that emerged from Pearl Harbor in World War II—dedication to America's bipartisan policy of pursuing peace through strength and dedication to a new future of interdependence and cooperation with all peoples of the Pacific.

I subscribe to a Pacific doctrine of peace with all and hostility toward none. The way I would like to remember or recollect Pearl Harbor is by preserving the power of the past to build the future. Let us join with new and old countries of that great Pacific area in creating the greatest civilization on the shores of the greatest of our oceans.

My visit here to the East-West Center holds another kind of meaning. Your center is a catalyst of America's positive concern for Asia, its people and its rich diversity of cultures. You advance our hope that Asia will gain a better understanding of the United States.

Last year we were pleased to receive and to welcome nearly 54,000 Asian students to the United States, while thousands upon thousands of American students went to Asian countries. I applaud your contri-

¹ Source: *Public Papers: Ford*, 1975, Book II, pp. 1950–1955. The President delivered his remarks at 11:05 a.m. at the East-West Center at the University of Hawaii. Congress established the East-West Center in 1960 as an educational and research facility. Prior to this speech, Ford visited the People's Republic of China (December 1–5), Indonesia (December 5–6), and the Philippines (December 6–7). For memoranda of Ford's conversations with Asian leaders, see *Foreign Relations*, 1969–1976, volume XVIII, China, 1973–1976, Documents 134, 136, and 137; and *ibid.*, volume E–12, Documents on East and Southeast Asia, 1973–1976, Documents 141 and 341.

bution to partnership in education. Your efforts represent America's vision of an open world of understanding, freedom, and peace.

In Hawaii, the crossroads of the Pacific, our past and our future join.

I was deeply moved when I visited Japan last year and when I recently had the honor of welcoming the Emperor and the Empress of Japan to America.² The gracious welcome that I received and the warmth of the welcome the American people bestowed upon the Emperor and the Empress testify to a growing friendship and partnership between our two great countries. This is a tribute to what is best in man—his capacity to grow from fear to trust and from a tragedy of the past to a hopeful future. It is a superb example of what can be achieved in human progress. It inspires our new efforts in Asia to improve relations.

America, a nation of the Pacific Basin, has a very vital stake in Asia and a responsibility to take a leading part in lessening tensions, preventing hostilities, and preserving peace. World stability and our own security depend upon our Asian commitments.

In 1941, 34 years ago today, we were militarily unprepared. Our trade in the Pacific was very limited. We exercised jurisdiction over the Philippines. We were preoccupied with Western Europe. Our instincts were isolationist.

We have transcended that age. We are now the world's strongest nation. Our great commercial involvement in Asia is expanding. We led the way in conferring independence upon the Philippines. Now we are working out new associations and arrangements with the trust territories of the Pacific.

The center of political power in the United States has shifted westward. Our Pacific interests and concerns have increased. We have exchanged the freedom of action of an isolationist state for the responsibilities of a great global power. As I return from this trip to three major Asian countries, I am even more aware of our interests in this part of the world.

The security concerns of great world powers intersect in Asia. The United States, the Soviet Union, China, and Japan are all Pacific powers. Western Europe has historic and economic ties with Asia. Equilibrium in the Pacific is absolutely essential to the United States and to the other countries in the Pacific.

The first premise of a new Pacific Doctrine is that American strength is basic to any stable balance of power in the Pacific. We must

² The Emperor and Empress visited several U.S. cities September 30–October 15. They were in Washington October 2–4.

reach beyond our concern for security. But without security, there can be neither peace nor progress. The preservation of the sovereignty and the independence of our Asian friends and allies remain a paramount objective of American policy.

We recognize that force alone is insufficient to assure security. Popular legitimacy and social justice are vital prerequisites of resistance against subversion or aggression. Nevertheless, we owe it to ourselves and to those whose independence depends upon our continued support to preserve a flexible and balanced position of strength throughout the Pacific.

The second basic premise of a new Pacific Doctrine is that partnership with Japan is a pillar of our strategy. There is no relationship to which I have devoted more attention, nor is there any greater success story in the history of American efforts to relate to distant cultures and to people.³ The Japanese-American relationship can be a source of great, great pride to every American and to every Japanese. Our bilateral relations have never been better. The recent exchange of visits symbolized a basic political partnership. We have begun to develop with the Japanese and other advanced industrial democracies better means of harmonizing our economic policy. We are joining with Japan, our European friends, and representatives of the developing nations this month to begin shaping a more efficient and more equitable pattern of North-South economic relations.

The third premise of a new Pacific Doctrine is the normalization of relations with the People's Republic of China, the strengthening of our new ties with this great nation representing nearly one-quarter of mankind. This is another recent achievement of American foreign policy. It transcends 25 years of hostility.

I visited China to build on the dialog started nearly 4 years ago. My wide-ranging exchanges with the leaders of the People's Republic of China—with Chairman Mao Tse-tung and Vice Premier Teng Hsiao-ping—enhanced our understanding of each other's views and each other's policies.

There were, as expected, differences of perspective. Our societies, our philosophies, our varying positions in the world give us differing perceptions of our respective national interests. But we did find a common ground. We reaffirmed that we share very important areas of concern and agreement. They say and we say that the countries of Asia should be free to develop in a world where there is mutual respect for the sovereignty and territorial integrity of all states; where people are

³ During a December 31 question-and-answer session with reporters, Ford described the U.S.-Japanese relationship as "the best in the history of this country." (*Public Papers: Ford, 1975*, Book II, p. 2002)

free from the threat of foreign aggression; where there is noninterference in the internal affairs of others; and where the principles of equality, mutual benefit, and coexistence shape the development of peaceful international order. We share opposition to any form of hegemony in Asia or in any other part of the world.

I reaffirmed the determination of the United States to complete the normalization of relations with the People's Republic of China on the basis of the Shanghai communiqué. Both sides regarded our discussions as significant, useful, and constructive. Our relationship is becoming a permanent feature of the international political landscape. It benefits not only our two peoples but all peoples of the region and the entire world.

A fourth principle of our Pacific policy is our continuing stake in stability and security in Southeast Asia.

After leaving China, I visited Indonesia and the Philippines. Indonesia is a nation of 140 million people, the fifth largest population in the world today. It is one of our important new friends and a major country in that area of the world. The Republic of the Philippines is one of our oldest and dearest allies. Our friendship demonstrates America's longstanding interest in Asia.

I spent 3 days in Djakarta and Manila. I would have liked to have had time to visit our friends in Thailand, Singapore, and Malaysia. We share important political and economic concerns with these five nations who make up the Association of Southeast Asian Nations.

I can assure you that Americans will be hearing much more about the ASEAN organization. All of its members are friends of the United States. Their total population equals our own. While they are developing countries, they possess many, many assets—vital peoples, abundant natural resources, and well-managed agricultures. They have skilled leaders and the determination to develop themselves and to solve their own problems. Each of these countries protects its independence by relying on its own national resilience and diplomacy. We must continue to assist them. I learned during my visit that our friends want us to remain actively engaged in the affairs of the region. We intend to do so.

We retain close and valuable ties with our old friends and allies in the Southwest Pacific—Australia on the one hand and New Zealand on the other.

A fifth tenet of our new Pacific policy is our belief that peace in Asia depends upon a resolution of outstanding political conflicts.

In Korea, tension persists. We have close ties with the Republic of Korea. And we remain committed to peace and security on the Korean Peninsula, as the presence of our forces there attests. Responding to the

heightened tension last spring, we reaffirmed our support of the Republic of Korea. Today, the United States is ready to consider constructive ways of easing tensions on the peninsula. But we will continue to resist any moves which attempt to exclude the Republic of Korea from discussion of its own future.

In Indochina, the healing effects of time are required. Our policies toward the new regimes of the peninsula will be determined by their conduct toward us. We are prepared to reciprocate gestures of good will—particularly the return of remains of Americans killed or missing in action or information about them. If they exhibit restraint toward their neighbors and constructive approaches to international problems, we will look to the future rather than to the past.

The sixth point of our new policy in the Pacific is that peace in Asia requires a structure of economic cooperation reflecting the aspiration of all the peoples in the region.

The Asian-Pacific economy has recently achieved more rapid growth than any other region in the world. Our trade with East Asia now exceeds our transactions with the European Community. America's jobs, currency, and raw materials depend upon economic ties with the Pacific Basin. Our trade with the region is now increasing by more than 30 percent annually, reaching some \$46 billion last year. Our economies are increasingly interdependent as cooperation grows between developed and developing nations.

Our relations with the five ASEAN countries are marked by growing maturity and by more modest and more realistic expectations on both sides. We no longer approach them as donor to dependent. These proud people look to us less for outright aid than for new trading opportunities and more equitable arrangements for the transfer of science and technology.

There is one common theme which was expressed to me by the leaders of every Asian country that I visited. They all advocate the continuity of steady and responsible American leadership. They seek self-reliance in their own future and in their own relations with us.

Our military assistance to allies and friends is a modest responsibility, but its political significance far surpasses the small cost involved. We serve our highest national interests by strengthening their self-reliance, their relations with us, their solidarity with each other, and their regional security.

I emphasized to every leader I met that the United States is a Pacific nation. I pledged, as President, I will continue America's active concern for Asia and our presence in the Asian-Pacific region.

Asia is entering a new era. We can contribute to a new structure of stability founded on a balance among the major powers, strong ties to

our allies in the region, an easing of tension between adversaries, the self-reliance and regional solidarity of smaller nations, and expanding economic ties and cultural exchanges. These components of peace are already evident. Our foreign policy in recent years and in recent days encourages their growth.

If we can remain steadfast, historians will look back and view the 1970's as the beginning of a period of peaceful cooperation and progress, a time of growing community for all the nations touched by this great ocean.

Here in the Pacific crossroads of Hawaii, we envision hope for a wider community of man. We see the promise of a unique republic which includes all the world's races. No other country has been so truly a free, multiracial society. Hawaii is a splendid example, a splendid showcase of America and exemplifies our destiny as a Pacific nation.

America's Pacific heritage emerged from this remarkable State. I am proud to visit Hawaii—the island star in the American firmament which radiates the universal magic of *aloha*.

Let there flow from Hawaii—and from all of the States in our Union—to all peoples, East and West, a new spirit of interchange to build human brotherhood.

Thank you very much.

66. Interview With President Ford¹

Washington, January 3, 1976.

Tom Brokaw: Mr. President, do you think that it is possible for you to make decisions in the name of national security if those decisions do not reflect the popular will of the people?

The President: It does make it somewhat difficult, Tom, but I think it is the responsibility of a President to fully inform the American people and convince them that what we are seeking to do in foreign policy is in our best interests. And if a President carries out that responsibility, then he can and will have the support of the American people.

¹ Source: *Public Papers: Ford, 1976–77*, Book I, pp. 7–11. The interview began at 11:36 a.m. in the Library at the White House. It was broadcast during a portion of the program “New World—Hard Choices: American Foreign Policy 1976,” which was shown on the NBC network on January 5.

Mr. Brokaw: Is that the situation now in Angola? Do you have to convince the American people of what you consider to be the national security of the United States there?

The President: I believe there is a need and necessity for that. I don't believe that enough Americans understand the great responsibilities we have as a nation on a worldwide basis, and that includes, of course, Africa as a whole. What we really want and what we are seeking to do in Angola is to get an African solution to an African problem, and through bilateral negotiations, through working with the Organization of African Unity, through relations with the Soviet Union and others, we are trying to achieve that African solution to an African problem.

Mr. Brokaw: Mr. President, the Soviet Union quite clearly has signaled in a TASS article that it wants all major powers to withdraw militarily from Angola. Has Moscow privately communicated that to you as well?

The President: We are working with all powers, including the Soviet Union, to try and permit the Angolan people, the three different groups there at the present time, to get a decision or solution that will reflect a majority view of the Angolan people. And we are doing it, as I indicated, with a number of major powers, including the Soviet Union, as well as the many, many African countries that are a part of the Organization of African Unity.

Mr. Brokaw: But as a result of this TASS article, is it your understanding now that Russia is prepared to break off its military support and to have Cuba quit sending troops as well to Angola?

The President: I don't believe we can say categorically that that is their intention. We are simply working with them because a continuation of that confrontation is destabilizing. It is, I think, inconsistent with the aims and objectives of détente, and we are making some headway. But I can't say categorically that the end result is what we want it to be at the present time.

Mr. Brokaw: Mr. President, in a recent speech, Secretary Kissinger said there is a gray area between foreign policy and national security which, he said, we deny ourselves at great risk to our national security.² I suppose that training foreign mercenaries for use in Angola might be called part of that gray area. Are we training foreign mercenaries for use in Angola?

² In his November 24 speech in Detroit, Kissinger said: "We must keep in mind that in a world where totalitarian government can manipulate friendly political parties, there is a gray area between foreign policy and overt intervention which we deny ourselves only at grave risk to our national security." (Department of State *Bulletin*, December 15, 1975, p. 849)

The President: The United States is not training foreign mercenaries in Angola. We do expend some Federal funds, or United States funds, in trying to be helpful, but we are not training foreign mercenaries.

Mr. Brokaw: Are we financing the training of foreign mercenaries?

The President: We are working with other countries that feel they have an interest in giving the Angolans an opportunity to make the decision for themselves, and I think this is a proper responsibility of the Federal Government.

Mr. Brokaw: Mr. President, while you may disagree with the results of the Senate vote on Angola,³ do you agree that it probably represents the will of the American people?

The President: It may at this time. But I will repeat, as I said a few moments ago, the American people, I think, if told and fully informed as to the role and responsibility and the aims and objectives of the American Government in trying to let the Angolans and the Africans come to a solution, I think in time the American people will support what we have been trying to do in Angola.

Mr. Brokaw: Mr. President, in the past the congressional role in foreign policy has been largely confined to a few chairmen and senior members. Now the process has been broadened considerably. You are formerly a man of Congress. Do you think that is a healthy sign?

The President: I think Congress, under the Constitution, does have a proper role in foreign policy, but I don't think our forefathers who drafted that Constitution ever envisioned that 535 Members of the House and Senate could execute foreign policy on a day-to-day basis. I think the drafters of the Constitution felt that a President had to have the opportunity for decisiveness, for flexibility, for continuity in the execution of foreign policy, and somehow we have to mesh the role and responsibility of the Congress, which is proper, with the opportunity for the President to carry out that foreign policy in the best interests of the United States.

Now, there have been some instances in recent months where I think the actions of the Congress have hampered, interfered with the execution of foreign policy, and let me cite one or two examples.

The action of the Congress about a year ago has harmed the opportunity of many to emigrate from the Soviet Union.⁴ I noticed just the other day that the emigration from the Soviet Union is down this year,

³ On December 19, 1975, the Senate approved the Tunney amendment; see Document 64.

⁴ Reference is to the Jackson-Vanik amendment to the Foreign Trade Act of 1974; see Document 31.

including many reductions in the emigration of Soviet Jews from Russia. I think the action of the Congress was harmful in that regard.

It is my judgment that in the case of congressional action on Turkish aid,⁵ they have slowed down the potential solution to the Cyprus problem.

In some respects—and I emphasize some—the action of the Congress has hurt our efforts in the intelligence field, although the Congress in some respects in this area has illuminated what were, and I think we all recognize, some abuses in the intelligence field.⁶

But overall there has to be a better understanding of the role of the Congress and the role of the President, and they have to be meshed if we are going to be successful.

John Chancellor: Mr. President, is it because of Vietnam and the fact that President Johnson and, to some degree, President Nixon had a lot of control over Vietnam and the Congress had very little control of it that you are in this fix?

The President: I believe some of the instances that I have cited, John, are an aftermath of the trauma of Vietnam. Congress really asserted itself in the latter days of the Vietnam war. We all understand why. And Congress, having whetted its appetite, so to speak, I think, in the last few months, has continued to do some things that have been harmful in the execution on a day-to-day basis of our foreign policy.

Mr. Brokaw: Mr. President, as a result of the Soviet role in Angola, the fact that the SALT talks now have bogged down somewhat, the fact that the spirit and the letter of the Helsinki agreements⁷ have not been fully carried out by Russia, are you now less enthusiastic about the prospects for détente?

The President: I am not at all, and I think it would be very unwise for a President—me or anyone else—to abandon détente. I think détente is in the best interest of this country. It is in the best interest of world stability, world peace.

We have to recognize there are deep ideological differences between the United States and the Soviet Union. We have to recognize they are a super power militarily and industrially, just as we are. And when you have two super powers that have such great influence, it is in the best interests of those two countries to work together to ease tensions, to avoid confrontation where possible, to improve relations on a worldwide basis.

⁵ See footnote 4, Document 52.

⁶ The Church Committee investigating possible CIA involvement in assassinations, among other issues, had issued an interim report in December 1975.

⁷ See footnote 2, Document 62.

And for us to abandon this working relationship and to go back to a cold war, in my opinion, would be very unwise for we in the United States and the world as a whole.

Mr. Brokaw: But won't you be under a lot of domestic political pressure in this election year to change your attitude about détente?

The President: I think it would be just the reverse, because when we look at détente—with the Berlin agreement of 1971, with SALT I, which put, to some extent, a limitation on nuclear development, et cetera—and when I look at the benefits that can come from the Vladivostok agreement of 1974, it is my opinion that we must continue rather than stop.

And if the American people take a good, calculated look at the benefits from détente, I think they will support it rather than oppose it. And politically, I think any candidate who says abandon détente will be the loser in the long run.

Mr. Brokaw: Mr. President, the historian, Will Durant, has said that a statesman can't afford to be a moralist as well. Briefly, do you agree with that statement?

The President: I don't believe there is any necessary conflict between the two. We have to be pragmatic at the same time. We have to be practical as we meet these specific problems. But if you lose your moral value, then I think you have destroyed your capability to carry out things in a practical way.

Mr. Chancellor: Mr. President, I wonder if I could ask you a question about the United Nations, which seems to have less utility in the world these days than it did when it began, and also about some of the pressure groups that we find both within the United Nations and as you see these pressure groups in foreign affairs. I am thinking, for example, of the influence of American Jews, of the growing influence of Arabs, of various groups. Aren't those groups kind of closing in on you, or do you feel that sometimes, sir?

The President: I believe that substantial progress, John, was made in the United Nations in the Seventh Special Session late in 1975.⁸ That was a very constructive session of the United Nations, which sought to bring together the developing, as well as the developed, nations. This was constructive.

Now, it is true that subsequent to that there were some very vitriolic debates, there were some very serious differences that developed in the United Nations from various pressure groups.

I would hope that in the future some of this conflict would subside and there would be a more constructive effort made to solve the

⁸ See footnote 8, Document 60.

problems. And since I am always an optimist—and I think it is important and necessary for a President to be that—I think that as we move in the United Nations in the future that we can calm some of the voices and get to some of the answers.

And so, this country's foreign policy in the United Nations will be aimed in that direction. And if we follow what we did in the Seventh Special Session and what we are trying to do now, I think these pressure groups will recognize that words are not the answer, but solutions will be to the benefit of all parties concerned.

Mr. Chancellor: In your history in public life as a Member of Congress, Mr. President, and now as the President, do you find that organized groups play a greater role now in terms of our foreign affairs or trying to influence them than they did when you began?

The President: To some degree, yes. I think highly organized, very articulate pressure groups can, on occasion, tend to distort the circumstances and can hamper rather than help in the solution.

I don't believe those pressure groups necessarily represent the American people as a whole. So, a President, myself included, has to look at the broad perspective and not necessarily in every instance respond to the pressure groups that are well intentioned but who have a limited perspective or scope.

And as we move ahead, we are going to try and predicate our foreign policy on the best interests of all the people in this country, as well as our allies and our adversaries, rather than to respond to a highly articulate, a very tightly organized pressure group of any kind. We cannot let America's policies be predicated on a limited part of our population or our society.

Mr. Chancellor: Mr. President, thank you for spending that extra minute with us. We thought that was an important point. I appreciate very much your answering that question.

The President: Thank you, John.

67. Statement by Secretary of State Kissinger¹

Washington, January 29, 1976.

Implications of Angola for Future U.S. Foreign Policy

I appear before you not to score debating points in an abstract contest over executive-legislative prerogative. What faces us is a congressional decision of potentially grave magnitude² taken after the executive branch had complied with all legal requirements for the kind of operation involved in Angola and after eight congressional committees had been briefed over 20 times without foreshadowing any opposition in principle. The issue is not “victory” of one branch over another. The issue is what constitutes a victory for the national interest.

I welcome this opportunity to explain the global significance of what is now happening in Angola, the events that have brought us to this point, the U.S. objectives, and the major consequences which can result if we fail to pursue those objectives.

The Soviet Union’s massive and unprecedented intervention in the internal affairs of Africa—with nearly 200 million dollars’ worth of arms and its military technicians and advisers, with 11,000 Cuban combat troops, and with substantial sea and airlift and naval cover in adjacent waters—is a matter of urgent concern. Not only are the interests of the countries directly affected at stake but also the interests of all nations in preserving global stability—which is the precondition for all else mankind aspires to accomplish.

In recent years the United States has sought to help build a new international order less tied to the traditional patterns of power balances. It was the United States which took the initiative in seeking to resolve the most dangerous problems of our time by negotiation and cooperation rather than by force of arms. It was we who saw that the historical necessity of this period required a more stable relationship between the two nations that possess the capacity to destroy civilization.

We have sought—and with some successes—to build more constructive relations with the U.S.S.R. across a broad range: to contain

¹ Source: Department of State *Bulletin*, February 16, 1976, pp. 174–182. The statement was made before the Subcommittee on African Affairs of the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations.

² In addition to the recent passage of the Tunney amendment (see Document 64), the Senate Foreign Relations Committee was considering the Clark amendment to the 1976 security assistance bill. Proposed by Senator Dick Clark (D-Iowa) on December 15, 1975, the amendment would prohibit any assistance to military or paramilitary operations in Angola, except under specified conditions. The bill was passed with the Clark amendment on June 25 and signed by the President on June 30 (P.L. 94–329).

strategic arms; to institutionalize cooperation in economic, scientific, and cultural fields; to reduce tensions in areas where our vital interests impinge on one another; and to avoid destabilizing confrontations in peripheral areas of the globe—such as Angola. The classical pattern of accumulating marginal advantages must be overcome and mankind must build more constructive patterns if catastrophe is to be avoided. No one has been more dedicated than the President and I to working for these principles.

But our efforts have been founded upon one fundamental reality: peace requires a sense of security, and security depends upon some form of equilibrium between the great powers. And that equilibrium is impossible unless the United States remains both strong and determined to use its strength when required. This is our historic responsibility, for no other nation has the capacity to act in this way. While constantly seeking opportunities for conciliation, we need to demonstrate to potential adversaries that cooperation is the only rational alternative. Any other course will encourage the trends it seeks to accommodate; a challenge not met today will tempt far more dangerous crises tomorrow.

If a continent such as Africa, only recently freed from external oppression, can be made the arena for great-power ambitions, if immense quantities of arms can affect far-off events, if large expeditionary forces can be transported at will to dominate virtually helpless peoples—then all we have hoped for in building a more stable and rational international order is in jeopardy.

The effort of the Soviet Union and Cuba to take unilateral advantage of a turbulent local situation where they have never had any historic interests is a willful, direct assault upon the recent constructive trends in U.S.-Soviet relations and our efforts to improve relations with Cuba. It is an attempt to take advantage of our continuing domestic division and self-torment. Those who have acted so recklessly must be made to see that their conduct is unacceptable.

The history of the postwar period should give us pause. Military aggression, direct or indirect, has frequently been successfully dealt with, but never in the absence of a local balance of forces. U.S. policy in Angola has sought to help friends achieve this balance. Angola represents the first time since the aftermath of World War II that the Soviets have moved militarily at long distances to impose a regime of their choice. It is the first time that the United States has failed to respond to Soviet military moves outside their immediate orbit. And it is the first time that Congress has halted the executive's action while it was in the process of meeting this kind of threat.

Thus to claim that Angola is not an important country or that the United States has no important interests there begs the principal ques-

tion. The objectives which the United States has sought in Angola have not been aimed at defending, or acquiring, intrinsic interests in that country. We are not opposing any particular faction. We could develop constructive relations with any Angolan government that derives from the will of the people. We have never been involved militarily in Angola. We are not so involved now. We do not seek to be so involved in the future.

Our objective is clear and simple: to help those African countries and those groups within Angola that would resist external aggression by providing them with needed *financial* support. Those whom we seek to assist are our friends; they share our hopes for negotiated solutions and for African self-determination. They played a larger role than the MPLA [Popular Movement for the Liberation of Angola]³ in striving toward Angolan independence.

But our deeper concern is for global stability. If the United States is seen to emasculate itself in the face of massive, unprecedented Soviet and Cuban intervention, what will be the perception of leaders around the world as they make decisions concerning their future security?

Will they feel they can proceed to develop their nations in an international climate which fosters cooperation and self-determination? How will they adjust their conduct in the context of such events? And what conclusion will an unopposed superpower draw when the next opportunity for intervention beckons?

America's modest direct strategic and economic interests in Angola are not the central issue. The question is whether America still maintains the resolve to act responsibly as a great power—prepared to face a challenge when it arises, knowing that preventive action now may make unnecessary a more costly response later.

Let there be no mistake about it—the culprits in the tragedy that is now unfolding in Angola are the Soviet Union and its client state Cuba. But I must note with some sadness that by its actions the Congress has deprived the President of indispensable flexibility in formulating a foreign policy which we believe to be in our national interest. And Congress has ignored the crucial truth that a stable relationship with the Soviet Union based on mutual restraint will be achieved only if Soviet lack of restraint carries the risk of counteraction.

The consequences may well be far-reaching and substantially more painful than the course we have recommended. When one great power attempts to obtain special positions of influence based on military interventions, the other power is sooner or later bound to act to offset this advantage in some other place or manner. This will inevi-

³ Brackets are in the original.

tably lead to a chain of action and reaction typical of other historic eras in which great powers maneuvered for advantage, only to find themselves sooner or later embroiled in a major crisis and often in open conflict.

It is precisely this pattern that must be broken—and that we wanted to break until stopped—if a lasting easing of tensions is to be achieved. And if it is not broken now, we will face harder choices and higher costs in the future.

It is in this context that we have framed our goals in Angola. Simply put, we wish to see:

- A cease-fire, ending the tragic bloodshed in that country;
- Withdrawal of outside forces—Soviet, Cuban, and South African;
- Cessation of foreign military involvement; and
- Negotiations among the Angolan factions.

We are prepared to accept any solution that emerges from African efforts. And we are ready to offer economic assistance to the people of Angola when a legitimate government is established there.

We have consistently advocated such a government representing all three factions in Angola. We have never opposed participation by the Soviet-backed Popular Movement for the Liberation of Angola, the MPLA. What we do oppose is the massive Soviet and Cuban intervention and their expressed aim of denying the other two groups any part in governing the country. Our overriding goal has been to assure that Africans shape their own destiny and that traditional colonialism not be replaced by a more modern version.

For the United States to be found wanting as a credible friend, precisely at a time when moderate African states have clearly and repeatedly expressed their hope that America provide the necessary balance to the Soviet Union and Cuba, will have a major impact on those countries on the continent of Africa which resisted all pressures and stuck by their position even after the Senate cut off aid; on our allies in other parts of the world who look to us for security; on other countries that seek ties with us primarily because they see us as the guardian of international equilibrium.

[Omitted here is discussion of the record of events from the beginning of the Angolan independence movements to 1976.]

The United States Position

This, then, is the significance of Angola and the record to date. In elaborating further the U.S. position, I want to respond directly to some of the issues raised in the current debate.

Our principal objective has been to respond to an unprecedented application of Soviet power achieved in part through the expeditionary force of a client state.

During 1975 the Soviet Union is estimated to have contributed nearly 200 million dollars' worth of military assistance to Angola. This equals the entire amount of all military aid from all sources to sub-Saharan Africa in 1974.

Soviet arms have included infantry weapons—machineguns, bazookas, mortars, and recoilless rifles—armored personnel carriers, heavy artillery, light and medium tanks, truck-mounted multitube rocket launchers, helicopters, and light aircraft. There are unconfirmed reports that the Soviet Union will provide the MPLA with MIG-21 aircraft to be piloted by Cubans.

A total of at least 46 flights of Soviet heavy and medium military transports have ferried Soviet military equipment from the U.S.S.R. to Luanda and Congo (Brazzaville), while a steady stream of Soviet and Cuban aircraft has continued to bring Cuban troops across the Atlantic. Soviet naval involvements clearly related to the Angolan event have continued in west African waters for several weeks.

The implications of Cuba's unprecedented and massive intervention cannot be ignored. It is a geopolitical event of considerable significance. For the first time, Cuba has sent an expeditionary force to another nation on another continent. About 11,000 Cuban military personnel have been sent to Angola.

If allowed to proceed unchecked, this blatant power play cannot but carry with it far-reaching implications—including the impact it will have on the attitudes and future conduct of the nations of this hemisphere. Indeed, friend and foe alike cannot fail to contrast the sending of a large Cuban expeditionary force with our apparent inability to provide even indirect financial assistance. The failure of the United States to respond effectively will be regarded in many parts of the world as an indication of our future determination to counter similar Communist interventions.

We have been asked why we do not respond with other pressures on the Soviet Union.

The first answer is that many of the links the Administration has tried to forge—such as trade and credit, which would have provided incentives for restraint and levers for penalties—have been precluded by earlier congressional actions. But two other instruments have been suggested: wheat sales and the Strategic Arms Limitation Talks.

A moratorium was placed on wheat sales for four months in 1975. To use this device every three months is to blunt it permanently. Above all, economic measures take too much time to affect a fast-moving situ-

ation like Angola; any longer term impact would be of little use to those immediately threatened. We should also ponder whether we want to return to the situation, now prevented by the grain agreement,⁴ in which the U.S.S.R. can capriciously enter and leave the U.S. grain trade.

As for the Strategic Arms Limitation Talks, we have never considered these to be a favor which we grant to the Soviet Union to be turned on and off according to the ebb and flow of our relations. The fact is that limiting the growth of nuclear arsenals is an overriding global problem that must be dealt with urgently for our own sake and for the sake of world peace.

Still, we have made clear that a continuation of actions like those in Angola must threaten the entire web of Soviet-U.S. relations. In this sense, both negotiations and the overall relationship are in long-term jeopardy unless restraint is exercised. But there is no substitute for a local balance; indirect pressures can succeed only if rapid local victories are foreclosed.

Have we really thought through the implications of our decisions? Do we really want the world to conclude that if the Soviet Union chooses to intervene in a massive way, and if Cuban or other troops are used as an expeditionary force, the United States will not be able to muster the unity or resolve to provide even financial assistance to those who are threatened? Can those faced with such a threat without hope of assistance from us be expected to resist? Do we want our potential adversaries to conclude that, in the event of future challenges, America's internal divisions are likely to deprive us of even minimal leverage over developments of global significance?

Our second objective is to help our friends in black Africa who oppose Soviet and Cuban intervention.

Only in recent years has Africa become free of great-power rivalry; it must not once again become an arena in which the ambitions of outside forces are pursued. We have sought with our African friends to maintain a local balance of power so there can be no imposed solution that would deprive the Angolan people of the right to determine their own destiny.

We are told that we need not concern ourselves, because in the final analysis and at some indefinite date in the future, African nationalism will reassert itself and drive out foreign influence. Even were this to prove true, it still ignores the fact that governments under pressure will be forced to yield whenever a threat develops. Those who are threatened cannot afford to wait; they must decide whether to resist or

⁴ A U.S.-Soviet agreement on the sale of U.S. grain to the Soviet Union was signed on October 20, 1975, in Moscow.

to adjust. Advice which counsels patience and confidence in the verdict of history is a mockery to those who are concerned for the fate of their country today. History rarely helps those who do not help themselves.

Some charge that we have acted in collusion with South Africa. This is untrue. We had no foreknowledge of South Africa's intentions and in no way cooperated with it militarily. Nor do we view South African intervention more benevolently than we do the intervention of other outside powers. Indeed, we have formally proposed that the removal of outside forces begin with those of South Africa and have asked—in vain—for an indication of how soon thereafter Soviet and Cuban forces would be withdrawn.

It is also claimed that because of our support for the side which later felt itself compelled to seek the aid of South Africa, we have lost influence in black Africa. One cannot generalize so easily about the perceptions of the African people, as the firm stand at Addis Ababa of 22 OAU members against OAU recognition of the MPLA should demonstrate. Behind this stand, which coincided with the U.S. position, was awareness that the MPLA represented only a minority of Angolans, and also a genuine apprehension over Soviet and Cuban, as well as South African, intervention. Indeed, it is our inability to support our African friends that will cost us influence in Africa.

We are firmly convinced that, had there been no outside interference initiated by the Soviet Union, the Africans would have found their own solution. No single movement would have been strong enough to take over. The resulting solution would have been more representative of the people of Angola than a government imposed by an outside power and representing only a minority faction.

The outcome in Angola will have repercussions throughout Africa. The confidence of countries neighboring Angola—Zambia and Zaïre—as well as other African countries, in the will and power of the United States will be severely shaken if they see that the Soviet Union and Cuba are unopposed in their attempt to impose a regime of their choice on Angola. They and others elsewhere may well adjust their policies to what they consider to be the forces of the future.

The means we have chosen have been limited, and explained to Congress.

Our immediate objective was to provide leverage for diplomatic efforts to bring about a just and peaceful solution. They were not conceived unilaterally by the United States; they represented support to friends who requested our financial assistance.

We chose covert means because we wanted to keep our visibility to a minimum; we wanted the greatest possible opportunity for an African solution. We felt that overt assistance would elaborate a formal doctrine justifying great-power intervention—aside from the technical

issues such as in what budgetary category this aid should be given and how it could be reconciled with legislative restrictions against the transfer of U.S. arms by recipients.

The Angola situation is of a type in which diplomacy without leverage is impotent, yet direct military confrontation would involve unnecessary risks. Thus it is precisely one of those gray areas where covert methods are crucial if we are to have any prospect of influencing certain events of potentially global importance.

We chose a covert form of response with the greatest reluctance. But in doing so, we were determined to adhere to the highest standard of executive-legislative consultation. Eight congressional committees were briefed on 24 separate occasions. We sought in these briefings to determine the wishes of Congress. While we do not claim that every member approved our actions, we had no indication of basic opposition.

Between July and December 1975 we discussed the Angolan situation on numerous occasions with members of the foreign relations committees and the appropriations committees of both Houses and the committees of both Houses that have CIA oversight responsibilities. The two committees investigating CIA activities—the Church Committee and the Pike Committee—were also briefed. Altogether more than two dozen Senators, about 150 Congressmen, and over 100 staff members of both Houses were informed. I am attaching to my statement a list of all the briefings carried out.⁵

Mr. Chairman, where are we now?

We are told that by providing money and arms in Angola we are duplicating the mistakes we made in Viet-Nam. Such an argument confuses the expenditure of tens of millions of dollars with the commitment of U.S. troops. If we accept such a gross distortion of history—if we accept the claim that we can no longer do anything to aid our friends abroad because we will inevitably do too much—then the tragedy of Viet-Nam will indeed be monumental.

We will have lost all ability to respond to anything less than direct and substantial challenge. And having lost that ability, we will eventually discover that by failing to respond at an early stage, our ultimate response will have to be greater and the stakes will be higher. If we do not exercise our responsibilities to maintain the international balance, if Congress and the executive are unable to act in concert when vital national interests are affected, then world security may well be seriously undermined.

⁵ Not printed here; for text, see press release 40. [Footnote is in the original. The Pike Committee investigation of the effectiveness of the Central Intelligence Agency ran parallel to that of the Church Committee (see footnote 6, Document 66).]

Many of the members of this committee have expressed their general support for our policy of easing tensions with the Soviet Union. We in the executive branch are grateful for that support. But this process cannot be divided into those segments which the Soviets will honor and those which we will allow them to ignore. What the United States does when confronted with a challenge like Angola can be of great significance in shaping our future relationship with the Soviet Union. A demonstration of a lack of resolve could lead the Soviets to a great miscalculation thereby plunging us into a major confrontation which neither of us wants. Credibility determines, to a great degree, what a nation can accomplish without a resort to force. And as credibility is reduced, the eventual need to resort to force increases. And in the end, we are all the losers.

The United States must make it clear that Angola sets no precedent; this type of action will not be tolerated elsewhere. This must be demonstrated by both the executive and the Congress—in our national interest and in the interest of world peace.

To the Soviet Union and to Cuba, the Administration says: We will continue to make our case to the American public. We will not tolerate wanton disregard for the interests of others and for the cause of world peace.

To the American people, the Administration says: The time has come to put aside self-accusation, division, and guilt. Our own country's safety and the progress of mankind depend crucially upon a united and determined America. Today, as throughout our 200 years, the world looks to us to stand up for what is right. By virtue of our strength and values we are leaders in the defense of freedom; without us there can be neither security nor progress.

To the Congress, the Administration says: Whatever our past disagreements, let the Congress and the executive now resolve to shape a cooperative relationship that will enable the United States to play a responsible international role. Both branches will have to do their share in restoring the kind of nonpartisan support that has served our foreign policy so well in the past.

On the issue of Angola, the Administration is now seriously considering overt financial aid, and we will soon be consulting with the Congress on this possibility. But whatever that decision, let us work together with an appreciation of the larger interests involved and with a sense of national responsibility. A united America cannot be ignored by our adversaries. Together we will preserve the independence of those who face the prospect of oppression. Together we will hearten the friends of liberty and peace everywhere.

68. Telegram From the Department of State to All European Diplomatic Posts¹

Washington, February 1, 1976, 2139Z.

24976. For Ambassador. Subject: U.S. Policy Toward USSR and Eastern Europe.

1. Following is a non-verbatim summary of the Counselor's discussion of this subject to the EUR Chiefs of Mission meeting in London in mid December. It is intended for your background guidance and that of your senior staff and is not to be used directly in your talks with host government.

2. *Begin Summary.* We are witnessing the emergence of the Soviet Union as a super power on a global scale. This will be a long-term process. It is a process that is just beginning in global terms as the Soviets are just now breaking out of their continental mold. They are just now developing modalities for carrying out such a global policy.

3. The reason why it is possible for the United States and its Western European allies to develop the policies that will allow us to cope with this situation is that Soviet power is developing irregularly. It is subject to flaws and to requirements which in some cases only the outside world can meet.

4. Their thrust as an imperial power comes at a time well after that period when the last imperial power, Germany, made the plunge, and it hence comes at a time when different rules and perceptions apply. The Soviets have been inept. They have not been able to bring the attractions that past imperial powers brought to their conquests. They have not brought the ideological, legal, cultural, architectural, organizational and other values and skills that characterized the British, French and German adventures.

5. In addition, there are serious underlying pressures and tensions in the Soviet system itself. The base from which imperialism asserts itself has serious problems in the economic and social sectors. There are also internal nationalist groups which are growing. Non-Russian nationalist groups in Russia are growing at a disproportionately faster rate, which will add to these tensions in the base whence springs Soviet imperialism.

6. The Soviets have been particularly unskilled in building viable international structures. They have nothing approaching the European

¹ Source: National Archives, RG 59, Central Foreign Policy File, D760038–0493. Secret; Exdis. Drafted by Warren Zimmerman (EUR/PP); cleared by Sonnenfeldt, Deputy Assistant Secretary of State for European Affairs James G. Lowenstein, and Allan W. Otto (S/S–O); and approved by Kissinger.

Community or the many other successful Western institutions. In Eastern Europe particularly, the single most important unifying force is the presence of sheer Soviet military power. There has been no development of a more viable, organic structure. If anything, the last thirty years have intensified the urges in Eastern European countries for autonomy, for identity. There has been an intensification of the desire to break out of the Soviet straitjacket. This has happened in every Eastern European country to one degree or another. There are almost no genuine friends of the Soviets left in Eastern Europe, except possibly Bulgaria.

7. The Soviets' inability to acquire loyalty in Eastern Europe is an unfortunate historical failure because Eastern Europe is within their scope and area of natural interest. It is doubly tragic that in this area of vital interest and crucial importance it has not been possible for the Soviet Union to establish roots of interest that go beyond sheer power.

8. It is, therefore, important to remember that the main, if not the only, instrument of Soviet imperialism has been power.

9. The reason we can today talk and think in terms of dealing with Soviet imperialism, outside of and in addition to simple confrontation, is precisely because Soviet power is emerging in such a flawed way. This gives us the time to develop and to react. There is no way to prevent the emergence of the Soviet Union as a superpower. What we can do is affect the way in which that power is developed and used. Not only can we balance it in the traditional sense but we can affect its usage—and that is what *détente* is all about.

10. It is often asked how *détente* is doing. The question itself evades the central issue we are trying to pose. That is, what do you do in the face of increasing Soviet power? We will be facing this increased power if our relationship with the Russians is sweet or our relationship with the Russians is sour. The day when the U.S. could choose its preferences from two alternatives is over: that is, turning our back on the world—usually behind the protection of another power like the British Navy—or changing the world. That choice no longer exists for us. There is too much power in the world for us to ignore, not just the Soviets, but other industrial powers, raw material producers, and even the combined political power of the dwarf states. Nor do we today have enough power to simply overwhelm these problems.

11. So the Soviets will be seen and heard on the world stage no matter what we do. Therefore, the question of whether or not *détente* is up or down at a particular moment is largely irrelevant. We Americans like to keep score cards, but the historic challenge of the Soviet Union will not go away and the problem of coping with the effects of that growing Soviet power also won't go away. We don't have any alternative except to come to grips with the various forms of power which sur-

round us in the world. We have to get away from seeing détente as a process which appeases or propitiates Soviet power. We have to see our task as managing or domesticating this power. That is our central problem in the years ahead, not finding agreements to sign or atmospheres to improve, although those have some effect. Our challenge is how to live in a world with another super power, and anticipate the arrival of a third super power, China, in twenty years or so.

12. The debate in the United States on détente is illustrated by comments that Soviet trade is a one-way street. It seems that today you can't just get payment for the goods you sell—you must get Jewish emigration, or arms restraint, or any number of other things.

13. Our European friends have extended considerable credit to the Soviets and Eastern European countries, while the US does not extend lines of credit but rather approves financing on the basis of each project. That feature gives us some control over the direction of Soviet economic development. The Europeans have surrendered on this point. While not falling into the trade trap, we have seen trade as a set of instrumentalities to address the set of problems we face with the Soviets. We have to find a way to develop a coherent trade strategy that goes beyond the commercial views of individual firms.

14. The grain agreement is a good but narrow example of what I am talking about. The Soviets were forced to accept that they need substantial imports from the United States. That gives us leverage, but only if it is done within a coherent framework of policies to achieve certain objectives. MFN has been considered a concession to the USSR, and in a sense it is. The Soviets don't like paying interest—they prefer to earn their way as they go. If this is an accurate assessment, then with MFN and credit policies we can get the USSR to be competitively engaged in our US markets. If done skillfully, this forces them to meet the requirements of the sophisticated US market. MFN entry into US markets can have an impact on Soviet behavior. This is not a trivial matter.

15. It is in our long-term interests to use these strengths to break down the autarkic nature of the USSR. There are consumer choices being made in the USSR that, although more below the surface than those in the United States, can be exploited. This is just one illustration. There are many assets in the West in this area and instead of looking at them as just commercial sales, we need to be using them to draw the Soviet Union into a series of dependencies and ties with the West. It is a long-term project.

16. When we lost the MFN battle with Congress, we lost our ability to impose a degree of discipline on the Soviet Union as we were able to do in the case of the grain deal. This is the real tragedy of losing that trade issue. In the long-term, we have suffered a setback.

17. With regard to Eastern Europe, it must be in our long-term interest to influence events in this area—because of the present unnatural relationship with the Soviet Union—so that they will not sooner or later explode, causing WW III. This inorganic, unnatural relationship is a far greater danger to world peace than the conflict between East and West. There is one qualification to this statement. If Western Europe becomes so concerned with its economic and social problems that an imbalance develops, then perhaps the dangers to the United States' interests will be endangered by the simple change in the balance of power.

18. So, it must be our policy to strive for an evolution that makes the relationship between the Eastern Europeans and the Soviet Union an organic one. Any excess of zeal on our part is bound to produce results that could reverse the desired process for a period of time, even though the process would remain inevitable within the next 100 years. But, of course, for us that is too long a time to wait.

19. So, our policy must be a policy of responding to the clearly visible aspirations in Eastern Europe for a more autonomous existence within the context of a strong Soviet geopolitical influence. This has worked in Poland. The Poles have been able to overcome their romantic political inclinations which led to their disasters in the past. They have been skillful in developing a policy that is satisfying their needs for a national identity without arousing Soviet reactions. It is a long process.

20. A similar process is now going on in Hungary. Janos Kadar's performance has been remarkable in finding ways which are acceptable to the Soviet Union which develop Hungarian roots and the natural aspirations of the people. He has conducted a number of experiments in the social and economic areas. To a large degree he has been able to do this because the Soviets have four divisions in Hungary and, therefore, have not been overly concerned. He has skillfully used their presence as a security blanket for the Soviets, in a way that has been advantageous to the development of his own country.

21. The Romanian picture is different as one would expect from their different history. The Romanians have striven for autonomy but they have been less daring and innovative in their domestic systems. They remain among the most rigid countries in the internal organization of their system.

22. We seek to influence the emergence of the Soviet imperial power by making the base more natural and organic so that it will not remain founded in sheer power alone. But there is no alternative open to us other than that of influencing the way Soviet power is used.

23. Finally, on Yugoslavia. We and the Western Europeans, indeed the Eastern Europeans as well, have an interest which borders on the vital for us in continuing the independence of Yugoslavia from Soviet domination. Of course we accept that Yugoslav behavior will continue

to be, as it has been in the past, influenced and constrained by Soviet power, but any shift back by Yugoslavia into the Soviet orbit would represent a major strategic set-back for the West. So we are concerned about what will happen when Tito disappears, and it is worrying us a good deal.

24. So our basic policy continues to be that which we have pursued since 1948–49, keeping Yugoslavia in a position of substantial independence from the Soviet Union. Now at the same time we would like them to be less obnoxious, and we should allow them to get away with very little. We should especially disabuse them of any notion that our interest in their relative independence is greater than their own and, therefore, they have a free ride.

End Summary.

Kissinger

69. Editorial Note

In a campaign speech delivered in Exeter, New Hampshire, on February 10, 1976, Ronald Reagan, a candidate for the Republican Presidential nomination, criticized the foreign policy of the Ford administration, its conception of détente, and what he perceived as concessions made to the Soviet Union in the Strategic Arms Limitation Talks (SALT) and the 1975 Helsinki agreements. For Reagan, détente under the Ford administration had been a “one-way street” that favored the Soviets, a policy that “will fail. As a two-way street it may succeed.” Reagan asserted, “we can bargain successfully only if we are strong militarily and only if we are willing to defend ourselves if necessary.” “For many years,” he continued, “we remained the strongest nation on earth. Through the 1950s and on into the early ‘60s our national security was coupled with a sense of national unity and purpose. But that changed. The Soviet Union has now forged ahead in producing nuclear and conventional weapons. Opening the Chinese door [in 1972] offered an excellent opportunity for us to blunt the expansionism of the Soviet Union. But we have since lost the momentum we gained by acting as if we expected the Soviets to inherit the earth.” With the SALT I agreement, Reagan argued, “we compromised our clear technological lead in the anti-ballistic missile system, the ABM, for the sake of a deal”; at Helsinki, the administration “agreed to legitimize the boundaries of Eastern Europe, legally acquiescing in the loss of freedom of millions of Eastern Europeans.” “Let us not be satisfied with a foreign policy

whose principal accomplishment seems to be our acquisition of the right to sell Pepsi-Cola in Siberia. It is time we, the people of the United States, demanded a policy that puts our nation's interests as the first priority." (Ronald Reagan, "Tactics for Détente," *Wall Street Journal*, February 13, 1976, page 8; see also Richard Bergholz, "Reagan Attacks Kissinger and Ford's Foreign Policy," *Los Angeles Times*, February 11, 1976, page B1)

Responding to Reagan's criticisms, President Gerald Ford, in a February 13 Orlando, Florida, press conference, stated he was "very proud of the accomplishments of our American foreign policy" and defended his administration's record. "We are at peace," he asserted. "We are at peace because we are strong." Pointing out that he had submitted "strong, affirmative Defense Department budgets" to Congress, Ford went on to list his administration's foreign policy achievements: the alliance with Western Europe "has never been better," relations with Japan "are excellent," and there had been "tremendous success in diffusing the volatile situation in the Middle East." As far as relations with Communist countries were concerned, Ford noted that the United States had "maintained a growing relationship with the People's Republic of China. At the same time, we have been able to negotiate with strength with the Soviet Union." He also defended his administration's negotiation of an arms limitation agreement with Moscow, arguing it would "relax tensions between the two super powers." Ford concluded by saying his foreign policy was "in the best interest of the United States" and "I am proud of it. I think most Americans are proud of it, and they should know that it will continue—a policy of peace with strength under the next 4 years of the Ford administration." (*Public Papers: Ford, 1976–77*, Book I, page 268)

On February 24, Ford narrowly defeated Reagan in the New Hampshire Republican primary. In the final count, Ford received 51 percent of the vote (54,824 votes) to Reagan's 49 percent (53,507 votes). (*Keesing's Contemporary Archives*, 1976, page 27864) A poll taken by the *New York Times* and the Columbia Broadcasting System, published on February 26, indicated that the voters' concerns about détente helped account for the closeness of the race. Sixty percent of Republican voters opposed to détente voted for Reagan, while only 36 percent of anti-détente voters cast their ballots for Ford. (Robert Reinhold, "Reagan Voters Viewed as Similar to Carter's," *New York Times*, February 26, 1976, page 1)

In the weeks following the New Hampshire primary, Ford eschewed the word "détente" in his public appearances. When asked about this during an interview with a Miami television station, Ford commented, "Détente is only a word that was coined," adding, "I don't think it is applicable anymore." He told his interviewer, "I think what

we ought to say is that the United States will meet with superpowers, the Soviet Union and with China and others, and seek to relax tensions so that we can continue a policy of peace through strength." He continued: "If we are strong militarily, which we are, and if we continue that strength, we can negotiate with the Soviet Union, with China, and with others to maintain that peace." In a *Chicago Tribune* article reporting Ford's comments, "top White House officials" were said to "insist" that the President's remarks "do not reflect any change in American foreign policy." However, one unidentified official stated: "It did not go unnoticed that one survey showed that detente cost the President votes in New Hampshire." White House Press Secretary Ron Nessen explained that the word *détente* "has become perverted and polluted by use and misuse" and that Ford's decision not to use it was "'an effort to educate and illuminate' Americans about the administration's foreign policy." (Aldo Beckman, "'Detente' a Dirty Word, Ford Decides to Shun It," *Chicago Tribune*, March 2, 1976, page 3)

On March 5, during a question-and-answer session following an address to the Everett McKinley Dirksen Forum in Peoria, Illinois, Ford began his answer to a question regarding the administration's foreign policy toward the Soviet Union and China by stating, "let me say very specifically that we are going to forget the use of the use of the word *détente*." "The word is inconsequential," he continued. "What happens in the negotiations between the United States and the Soviet Union, what happens in the negotiations between the People's Republic of China and the United States—those are the things that are of consequence. Now, this administration believes that we have an obligation not to go back to the cold war where confrontation, in effect, took place literally every day of the year. We have an obligation to try and meet every problem individually; specifically, every issue as it comes up, in an effort to negotiate rather than to confront, whether it's with the Soviet Union or the People's Republic of China. And we can do this effectively if we have the strength, militarily and otherwise, to have a two-way street. Now, the United States, despite what some critics have said, has not under any circumstances gotten the short end of the deal. We're good Yankee traders, and we've done darn well by the United States." (*Public Papers: Ford, 1976–77*, Book I, page 552)

70. **Memorandum From the Secretary of State's Executive Assistant (Eagleburger) to Secretary of State Kissinger¹**

Washington, February 24, 1976.

HAK:

Subject: The Future

As promised here is what I hope is a more thoughtful memo following up on my telegram of yesterday.² What I will try to do here is lay out as briefly as I can what I hope is an objective statement of your situation, plus some thoughts on themes and how we may be able to cope with current problems. I am substantially more confident of my description of the current situation than I am of the suggestions on what to do about it. Once again I should caution, however, that I will almost certainly exaggerate the more negative elements of your contemporary position than is probably warranted, and downplay the very real strengths you still possess. So let me emphasize now that I do not consider the situation irreparably lost; I do consider that you have a great reservoir of respect (even awe), confidence and popularity around the country, and that you are more respected (and feared) on the Hill than we oftentimes think. Senator Clark told me today, for example, that he hopes to begin a colloquy on the Senate floor next week on détente in support of you and your position. Parenthetically, Clark was on television a few days ago defending you firmly and well on détente.

I. The Problem.

Let me first lay out my conclusions on your present situation. Some of them you will have seen before in the telegram; others are new.

—Détente is in trouble and consequently you, because you are so closely identified with it, are also in trouble. I know how strongly you feel that as this process continues your flexibility with the Soviets (and I suppose the same is true with the Chinese) is being limited. Equally, I recognize that for good and sufficient reasons you therefore do your utmost to be cautious in your public approach. But the net effect, in all honesty, is that you are perceived to be prepared to preserve détente at all costs. I no longer think you can afford this posture, no matter how right it may be in substantive terms. You have to demonstrate to the public that you, too, are tough. You did this on Angola and it has

¹ Source: Department of State, Files of Lawrence S. Eagleburger, Lot 84D204, Chron—February 1976. Confidential; Eyes Only.

² Not found. Kissinger was traveling in Central and South America February 16–24.

helped your situation; but it has not resolved the problem. It is in this sense that I feel both so frustrated and powerless when issues such as the Moscow Embassy signal³ arise. Because with all of the best will in the world—and with all of the right instincts about its impact on U.S.-Soviet relations—there is no way, in the long run, that you could keep this from becoming a substantial issue. And the harder you try, and the longer you hold off from expressing your outrage, the more damage will be done to you. I do not mean to get drawn off into a frivolous discussion of an essentially tactical problem; nor am I recommending any particular course of action with regard to the signal. I simply cite this as an example of the sort of problem we are going to have more of and warn you that as you address the issue of how to proceed you will need to think more carefully than you have in the past about the impact on your personal position both in Washington and around the country.

—You have, as I indicated in my cable, begun to lose your ability to communicate with the American people. I have explained the reasons in my cable and will not repeat them here, except to emphasize my very strong belief that your speeches from now on must be shorter (20–30 minutes) and must focus in on one or two discreet themes. With all due respect to the quality of the San Francisco⁴ and Laramie⁵ speeches, they simply will not grab the headlines in a political year. And, as Bernie Gwertzman⁶ said to me the other day, your speeches are all beginning to sound alike. While that may be okay in terms of the specific audience to which you are speaking (and which is unlikely to see you again in the flesh), it won't wash with the press and television.

—Gloom and doom are too much a part of your style these days. Again, I have explained in the cable why I think this is dangerous, and will not belabor it further here.

—An additional (and I think critical) item I did not mention in my cable is a conviction I developed in Pittsburgh,⁷ a conviction that sev-

³ The media were reporting that Embassy personnel in Moscow had been exposed to "dangerous levels of radiation stemming from some type of sophisticated Soviet listening or jamming equipment." (Terence Hunt, "Embassy Staff in Moscow Warned of Radiation Leak," *Washington Star*, February 8, 1976, p. A-7) The article was forwarded to Ford, and it was returned to Scowcroft on February 9 with the President's handwritten note: "Please bring me up to date." (Ford Library, Staff Secretary's Office, Presidential Handwriting File, Box 23, Subject File, Foreign Affairs—Moscow Embassy)

⁴ The text of Kissinger's February 3 speech in San Francisco entitled "The Permanent Challenge of Peace: U.S. Policy Toward the Soviet Union," is in Department of State *Bulletin*, February 23, 1976, pp. 201–212.

⁵ The text of Kissinger's February 4 speech in Laramie, Wyoming, entitled "America's Destiny: The Global Context," is *ibid.*, March 1, 1976, pp. 249–256.

⁶ Journalist for the *New York Times*.

⁷ On February 18, the first of five "town meetings" in various cities was held in Pittsburgh, where Department officials listened to the views of a cross-section of the

eral others I have talked to since (particularly including Scotty Reston) have tended to confirm: the American people feel we have lost the “moral” basis of our foreign policy. We stand for nothing and are in a totally pragmatic and opportunistic mode. This is not either your fault or of your making but it is a factor in the changing attitude toward you. In a sense you are a victim of your own success. You have demonstrated a remarkable ability in the Middle East, in Europe, with the Soviets, with the Chinese, etc., to deal brilliantly with immediate problems but there is a lack of the Kennedyesque moralism which Americans so like and which gives us a sense of purpose and uniqueness. In a sense we are tired of making money, making love, and making do; I suspect there is a certain subliminal sense of shame over what we seem to have become and a largely unconscious seeking for the moral simplicities of the past. You have great trouble in talking to the American people about these moral verities but they hunger for it and I think we continue to ignore it at our peril.

—The lame duck syndrome is beginning to hurt. You are beginning to be thought of like yesterday’s newspaper simply because everyone recognizes that you will not be next year’s Secretary of State. This is understandable and to some degree inevitable. But there are some things that can be done about this and I will speak of these later.

—We have tended to slip into a reactive posture, and at times a grumpy one at that. In retrospect your last press conference was an important benchmark in this regard because you came across as tired and touchy. Words like “malicious,” “outrageous,” etc must become the exception not the rule because the more you use them the less they have meaning and the more you seem on the defensive.

II. Themes and Actions.

Let me now turn to a rather unstructured listing of themes⁸ I think you need to play on and actions you might take to counteract and offset the above.

public on four foreign policy issues: U.S.-Soviet relations, U.S. relations with developing countries, the values which should govern U.S. foreign policy, and the objectives toward which U.S. foreign policy should be directed. A March 11 memorandum to Kissinger from Eagleburger, Lord, Lewis, and Vest summarized the audience’s reactions. (National Archives, RG 59, Records of Henry A. Kissinger, 1973–77, Lot 91D414, Box 20, NODIS Memos, 1977 (January)) In April, “town meetings” were held in Portland, San Francisco, Milwaukee, and Minneapolis. Summaries of the public’s views in Portland and San Francisco are *ibid.*, Box 1, NODIS Misc. Docs, Tels, Etc., 1973–77.

⁸ A similar list of themes to be emphasized in future speeches was created by Lord in a February 25 memorandum to Kissinger. Lord suggested that Kissinger place topics in a specific chronological sequence for his audiences. A handwritten note by Lord at the end of the memorandum reads: “In HAK–Lord conversation 2/25 HAK indicated this idea would be held in abeyance for the time being.” (National Archives, RG 59, Policy Planning Council (S/PC), Policy Planning Staff (S/P), Director’s Files (Winston Lord) 1969–77, Lot 77D112, Box 358, FEB 16–29 1976)

—First and foremost in my view is a need for you to take on an optimistic tone. As Scotty Reston said today, if you compare the third quarter of this century with the first two quarters thereof, we don't really look so bad, no matter how painful the period from 1950 to 1975 might have been. We've had no world war. Social and economic justice have been strengthened, not weakened in the United States, nations have gained their freedom, etc. Thus for America to go through their bicentennial in a mood of despair is neither sensible nor good history. Our third century can be our best century. And no one else is playing this theme, or at least playing it well and eloquently, and you can. And it will not be out of character for you nor be seen to be a change in your style.

—Another thing that you perhaps more than anyone else in America can bring to this country is a sense of perspective. The American people are now so preoccupied with matters of the moment that they are captured and captivated by anyone who can present them with a sense of perspective, particularly when it is simply and optimistically put.

—I continue to believe in the “don't tread on me” approach (I have cleaned the language up a bit because Millie⁹ is typing this). But if we follow this principle it ought to be done on our terms, on the basis of our timing, and not simply day-to-day reactions to outrageous comments. Some of the latter is necessary as well but it ought to be done in moderation.

—The lame duck disability needs to be offset by hints that you will be around and a major part of the foreign policy process for the next two decades no matter who wins the election this year. People need to begin to understand that you will be a force to be reckoned with in foreign policy—your life's work—whether you are in or out of office. We need to think about ways to get this point across. People need to remember that your teeth are sharp now and are likely to be for some time to come.

—People need to get a sense that you are holding the place together in a statesmanlike fashion while others play their games for their own personal profit. You have nothing to gain by staying other than your deep sense of duty and responsibility to the country. Thus, the important issue for you over the course of the next few months is at least as much what you say as what you do. The great historical accomplishments of the past seven Kissinger years will remain no matter what happens. What you have yet to contribute is a sense of purpose, perspective and hope for the future.

⁹ Mildred Leatherman, Eagleburger's Personal Assistant.

—I feel very strongly that we must find some way to give you more time to devote to individual and group meetings with Congressmen and Senators, and opinion leaders around the country, and more time to devote to careful and in fact meticulous planning on how you can be most effective in the months ahead. This means, I believe, that you must—despite your strong prejudice against it—consciously turn over more of the operations of this Department to your subordinates. They will make mistakes, yes. But you will have more time to think and give the major issues of the moment a sense of coherence that only you can bring to them.

—Another theme that occurs to me is that when America wouldn't do a whole range of things at a time when it had either a nuclear monopoly or vast nuclear superiority, how can we expect to do those things in today's world.

III. Conclusions.

I have rambled but it is difficult not to do so at the current state of my thinking. I very much believe that you ought to do one or two speeches a month picking on these themes as you can and developing them in a variety of ways. I continue to believe that one effective method of getting our point across is to examine alternatives to the policies we have been following for the last seven years. In this regard I still believe that a speech on détente that dwells on alternatives could be a useful thing for you and would no more identify you as defender of détente than you already are. But done properly you could put the opposition on the defensive. And done with humor, directed at your opponents (though not by name) rather than yourself, it might well have a devastating effect.

I know my suggestions sound simple when compared to the magnitude of the problems I have described. But I think it would be a mistake to believe that your situation is more serious than I believe it to be. You are still a major force to be reckoned with and no one—except perhaps yourself—has forgotten that fact.

I include the original of Steve Graubard's memo¹⁰ to me for your review. I did not include the first page of that memo in the cable I sent you.

LSE¹¹

¹⁰ An undated memorandum by university professor Stephen Graubard, proposing suggestions for Kissinger's forthcoming March 11 speech in Boston, is attached but not printed.

¹¹ Printed from a copy that bears these typed initials.

71. Address by Secretary of State Kissinger¹

Boston, March 11, 1976.

America's Permanent Interests

I deeply appreciate the honor you bestow upon me today, not only because it is given me by old Massachusetts friends but also for the name it bears. Throughout his long career as legislator, Governor, and Secretary of State, Christian Herter² embodied the ideals of selfless public service and responsible patriotism which have always marked our nation's great leaders. Most of all, Christian Herter was a man who had faith in his country and its goodness. He understood the decisive role this nation must play in the world for security and progress and justice.

In this election year, some 10 years after Chris Herter's death, we would all do well to remember his wisdom. For America is still the great and good country he knew it was, and our participation in the international scene remains decisive if our era is to know peace and a better life for mankind. We must never forget that this nation has permanent interests and concerns that must be preserved through and beyond this election year.

This can be a time of national renewal—when Americans freely renegotiate their social compact. Or if the quest for short-term political gain prevails over all other considerations, it can be a period of misleading oversimplification, further divisiveness, and sterile recrimination.

This Administration has for many months been prepared to put its policies, its premises, and its design for the future before the American people. The President has often spoken about our concerns and hopes in the world. In the past 14 months alone, I have given 17 major speeches, some 20 major news conferences, and countless interviews across this country, and I have testified 39 times before congressional committees.

Certainly there is room for differences on the policies to be pursued in a complex and dangerous world. But those who challenge cur-

¹ Source: Department of State *Bulletin*, April 5, 1976, pp. 425–432. Kissinger made the address before the Boston World Affairs Council upon receiving the Christian A. Herter Memorial Award. Eagleburger's February 24 memorandum to Kissinger suggested a strategy for this speech (Document 70 and footnote 8 thereto). Kissinger made similar remarks during a speech in Phoenix April 16. The text of that speech is in Department of State *Bulletin*, May 10, 1976, pp. 597–603.

² Secretary of State from 1959 until 1961.

rent policies have an obligation to go beyond criticisms, slogans, and abuse and set forth in detail their premises and alternatives, the likely costs, opportunities, and risks.

America has come through a difficult time—when our institutions have been under challenge, our purposes doubted, and our will questioned. The time has come, as Adlai Stevenson³ said, to “talk sense to the American people.” As a nation we face new dangers and opportunities; neither will wait for our decisions next November, and both can be profoundly affected by what we say and do in the meantime. Complex realities cannot be resolved or evaded by nostalgic simplicities.

Throughout the turmoil of this decade, our foreign policy has pursued our fundamental national goals with energy and consistent purpose:

—We are at peace for the first time in over a decade. No American fighting men are engaged in combat anywhere in the world.

—Relations with our friends and allies in the Atlantic community and with Japan have never been stronger.

—A new and durable relationship with the People’s Republic of China has been opened and fostered.

—Confrontation in the heart of Europe has been eased. A four-power agreement on Berlin has replaced a decade and a half of crisis and confrontation.

—We negotiated an interim agreement limiting strategic arms with the Soviet Union which forestalled the numerical expansion of Soviet strategic programs while permitting us to undertake needed programs of our own.

—We are now negotiating a long-term agreement which, if successfully concluded, will for the first time in history set an upper limit on total numbers of strategic weapons, requiring the Soviet Union to dismantle some of its existing systems.

—Significant progress toward a durable settlement in the Middle East has been made. Much work and many dangers remain, but the peace process is underway for the first time since the creation of the State of Israel.

—There is a new maturity and impetus to our relations with Latin America reflecting changing realities in the hemisphere and the growing importance of these countries on the international scene.

³ Former Governor of Illinois Adlai E. Stevenson II was the Democratic Presidential candidate in 1952 and 1956. He also served as Ambassador to the United Nations from 1961 until 1965.

—The United States has taken the role of global leadership in putting forward a comprehensive agenda for a new and mutually beneficial relationship between the developed and developing nations.

—We have defended human rights and dignity in all international bodies as well as in our bilateral relations.

This is a record of American accomplishment that transcends partisanship, for much of it was accomplished with the cooperation of both parties. It reflects the ideals of the American people. It portends for this nation a continuing role of moral and political leadership—if we have the understanding, the will, and the unity to seize the opportunity history has given us.

Thirty years ago this country began its first sustained peacetime involvement in foreign affairs. We achieved great things, and we can continue to do so as long as we are prepared to face the fact that we live in a more complex time:

—Today the Soviet Union is a superpower. Nothing we could have done would have halted this evolution after the impetus that two generations of industrial and technological advance have given to Soviet military and economic growth. But together with others we must assure that Russian power and influence are not translated into an expansion of Soviet control and dominance beyond the U.S.S.R.'s borders. This is prerequisite to a more constructive relationship.

—Today scores of new nations have come into being, creating new centers of influence. These nations make insistent claims on the global system, testing their new economic power and seeking a greater role and share in the world's prosperity.

—Today the forces of democracy are called upon to show renewed creativity and vision. In a world of complexity—in a world of equilibrium and coexistence, of competition and interdependence—it is our democratic values that give meaning to our sacrifice and purpose to our exertions. Thus the cohesion of the industrial democracies has a moral as well as a political and economic significance.

Americans are a realistic people who have never considered the definition of a challenge as a prophecy of doom or a sign of pessimism. Instead, we have seen it as a call to battle. "... the bravest," said Thucydides, "are surely those who have the clearest vision of what is before them, glory and danger alike, and yet notwithstanding go out to meet it." That has always been the test of democracy—and it has always been the strength of the American people.

Equilibrium and Peace

Let me now deal with America's permanent interests: peace, progress, and justice.

Since the dawn of the nuclear age, the world's fears of catastrophe and its hopes for peace have hinged on the relationship between the United States and the Soviet Union.

In an era when two nations have the power to visit utter devastation on the world in a matter of hours, there can be no greater imperative than assuring that the relationship between the superpowers be managed effectively and rationally.

This is an unprecedented task. Historically, a conflict of ideology and geopolitical interests such as that which characterizes the current international scene has almost invariably led to conflict. But in the age of thermonuclear weapons and strategic equality, humanity could not survive such a repetition of history. No amount of tough rhetoric can change these realities. The future of our nation and of mankind depends on how well we avoid confrontation without giving up vital interests and how well we establish a more hopeful and stable relationship without surrender of principle.

We therefore face the necessity of a dual policy. On the one hand, we are determined to prevent Soviet military power from being used for political expansion; we will firmly discourage and resist adventurist policies. But at the same time, we cannot escalate every political dispute into a central crisis; nor can we rest on identifying foreign policy with crisis management. We have an obligation to work for a more positive future. We must couple opposition to pressure and irresponsibility with concerned efforts to build a more cooperative world.

History can inform—or mislead—us in this quest.

For a generation after World War II, statesmen and nations were traumatized by the experience of Munich; they believed that history had shown the folly of permitting an adversary to gain a preponderance of power. This was and remains a crucial lesson.

A later generation was chastened by the experience of Viet-Nam; it is determined that America shall never again overextend and exhaust itself by direct involvement in remote wars with no clear strategic significance. This, too, is a crucial lesson.

But equally important and too often neglected is the lesson learned by an earlier generation. Before the outbreak of the First World War, there was a virtual equilibrium of power. Through crisis after crisis, nations moved to confrontation and then retreated to compromise. Stability was taken for granted until—without any conscious decision to overturn the international structure—a crisis much like any other went out of control. Nation after nation slid into a war whose causes they did not understand but from which they could not extricate themselves. The result was the death of tens of millions, the destruction of the global order, and domestic upheavals whose consequences still torment mankind.

If we are to learn from history, we cannot pick and choose the lessons from which we will draw inspiration. The history of this century tells us:

- That an imbalance of power encourages aggression;
- That overcommitment cannot be sustained domestically; and
- That an equilibrium based on constant confrontation will ultimately end in cataclysm.

But the lessons of history are never automatic; each generation must apply them to concrete circumstances.

There is no question that peace rests, in the first instance, on the maintenance of a balance of global stability. Without the ultimate sanction of power, conciliation soon becomes surrender. Moderation is a virtue only in those who are thought to have a choice.

No service is done to the nation by those who portray an exaggerated specter of Soviet power and of American weakness, by those who hesitate to resist when we are challenged, or by those who fail to see the opportunities we have to shape the U.S.-Soviet relationship by our own confident action.

Soviet strength is uneven; the weaknesses and frustrations of the Soviet system are glaring and have been clearly documented. Despite the inevitable increase in its power, the Soviet Union remains far behind us and our allies in any overall assessment of military, economic, and technological strength; it would be reckless in the extreme for the Soviet Union to challenge the industrial democracies. And Soviet society is no longer insulated from the influences and attractions of the outside world or impervious to the need for external contacts.

The great industrial democracies possess the means to counter Soviet expansion and to moderate Soviet behavior. We must not abdicate this responsibility by weakening ourselves either by failing to support our defenses or refusing to use our power in defense of our interests; we must, along with our allies, always do what is necessary to maintain our security.

It is true that we cannot be the world's policeman. Not all local wars and regional conflicts affect global stability or America's national interest. But if one superpower systematically exploits these conflicts for its own advantage and tips the scales decisively by its intervention, gradually the overall balance will be affected. If adventurism is allowed to succeed in local crises, an ominous precedent of wider consequence is set. Other nations will adjust their policies to their perception of the dominant trend. Our ability to control future crises will diminish. And if this pattern is not broken, America will ultimately face harder choices, higher costs, and more severe crises.

But our obligation goes beyond the balance of power. An equilibrium is too precarious a foundation for our long-term future. There is no tranquillity in a balance of terror constantly contested. We must avoid the twin temptations of provocation and escapism. Our course must be steady and not reflect momentary fashions; it must be a policy that our adversaries respect, our allies support, and our people believe in and sustain.

Therefore we have sought with the Soviet Union to push back the shadow of nuclear catastrophe—by settling concrete problems such as Berlin so as to ease confrontations and negotiating on limitation of strategic arms so as to slow the arms race. And we have held out the prospect of cooperative relations in the economic and other fields if political conditions permit their implementation and further development.

It goes without saying that this process requires reciprocity. It cannot survive a constant attempt to seek unilateral advantage. It cannot, specifically, survive any more Angolas. If the Soviet Union is ready to face genuine coexistence, we are prepared to make every effort to shape a pattern of restraint and mutual interest which will give coexistence a more reliable and positive character making both sides conscious of what would be lost by confrontation and what can be gained by cooperation.

And we are convinced that when a vigorous response to Soviet encroachment is called for, the President will have the support of the American people—and of our allies—to the extent that he can demonstrate that the crisis was imposed upon us; that it did not result from opportunities we missed to improve the prospects of peace.

No policy will soon, if ever, eliminate the competition and irreconcilable ideological differences between the United States and the Soviet Union. Nor will it make all interests compatible. We are engaged in a protracted process with inevitable ups and downs. But there is no alternative to the policy of penalties for adventurism and incentives for restraint. What do those who speak so glibly about “one-way streets” or “preemptive concessions” propose concretely that this country do? What precisely has been given up? What level of confrontation do they seek? What threats would they make? What risks would they run? What precise changes in our defense posture, what level of expenditure over what period of time, do they advocate? How, concretely, do they suggest managing the U.S.-Soviet relationship in an era of strategic equality?

It is time we heard answers to these questions.

In short we must—and we shall—pursue the two strands of our policy toward the Soviet Union: Firmness in the face of pressure and

the vision to work for a better future. This is well within our capacities. We owe this to our people, to our future, to our allies, and to the rest of mankind.

The World Community

The upheavals of this century have produced another task—the fundamental need of reshaping the structure of international relations. For the first time in history the international system has become truly global. Decolonization and the expansion of the world economy have given birth to scores of new nations and new centers of power and initiative.

Our current world, numbering nearly 150 nations, can be the seedbed for growing economic warfare, political instability, and ideological confrontation—or it can become a community marked by unprecedented international collaboration. The interdependence of nations—the indivisibility of our security and our prosperity—can accelerate our common progress or our common decline.

Therefore, just as we seek to move beyond a balance of power in East-West relations, so must we transcend tests of strength in North-South relations and build a true world community.

We do so in our own self-interest, for today's web of economic relationships links the destinies of all mankind. The price and supply of energy, the conditions of trade, the expansion of world food production, the technological bases for economic development, the protection of the world's environment, the rules of law that govern the world's oceans and outer space—these are concerns that affect all nations and that can be satisfactorily addressed only in a framework of international cooperation.

Here, too, we need to sustain a complex policy. We must resist tactics of confrontation, but our larger goal must be to shape new international relationships that will last over decades to come. We will not be stampeded by pressures or threats. But it is in our own interest to create an international economic system that all nations will regard as legitimate because they have a stake in it and because they consider it just.

As the world's strongest power, the United States could survive an era of economic warfare. But even we would be hurt, and no American true to the humane heritage of his country could find satisfaction in the world that confrontation would bring in its wake. The benefits of common effort are so apparent and the prospects of economic strife so damaging that there is no moral or practical alternative to a world of expanded collaboration.

Therefore, at the World Food Conference in 1974,⁴ at the special session of the U.N. General Assembly last September,⁵ and in the Conference on International Economic Cooperation now underway in Paris,⁶ the United States has taken the lead in offering programs of practical cooperation. We have presented—and are vigorously following through on—a wide range of proposals to safeguard export earnings, accelerate industrial and agricultural growth, better conditions of trade and investment in key commodities, and meet the plight of the poorest countries. In every area of concern we have proposed forms of collaboration among *all* nations, including the other industrial countries, the newly wealthy oil producers, and the developing countries themselves.

It is the West—and overwhelmingly this nation—that has the resources, the technology, the skills, the organizational ability, and the good will that attract and invite the cooperation of the developing nations. In the global dialogue among the industrial and developing worlds, the Communist nations are conspicuous by their absence and, indeed, by their irrelevance.

Yet at the very moment when the industrial democracies are responding to the aspirations of the developing countries, many of the same countries attempt to extort what has in fact been freely offered. Lopsided voting, unworkable resolutions, and arbitrary procedures too often dominate the United Nations and other international bodies. Nations which originally chose nonalignment to shield themselves from the pressures of global coalitions have themselves formed a rigid, ideological, confrontationist coalition of their own. One of the most evident blocs in the world today is, ironically, the almost automatic alignment of the nonaligned.

The United States remains ready to respond responsibly and positively to countries which seriously seek justice and an equitable world economic system. But progress depends on a spirit of mutual respect, realism, and practical cooperation. Let there be no mistake about it: extortion will not work and will not be supinely accepted. The stakes are too high for self-righteous rhetoric or adolescent posturing.

At issue is not simply the economic arrangements of the next quarter century but the legitimacy of the international order.

⁴ See Document 47.

⁵ See footnote 8, Document 60.

⁶ The Conference on International Economic Cooperation, with 27 participants comprised of developed and developing nations and OPEC members, convened in Paris in December 1975 and met sporadically throughout 1976. Four commissions on energy, raw materials, development, and finance considered a wide range of development issues. Documentation on the CIEC is in *Foreign Relations, 1969–1976*, volume XXXVII, Energy Crisis, 1974–1980.

Technology and the realities of interdependence have given our generation the opportunity to determine the relationships between the developed and developing countries over the next quarter century. It is the quality of statesmanship to recognize that our necessity, our practical aspirations, and our moral purpose are linked. The United States is ready for that challenge.

The Moral Unity of the Great Democracies

Our efforts to build peace and progress reflect our deep-seated belief in freedom and in the hope of a better future for all mankind. These are values we share with our closest allies, the great industrial democracies.

The resilience of our countries in recovering from economic difficulty and in consolidating our cooperation has an importance far beyond our immediate well-being. For while foreign policy is unthinkable without an element of pragmatism, pragmatism without underlying moral purpose is like a rudderless ship.

Together, the United States and our allies have maintained the global peace and sustained the world economy for more than 30 years. The spirit of innovation and progress in our societies has no match anywhere, certainly not in societies laying claim to being “revolutionary.” Rarely in history have alliances survived—let alone flourished—as ours have in vastly changing global and geopolitical conditions. The ideals of the industrial democracies give purpose to our efforts to improve relations with the East, to the dialogue with the Third World, and to many other spheres of common endeavor.

Our ties with the great industrial democracies are therefore not alliances of convenience but a union of principle in defense of values and a way of life.

It is in this context that we must be concerned about the possibility of Communist parties coming to power—or sharing in power—in governments in NATO countries. Ultimately, the decision must, of course, be made by the voters of the countries concerned. But no one should expect that this question is not of concern to this government.

Whether some of the Communist parties in Western Europe are in fact independent of Moscow cannot be determined when their electoral self-interest so overwhelmingly coincides with their claims.

Their internal procedures—their Leninist principles and dogmas—remain the antithesis of democratic parties. And were they to gain power, they would do so after having advocated for decades programs and values detrimental to our traditional ties. By that record, they would inevitably give low priority to security and Western defense efforts, which are essential not only to Europe’s freedom but to maintaining the world balance of power. They would be tempted to

orient their economies to a much greater extent toward the East. We would have to expect that Western European governments in which Communists play a dominant role would, at best, steer their countries' policies toward the positions of the nonaligned.

The political solidarity and collective defense of the West, and thus NATO, would be inevitably weakened, if not undermined. And in this country, the commitment of the American people to maintain the balance of power in Europe, justified though it might be on pragmatic geopolitical grounds, would lack the moral base on which it has stood for 30 years.

We consider the unity of the great industrial democracies crucial to all we do in the world. For this reason we have sought to expand our cooperation to areas beyond our mutual defense—in improved political consultation, in coordinating our approaches to negotiations with the East, in reinforcing our respective economic policies, in developing a common energy policy, and in fashioning common approaches for the increasingly important dialogue with the developing nations. We have made remarkable progress in all these areas. We are determined to continue. Our foreign policy has no higher priority.

The Debate at Home

This, then, is the design of our foreign policy:

—We have the military and economic power, together with our allies, to prevent aggression.

—We have the self-confidence and vision to go beyond confrontation to a reduction of tensions and ultimately a more cooperative world.

—We have the resources, technology, and organizational genius to build a new relationship with the developing nations.

—We have the moral courage to hold high, together with our allies, the banners of freedom in a turbulent and changing world.

The challenges before us are monumental. But it is not every generation that is given the opportunity to shape a new international order. If the opportunity is missed, we shall live in a world of chaos and danger. If it is realized we will have entered an era of peace and progress and justice.

But we can realize our hopes only as a united people. Our challenge—and its solution—lies in ourselves. Our greatest foreign policy problem is our divisions at home. Our greatest foreign policy need is national cohesion and a return to the awareness that in foreign policy we are all engaged in a common national endeavor.

The world watches with amazement—our adversaries with glee and our friends with growing dismay—how America seems bent on

eroding its influence and destroying its achievements in world affairs through an orgy of recrimination.

They see our policies in Africa, the eastern Mediterranean, in Latin America, in East-West relations undermined by arbitrary congressional actions that may take decades to undo.

They see our intelligence system gravely damaged by unremitting, indiscriminating attack.

They see a country virtually incapable of behaving with the discretion that is indispensable for diplomacy.

They see revelations of malfeasance abroad on the part of American firms wreak grave damage on the political structures of friendly nations. Whatever wrongs were committed—reprehensible as they are—should be dealt with in a manner consistent with our own judicial procedures and with the dignity of allied nations.

They see some critics suddenly pretending that the Soviets are 10 feet tall and that America, despite all the evidence to the contrary, is becoming a second-rate nation. They know these erroneous and reckless allegations to be dangerous, because they may, if continued, persuade allies and adversaries of our weakness, tempting the one to accommodation and the other to adventurism.

They see this Administration—which has been condemned by one set of critics for its vigorous reaction to expansionism in Southeast Asia, in the Middle East, in Africa—simultaneously charged by another group of opponents with permitting unilateral Soviet gains.

They see that the Administration whose defense budgets have been cut some \$39 billion by the Congress in the past seven years is simultaneously charged with neglecting American defenses.

The American people see all this, too, and wonder when it will end. They know that we cannot escape either our responsibilities or the geopolitical realities of the world around us. For a great nation that does not manage events will soon be overwhelmed by them.

If one group of critics undermines arms control negotiations and cuts off the prospect of more constructive ties with the Soviet Union while another group cuts away at our defense budgets and intelligence services and thwarts American resistance to Soviet adventurism, both combined will—whether they have intended it or not—end by wrecking the nation's ability to conduct a strong, creative, moderate, and prudent foreign policy. The result will be paralysis, no matter who wins in November. And if America cannot act, others will, and we and all the free peoples of the world will pay the price.

So our problem is at once more complex and simpler than in times past. The challenges are unprecedented but the remedies are in our own hands. This Administration has confidence in the strength, resil-

ience, and vigor of America. If we summon the American spirit and restore our unity, we will have a decisive and positive impact on a world which, more than ever, affects our lives and cries out for our leadership.

Those who have faith in America will tell the American people the truth:

- That we are strong and at peace;
- That there are no easy or final answers to our problems;
- That we must conduct a long-term and responsible foreign policy, without escape and without respite;
- That what is attainable at any one moment will inevitably fall short of the ideal;
- That the reach of our power and purpose has its limits;
- That nevertheless we have the strength and determination to defend our interests and the conviction to uphold our values; and finally,
- That we have the opportunity to leave our children a more cooperative, more just, and more peaceful world than we found.

In this Bicentennial year, we celebrate ideals which began to take shape around the shores of Massachusetts Bay some 350 years ago. We have accomplished great things as a united people. There is much yet to do. This country's work in the world is not a burden but a triumph—and the measure of greatness yet to come.

Americans have always made history rather than let history chart our course. We, the present generation of Americans, will do no less. So let this year mark the end of our divisions. Let it usher in an era of national reconciliation and rededication by all Americans to their common destiny. Let us have a clear vision of what is before us—glory and danger alike—and go forward together to meet it.

**72. Statement by the Director of the Policy Planning Staff
(Lord)¹**

Washington, March 23, 1976.

The Triangular Relationship of the United States,
the U.S.S.R., and the People's Republic of China

I appreciate this opportunity to participate in your committee's examination of one of the most critical subjects in foreign policy: the triangular relationship of the United States, the Soviet Union, and the People's Republic of China. Our relations with the world's largest country and with the world's most populous country are cardinal elements in our pursuit of a more secure and moderate international system.

The Soviet Union possesses great industrial prowess and military strength. It is directed by leaders dedicated to developing Soviet power and enhancing Soviet influence. Aside from ourselves, only the U.S.S.R. has strategic capabilities and conventional forces with a global reach. It is thus at once our principal rival in a geopolitical contest and an inevitable partner if we are to help shape a more positive globe. There can be no higher imperative than insuring that the vast nuclear arsenals we each hold are never used—for the ensuing holocaust could engulf not only our two countries but civilization itself. Our own security and global stability hinge fundamentally upon the success of our endeavors to manage this relationship.

China as well is a vast nation, with one-quarter of the world's population, a long and rich history, impressive economic potential, a growing nuclear capability, and substantial political influence. There can be no lasting equilibrium in Asia, and ultimately in the world, without China's constructive participation. Building a positive and durable relationship with that nation is at the heart of our international policy.

U.S. Policy Toward the U.S.S.R.

The relationship with the Soviet Union has been a central challenge for America for three decades. The power of the U.S.S.R. is continuing to grow. The United States could not have prevented the Soviet Union's rise to the stature of a superpower, nor can we make its power disappear. Our objective is to create inhibitions against the Soviets

¹ Source: Department of State *Bulletin*, April 19, 1976, pp. 514–518. Lord made the statement before the Subcommittee on Future Foreign Policy Research and Development of the House Committee on International Relations.

using their strength in ways that jeopardize our interests or those of our friends and, over time, to channel their energies in more positive directions. This is no simple task, for the conditions are unprecedented: we have competing national interests; our ideologies and values clash; we each possess arsenals of awesome destructiveness; and each of us can project its influence throughout the world.

President Ford and Secretary Kissinger have recently set forth our approach toward the Soviet Union in considerable detail. Let me, therefore, just briefly review the highlights.

We must pursue a complex dual policy. On the one hand, we need to demonstrate strength and resolve. We and our allies must maintain levels of military capability sufficient to dissuade the Soviet Union from seeking to further its positions by force. And we must firmly oppose adventurism.

On the other hand, we must seek to shape more constructive bilateral relations and global patterns of restraint and cooperation. We must work for reliable agreements to limit strategic arms on both sides. We must be prepared to resolve political disputes through negotiation. Developing bilateral ties in commercial and many other areas on the basis of reciprocal benefits is an important part of this process; it can help encourage Soviet interests in improved relations and moderate international conduct.

In short, we need both to maintain penalties for irresponsible Soviet behavior and to develop incentives for Moscow to pursue a more constructive course.

There have been positive accomplishments. We concluded one major agreement on strategic arms; and we are working toward a comprehensive second accord which—for the first time—would place a ceiling on the strategic arms race, thus reducing the threat of nuclear war and enabling us to avoid expenditures on forces that would have only marginal military or political utility. We have eased tensions and negotiated solutions on a number of problems; for example, the four-power agreement on Berlin defused one of the traditional crisis areas. We have expanded our relations with the U.S.S.R. in commerce, technology, and many other fields on the basis of mutual benefit; for example, last year's grain agreement, while helping to meet Soviet requirements, assured profits to our farmers, alleviated pressures on our prices, and protected our traditional foreign customers against unrestricted Soviet forays into our market during future periods of short supply.

If we have made significant progress on some fronts, problems remain on others. Most serious is the imperative of preventing expansionism and the exacerbation of regional conflicts. In Angola, the Soviet Union and a Cuban expeditionary force intervened to impose a solu-

tion on a turbulent local struggle. To allow such a pattern to develop without opposition would create a dangerous destabilizing trend in world affairs. Leaders of nations in Africa and elsewhere would tailor their perceptions and decisions accordingly. Continued American passivity would send misleading signals to the Soviet Union, and China as well. We might well face harder choices and higher risks in the future.

We have made clear to Soviet leaders that persistent attempts to gain unilateral advantage could not help but damage the state of our relations and thereby undermine global stability.

Thus we face the long-term challenge of maintaining a stable balance and striving to go beyond this to build a peaceful and secure world. While Americans can reasonably disagree on the tactical details of our policy toward Moscow, I believe that for the foreseeable future any Administration will need to follow this two-track approach.

Let me now turn to our relations with the other major Communist state.

U.S. Policy Toward China

Mutual concerns and incentives prompted the United States and the People's Republic of China to launch a new beginning together after two decades of hostility and isolation. Our shared interests provide the foundation for a durable and growing relationship.

Positive relations with the People's Republic of China offer us a variety of benefits: improved prospects for preserving global equilibrium; reduced dangers of conflict in Asia, an area where the interests of all the world's major powers intersect; the growth of mutually beneficial bilateral ties, including cultural and educational exchanges, and commercial opportunities; and possibilities for cooperation or compatible action on global issues.

The Chinese also derive advantages from this relationship: a hedge against Soviet diplomatic and military pressures, broader access to the international community, opportunities for trade and technology, and the prospect of progress on the Taiwan question.

We and the Chinese share common concerns that the world remain free from domination by military force or blackmail—"hegemony," as we have described it in our various communiqués. We have also agreed to pursue the normalization of our relations. We remain dedicated to these objectives as set forth in the Shanghai communiqué.

There has been significant progress. Extensive and wide-ranging talks between our two leaderships have deepened mutual perceptions—reducing the risks of miscalculations where we disagree and increasing the chances for parallel actions where we agree. Our respective approaches to various regions and problems often reinforce one

another. We have established liaison offices in each other's capitals. We have increased trade and promoted scientific and cultural exchanges.

The Taiwan question presents some difficult issues. We have acknowledged that Chinese on both sides of the Taiwan Strait maintain that there is but one China, of which Taiwan is a part; and we do not challenge that position. We have affirmed our own interest in a peaceful resolution of the Taiwan issue by the Chinese themselves. And with that prospect in mind we have reduced our forces on Taiwan—10,000 at the time the Shanghai communiqué was signed, less than 2,500 now. This process will continue.

There is understanding on both sides about the pace at which our relations have evolved. At the same time we cannot afford to be complacent. We see important national interests served by a consolidation of this relationship. We see no evidence thus far that foreign policy is a significant issue in the current campaign with the P.R.C., although, as in any country, there is a necessary relationship between domestic politics and the pursuit of foreign policy objectives. The Chinese, in a variety of ways, continue to signal to us their continuing interest in sustaining and developing Sino-American relations. In any event, the crucial factor for the Chinese will be their perception of the strength, steadiness, and vision of the United States on the world scene.

The basic decisions on how we will complete the normalization process have not yet been made, but the direction of our policy is clear. We are confident that with mutual efforts we will move ahead progressively to strengthen our ties.

The Sino-Soviet Dispute

The Sino-Soviet dispute remains a fundamental feature of the contemporary global setting.

The roots of this rivalry run deep. There are numerous and long-standing territorial and political disputes. These are compounded by perceptions of ideological heresy, racial tension, memories of past betrayals, and the convictions of political leaders on both sides. The relationship is also marked by the classic characteristics of rivalry between two powerful neighbors. Mutual suspicions are reinforced by military buildups in the border areas and intense competitive maneuvering for positions in Asia and beyond.

While war is by no means unimaginable, it seems improbable when both sides possess impressive deterrent capabilities. The more likely prospect is continued confrontation and geopolitical competition. The basic conflicts of interests, the clash of ideologies, the readiness of forces deployed on the borders, the intensity of mutual suspicions—all suggest that the present pattern will continue.

Nevertheless, we must not regard the Sino-Soviet confrontation as an immutable condition. While renewal of a tight Sino-Soviet alliance is difficult to conceive, at least a limited improvement in relations cannot be ruled out. It is possible that the Russians and Chinese may come to see incentives for moderating their bilateral relations—their desire for greater diplomatic flexibility in their dealings with us and with others, the lessening of at least border tensions, the openings caused by leadership successions in both countries.

We have no crystal ball. Rather than speculate on the future course of Sino-Soviet relations, let me specify more precisely the U.S. perspective:

—We did not create the dispute. It springs from sources independent of our will or our policy. To attempt to manipulate the rivalry, to meddle in it, or to take sides would be dangerous, indeed self-defeating.

—At the same time, in a triangular relationship it is undeniably advantageous for us to have better relations with each of the other two actors than they have with one another. But it does not follow that we would want to see this rivalry escalate into conflict. As history abundantly attests, large-scale clashes among major powers are exceedingly difficult to contain. In addition to tragic loss of life in the region, there would loom great dangers for global stability.

—Neither can we genuinely wish to see the two major Communist powers locked once again in close alliance. Clearly this would pose fresh dangers in the world. A limited thaw in Sino-Soviet relations, however, would not automatically redound to our disadvantage, provided it was not based on shared opposition to the United States.

—Our interests compel us to pursue our well-established policies of seeking improved relations with both the U.S.S.R. and China. Both courses are essential for maintaining a global equilibrium and shaping a more peaceful and positive international structure. The record to date suggests that improvement in our ties with one does not harm our ties with the other. Indeed, our relations with both countries were perhaps most active and positive during the same period, in 1972–73.

—We therefore do not intend to be instructed by either party on the course we should adopt toward its rival. Our policies must be dictated by our interests, not by others' injunctions. At the same time, we will make clear that we are not colluding with, or accommodating, one at the expense of the other.

—With both the Soviets and Chinese we have deep differences in national interests and purposes. We also have ideologies and values that clash, including our approach to human rights and individual freedom. We will not maintain any illusions or attempt to hide our differences. But in the thermonuclear age, we have an obligation to our

people and the world to moderate our relationships. We must seek to move not only from confrontation to coexistence but onward to cooperation.

—Our success in managing our relations with both nations depends fundamentally on the strength and vitality of our alliances with Western Europe and Japan. We must preserve the integrity of those bonds if we are to deal effectively with potential adversaries, and we must harmonize our policies with our allies lest differential approaches generate competition among friends. Our partnerships with the industrial democracies come first in our diplomacy; they will not be jeopardized in the pursuit of other objectives.

—Finally, the progress of our policies toward both the Soviets and the Chinese requires a solid domestic foundation: our material strength, our unity of purpose, our appreciation of the realities around us. Neither Moscow nor Peking will respect us if we do not act with determination and vision in the world. Thus our first priority in this aspect of our foreign policy, as in all others, is to heal our divisions at home and act once again as a confident, purposeful international power.

This is a complex policy, but it is dictated by the objective conditions of international relations today. In the past Americans have had the luxury of emphasizing one strand of policy at a time—either resistance to adventurism or cooperation with others for mutual benefit. The challenge of our era—in a world of competing values, nuclear weapons, and interdependence—is to pursue both at the same time.

The issues at stake run far deeper than questions of any one faction or party or Administration. The imperatives of shaping stable relations with the Soviet Union and the People's Republic of China will be with us for as far ahead as we can see. This long-range challenge, indeed all that we do in the world, will crucially require the cohesion of the American people and cooperation between the executive and legislative branches.

I remain confident that, after a turbulent decade, we will demonstrate our resiliency and once again achieve peace at home so that we can better promote peace in the world.

73. Notes of an Address by the Counselor of the Department of State (Sonnenfeldt)¹

Washington, March 31, 1976.

SONNENFELDT ON EUROPE

Hal Sonnenfeldt, Counselor of the Department of State, addressed the CEP's Political-Military Sub-Panel on 31 March 1976 in the Pentagon. Sonnenfeldt asked to address the Sub-Panel to set the record straight concerning the views on Eastern Europe attributed to him by the press. Sonnenfeldt made the following points:

—*Eastern Europe*: The Evans and Novak report on Sonnenfeldt's views on Eastern Europe have made Sonnenfeldt unjustifiably famous. The Evans and Novak article was based on selected portions of a leaked message which gave only a telescoped account of what actually transpired at the London meeting.²

—The original, and subsequent, press reports have distorted Sonnenfeldt's (and State's) views and policies by 180°. The press focused on the use of the word organic, and added the term union, which together, imply U.S. acceptance of Soviet dominance of Eastern Europe. This assertion is incorrect.

—U.S. policy, in fact, encourages Eastern European trends towards greater autonomy and the attendant dilution of Soviet influence.

—However, the U.S. must not be too zealous in encouraging greater national independence because to do so would invite the USSR to use its overwhelming military force to keep Eastern Europe in line.

—The issue for the U.S. is how to exploit autonomous trends in Eastern Europe, and at the same time, get the Soviets to accept a situation whereby their relationship with Eastern Europe is founded less on proximate Soviet military power.

¹ Source: National Archives, RG 59, Records of the Office of the Counselor Helmut Sonnenfeldt, Lot 81D286, Box 3, Sonnenfeldt Doctrine—Classified. Confidential. The date is handwritten.

² On March 22, political columnists Rowland Evans and Robert Novak reported on Sonnenfeldt's comments to the December meeting of U.S. Chiefs of Mission in Europe in London (see Document 68). In their article, Evans and Novak quoted Sonnenfeldt as saying that, in order to avoid conflict in Europe, it "must" be U.S. policy "to strive for an evolution which makes the relationship between the Eastern Europeans and the Soviet Union an organic one." ("A Soviet-East Europe 'Organic Union,'" *Washington Post*, March 22, 1976, p. A19)

—U.S. policy towards Eastern Europe must be followed selectively, for each Eastern European nation has a different relationship with the Soviets.

- Yugoslavia: out of the Bloc, but faces Tito succession problem.
- Romania: foreign policy maverick.
- Poland: maverick in cultural affairs and agriculture.
- Hungary: economic management policy is deviant from the Soviet policy.

—The Administration would like U.S. policies towards Eastern Europe to be implemented in a low-profile manner because advertising these policies results in the Soviets further stifling trends towards greater autonomy in Eastern Europe.

—The Administration is trying to clarify the Eastern Europe issue as authoritatively as possible. Sonnenfeldt has had discussions with several Eastern European ambassadors.

—The implication that the U.S. has acquiesced to Soviet domination of Eastern Europe is understandably upsetting to U.S. ethnic groups. Key legislators (Derwinski (R-IL)³ and Zablocki (D-WI)) were briefed, but feelings continue to run high.

—Hearings before Congress on U.S. policy towards Eastern Europe are possible, but they will be a problem because they will advertise our support for greater Eastern European autonomy.

—*Western European Communist Parties*: Sonnenfeldt denied recent press reports which link his policy statements on Eastern Europe to suggestions that the U.S. and the USSR have struck a tacit deal under which the U.S. and USSR would keep the Western European communist parties out of allied governments and the U.S. would not encourage autonomy in Eastern Europe. He disavowed a U.S.-Soviet agreement on spheres of influence.

—Sonnenfeldt asserted that the U.S. cannot found its European policy on the notion that the deviant Western European communists are more of a thorn in the side of the Soviets than they are to the U.S.

—Sonnenfeldt contended that the U.S. must be concerned with what would happen if Western European communists come to power.

- less defense spending
- erosion of the security structure
- loss of base rights (not a trivial issue)

—The U.S. cannot campaign against Western communist parties, but we have and must continue to make clear to our NATO allies that

³ Edward J. Derwinski, Republican Representative from Illinois.

communist participation in their governments will erode alliance cohesion and be deleterious to the balance of power.

—Western Europe and the rise of communist parties is a far more serious issue than the Eastern European issues.

—The professed independence of Western European communist parties is not an elaborately-conceived plot to dupe the U.S.

—The tough talk at the 25th CPSU Congress in Moscow⁴ by Western communist parties was for their home consumption.

—The Soviet hierarchy is not sufficiently flexible to permit deviant talk in such a forum for purposes of duplicity.

—U.S. academics have become fascinated with European communists and are pressing State to approve more interchanges. Many academics believe communists should share power and be forced to make the tough governmental decisions. Others suggest that the Western European communists will be fiercely independent and pro-defense.

—Sonnenfeldt believes that minority parties (such as the communists) must prove their bona fides in political opposition. He considers it doubtful they will be pro-defense, since their current prominence is based on economic issues, social improvements and governmental efficiency; they would give defense spending a low priority.

—Sonnenfeldt believes that Western European communist parties are not subservient to Moscow, but neither are they as independent as they claim.

⁴ The 25th Congress of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union (CPSU) was held in Moscow February 24–March 5.

74. Briefing Memorandum From the Director of the Policy Planning Staff (Lord) to Secretary of State Kissinger¹

Washington, April 12, 1976.

Strategy for Southern Africa

AF and ARA are working on the Rhodesian and Cuban pieces of the Southern Africa puzzle. This memorandum sketches the main outlines of an overall strategy to help you and us fit all of the pieces together and begin to determine specific steps.

I. The Problem and Our Objectives

You have already delineated the principal parameters of the Southern Africa problem that our strategy must address:

—To avert Soviet/Cuban action, and American inaction, which would extend the Angola precedent, and sharpen perceptions of a pattern of decisive Soviet/Cuban initiative and American irrelevance.

—To do what we can to help solve the problems of the area and satisfy the legitimate aspirations of its people, both because it is right and because our ability to contain the Soviets and Cubans in part depends on it.

—To avoid perceptions of American actions as concessions extorted from us under pain of Soviet/Cuban involvement, because of its damaging effects in Africa and globally.

The ultimate nightmare to be avoided is Soviet/Cuban combat intervention in Southern Africa with widespread African support. Clearly our global strategic interests would dictate some stiff action against the Soviets/Cubans at the cost of sizeable damage to our standing in Africa and domestic support—and Congress could block action in any case. This is the central dilemma our strategy must be designed to head off. At the same time, if this situation materializes, our

¹ Source: National Archives, RG 59, Policy Planning Council (S/PC), Policy Planning Staff (S/P), Director's Files (Winston Lord) 1969–77, Lot 77D112, Box 357, APR 1–15 1976. Secret. Drafted by Bartholomew, Deputy Director Nicholas A. Veliotis (S/P), Donald K. Peterson (S/P), and Lord on April 12. Forwarded to Kissinger by Lord under an April 12 covering memorandum that reads in part: "In addition to a specific action plan, we still have to get at the strategic problem of convincing the various African partners that the only real solution lies through us. This will be much more difficult than the Middle East: the Arabs know that only we have the capability to 'deliver' the Israelis; we have nothing like this trump with the white regimes in Southern Africa that could be played with the Africans. But there are nevertheless some similar assets in the two situations: the fear of too-tight a Communist embrace as a threat to their autonomy; our economic role and potential assistance; and the intra-regional rivalries and antagonisms—some with a Soviet dimension—from which we might derive leverage."

strategy should put us in the best position possible to move against the Soviets/Cubans and to limit the fall-out. And we also wish to reduce the Soviet/Cuban presence in Angola and the political muscle it gives them.

Certainly direct steps, or the threat of them, vis-à-vis the Soviets and Cubans will be essential to inhibit their moves in Southern Africa. But as you have often stated—for example in the case of Angola—action on this level must be supported by the political and military facts on the ground locally. Thus it will be essential to help shape these factors as well.

In short, we need to pursue the two tracks at once. By working to generate momentum towards majority rule and self-determination in Southern Africa, we have at least a chance of mitigating, if not foreclosing, the grounds for Soviet/Cuban intervention—though we have to be pessimistic about how much we or anyone else can really do, for example, to move Smith. Even so, in making the effort we will carve out a role on the side of African aspirations that is critical to our ability to muster the international support that a tough line towards the Soviets/Cubans requires. Otherwise we will be accused of sacrificing legitimate African objectives to our great power maneuvering, leaving the Soviets and Cubans in the role of energetic defenders of justice and progress. However deep the concerns of Africans, Europeans and some Latins about the risks of outside intervention, this would make it well-nigh impossible for them to side with us and oppose the Soviets and Cubans. African states in particular that might want to sustain a close association with us cannot do so either domestically or on the African scene if a US connection can be portrayed as inconsistent with African aspirations.

Both tracks are also needed at home if we are to gain sufficient Congressional and public support for either track. Liberals might be induced to take firm action against the Soviets and Cubans if they see us simultaneously moving to change the status quo in Southern Africa. At the same time, the Soviet/Cuban dimension ironically gives us an opportunity to win support from conservatives, that might otherwise be unavailable, for a more active policy on majority rights and self-determination.

This still leaves us with the extortion dilemma. Any step-up in our support for change in Southern Africa could contradict a basic message that we are trying to get across—that there is nothing to be gained by Soviet/Cuban intervention in Southern Africa or elsewhere. Thus—as we did in the Middle East—we must make it clear to the Africans that they have to work with us, if not through us; that we are not to be moved by the blackmail use of Cuban troops.

This is one of the toughest, most complicating, aspects of our strategic problem. But I think the answer is to ride *both* tracks of our policy

hard. In this way the Africans will see that we represent an opportunity to help move toward their goals but only if they take account of our geopolitical concerns at the same time. And if we succeed, the very effectiveness of our policy should upstage, and ultimately smother, the question of whether it was forced by Soviet/Cuban involvement. Parallels are dangerous, but there was some perception that our forward stance at the UN Seventh Special Session² had been extracted by LDC pressure; yet this notion was overwhelmed by the vigor and substance of our policy, and its half-life proved very short.

[Omitted here is an extended discussion of the Southern African strategic context.]

² See footnote 8, Document 60.

75. Memorandum of Conversation¹

Washington, April 15, 1976, 9:31–10:19 a.m.

PARTICIPANTS

President Ford

Henry A. Kissinger, Secretary of State

Donald Rumsfeld, Secretary of Defense

Brent Scowcroft, Assistant to the President for National Security Affairs

Richard Cheney, Assistant to the President

President: I have decided to make a major defense and foreign policy speech before the DAR next Wednesday. Hartmann has done a redraft. It is tough—it takes on Reagan.² Will you all look at it today so I

¹ Source: Ford Library, National Security Adviser, Memoranda of Conversations, 1973–1977, Box 19, Memoranda of Conversations—Ford Administration, April 15, 1976—Ford, Kissinger, Rumsfeld. Secret; Nodis. The meeting took place in the Oval Office. All brackets, except those indicating omitted material, are in the original.

² In a March 31 nationally televised speech on the NBC network, Reagan attacked the Ford administration's foreign policy, particularly détente. Reagan charged that Ford and Kissinger had been weak on Cuba, compromised American interests in the Panama Canal negotiations, and put "our stamp of approval on Russia's enslavement of the captive (Eastern European) nations." Reagan also accused Kissinger of "giving away our own freedom," quoting him as having stated that "the day of the United States is past, and today is the day of the Soviet Union." (Kenneth Reich, "Reagan Charges Kissinger Views Nation as No. 2," *Los Angeles Times*, April 15, 1976, p. B1) To the last charge, Eagleburger stated that Kissinger "did not say that," adding: "it is pure invention and totally irresponsible." (Ibid., p. B22)

can have it in final form by Saturday? It is a little tough on the Soviet Union but says we will negotiate . . .

Kissinger: The problem with the Soviet Union is that détente is really right. Second, you will have to deal with them after November. It really isn't so that they are being irresponsible—except in Angola. And politically, if it is Humphrey and they [the Soviets] decide that Humphrey is preferable, they can be troublesome.

President: I don't think it really does that. [He describes what is in the speech.]

Kissinger: Schlesinger is now saying the way we play détente is like the cold war.³

President: Reagan, you notice, is not now saying that we are behind strategically. He is now emphasizing the conventional needs.⁴

Rumsfeld: We need to avoid wild swings from euphoria to an all-out cold war with the Soviet Union.

[Omitted here is discussion of the Eastern Mediterranean, Communist representation in Western European governments, the Minuteman III missile, and Kissinger's upcoming trip to Arizona.]

Kissinger: I thought I would take Reagan on on the optimism-pessimism issue, but not by name. Say you are realistic, it is tough, but we can make it if we work at it.

President: I am giving a Texas press interview⁵ and will get at the Panama Canal. I thought I would say that in '64 there were riots and people were killed and we are working to avoid that and protect our interests. Hit Reagan on irresponsibility.

Rumsfeld: I don't like it. It looks like any time Americans get killed, we cave in.

Kissinger: I would say it is not just an issue between us and Panama. You have an obligation to explore whether we can reach an agreement which will preserve our interests over the expected useful life of the Canal and preserve our relationships with Panama and with Latin America. We don't want to return to the climate of '64 and de-

³ The reference is to an April 13 speech given by Schlesinger at Harvard University in which he stated that "détente means precious little regarding policy specifics." The *Washington Post* reported: "If détente really amounts only to avoiding nuclear war, Schlesinger said, it differs little from 'the Cold War period.'" (Murrey Marder, "Watered-Down Detente Hit By Schlesinger," *Washington Post*, April 14, 1976, p. A2)

⁴ Presumably the reference is to Reagan's April 10 speech in Seattle, in which he stated that Soviet forces outnumbered U.S. forces "2 to 1 in service ships and submarines," and "3 to 1 in artillery and 4 to 1 in tanks." (Jerry Gilliam, "Reagan Renews Attack on Ford Policies, Says Balance of Power Is Shifting to Russia," *Los Angeles Times*, April 11, 1976, p. 7)

⁵ The President was in Texas April 27–30 and had several exchanges with reporters, including a news conference in Houston on April 29.

stroy our Latin American relationships. It may not be possible to arrive at such an agreement but it would be irresponsible not to try. You can't sacrifice our interests in the open use and defense of the Canal and any agreement must be submitted to the Congress.

Rumsfeld: I like that better.

President: Okay. I just have to get myself off the hook of using the word "never" and I also want to demonstrate that Reagan is irresponsible or doesn't understand the issues.

76. Address by President Ford¹

Washington, April 21, 1976.

Thank you very much Mrs. Smith,² members and guests of the Daughters of the American Revolution:

It's a very great honor and a tremendous privilege for me to meet with you again in this historic hall. In this Bicentennial Year we have a very special reason for rededication of the ideals and to the principles that motivated American patriots in 1776.

I am very proud that my mother was a very active and dedicated member of the Sophie de Marsac Campau Chapter of the Daughters of the American Revolution. The principles of loyalty and love of this country which she cultivated in her children are just as important today as they were throughout her lifetime. And they will continue to be important throughout our third century of freedom in America.

The patriots of 1776—men like George Washington and Patrick Henry—did not mince words nor will I, 200 years later, in reporting to you on a matter of growing national concern.

Over the past several weeks, as the 1976 political campaigns have begun to heat up, more and more attention has focused on the issue of America's military strength. Frankly, I presume this has happened because a grab bag of other issues have tried and failed. However, this should not be a partisan discussion. On national defense matters, some

¹ Source: *Public Papers: Ford, 1976–77*, Book II, pp. 1139–1145. Ford delivered the address to the 85th Continental Congress of the Daughters of the American Revolution at Constitution Hall at 10:31 a.m. Ford explored many of the same themes in an earlier address to the Chicago Council of Foreign Relations, March 12. (*Ibid.*, Book I, pp. 643–652)

² Jane Farwell Smith, President General of the Daughters of the American Revolution.

of my supporters are Democrats and some of my critics are Republicans. Nevertheless, politics does have a way of confusing the extremely complex issues of national security. This is particularly evident every 4 years when we have a Presidential election campaign.

I welcome the emergence of this debate because during the next 4 years many crucial decisions must be made about our Armed Forces, decisions that will affect our freedoms until the end of this century and beyond. Nothing is more vital to our individual, personal security than the security of our Nation.

At the same time, the gravity of this subject demands that it be addressed honestly, factually, and fairly. Unfortunately, too much of the debate so far has been cast in exaggerated rhetoric that tends to mislead and confuse, not to enlighten and to clarify.

I believe the American people, as well as our friends and adversaries abroad, have too much common sense to fall for oversimplifications, but as your President and as Commander in Chief, I do have a responsibility to set the record straight. And, obviously, it is time for a little straight talk—and I will give it to you this morning.

Recent charges that the United States is in a position of military inferiority, that we have accepted Soviet world domination are complete and utter nonsense. If there is any single standard which has guided my years in public service it has been this: The freedom and security of the United States of America must always be preserved. America is the greatest nation on Earth and we will keep it that way.

I know the DAR's record on national defense and you know mine. They are virtually identical. My knowledge, my concern, my record in support of a strong national defense does not go back merely a few days, a few weeks, or even a few months, but all the way back to 1949 when I first went to the Congress. For 25 years in the Congress I stood for, I spoke for, and I voted for a strong national defense.

For 14 years I served on the House Committee on Appropriations that each year examined in great detail every one of the programs and then provided the appropriations for the Army, the Navy, the Air Force, and Marines. And always, in those years, my stance was on the side of strength for America.

During the years before I became Vice President, as minority leader of the House of Representatives, I fought openly and hard year after year for the maximum military strength recommended, whether by a Republican President or by a Democratic President. For these last 2 years as your President, I have called upon the Congress to approve the two biggest defense budgets in our American history.

And my pledge to you today is this, that as long as I hold this office I intend to see to it that the United States will never become second to anybody, period.

Let's look at the record more closely for just a few moments. When I became President in August of 1974, some 20 months ago, I reaffirmed my conviction that our military power must be strong enough to carry out three essential objectives, and I found that we successfully met all three. We were and we remain today ready and able to protect our own vital security interests. We were and we remain today ready and able to deter aggression against our allies. And we were and we remain today ready and able to keep the peace.

Yet, as I was sworn into office, it was also apparent that we could not afford complacency about our Armed Forces. Quite the contrary. For the past 10 to 15 years the Soviet Union has been striving with dogged determination to overtake us in military strength. In our own country, on the other hand, many people, especially in the United States Congress, seemed oblivious to the growing Soviet military capability. Instead, Congress seemed to believe that we could channel more and more of our tax dollars into rapidly growing social programs and that our military should receive a smaller and smaller share of our national financial resources.

In the 10-year period from 1964 to 1974, estimated in real dollar terms, the Soviets expanded their defense spending by fully one-third. By stark contrast, military requests of successive Presidents were slashed by \$50 billion in the Congress during this same period. When I became President, defense spending represented the lowest share of GNP since 1947.

There was cause to be concerned about the future security of the country, particularly if the Congress continued to hack away at our military budgets. If the Soviet Union continued to expand its capabilities and we continued to bleed our own defense forces, it was inevitable that the United States would eventually become a second-rate power. Clearly the adverse trend had to be reversed, and I set out to make that one of the foremost objectives of my administration.

In January of 1975, 5 months after I came into office, I submitted my first budget to the Congress calling for a 10-percent increase in overall defense spending.³ However, that year the Congress cut my defense budget request by \$6,500 million which included reductions of more than \$1,500 million in operation and maintenance for our forces, more than \$3 billion in procurement of weapons and other equipment, and more than \$700 million in research and development. Specifically, the Congress refused to provide the full funding I requested for new naval ships, took away funds for two of our new airborne warning and control systems aircraft designed to vastly improve our surveillance,

³ Ford submitted the budget to Congress on February 3; see footnote 20, Document 55.

warning, and control capabilities, denied us additional attack aircraft, reduced the funds for modifying civil reserve air fleet aircraft, delaying our backup airlift capability for support in military contingencies, cut our intelligence and communications programs, reduced the program for our new B-1 strategic bomber, cut into the Air Force program for development of a new air combat fighter to maintain our air superiority in the future, reduced our ballistic missile defense technology program, reduced the fund request for war reserve stocks and spare parts needed to sustain our fighting men in combat. I could go on and on but the point is clear: No President could countenance such disregard for the Nation's security needs.

So in January of this year, 1976—only 3 months ago—I submitted an even bigger defense budget: \$112,700 million, or a 14 percent bigger budget than the defense budget of the year before. I also made it very clear that if the Congress sent me a defense bill that shortchanged the needs of this country, I would take the unprecedented step of vetoing it because congressional action was inadequate. Furthermore, I have gone to the American people on this issue. To my satisfaction, it seems the American people share my concern and are communicating that message to the Congress, and their message was loud and clear—stop cheating the country's defenses.

Two weeks ago the Congress took the first steps toward committing us to the biggest single increase in defense spending since the Korean War. I thank you and millions of other Americans for your help in this very crucial matter. I hope you and literally millions of other Americans will keep the pressure on the Congress. The defense program that I am advancing will mean that the United States of America will remain unsurpassed for years and years to come.

Just about 2 weeks ago, we laid the keel for the first of a new class of nuclear submarines to be armed with the most accurate submarine ballistic missiles in the world. The Trident missile fleet will be the foundation for a formidable, technologically superior force through the 1980's. We are now completing the final testing of the world's most modern and capable strategic bomber, the B-1. We are also accelerating work on a new intercontinental ballistic missile for the 1980's. We are developing a new cruise missile for our air and naval forces.

Nor does our effort stop with weapons, for we are also expanding our Army from 13 to 16 combat divisions.

We are seeking to achieve new efficiencies across the board—better ways to carry out our military missions that will not only save taxpayers \$2,800 million for the next fiscal year but will also improve our readiness capability of the Army, the Navy, the Air Force, and Marines.

This is a program designed to ensure that America will never become number two in military power. It is a sound investment in our future, and I intend to see it through—this year, next year, right through to the end of this decade.

I have spoken of our military strength. Let us never forget that our strength will be meaningful only if it is matched by our resolve—our resolve to keep the peace, our resolve to preserve our precious freedom.

No one should mistake our internal debates as a weakening of our intention to protect our interests and to live up to our obligations to our friends. The United States will not only remain secure in its power but I assure you we shall not hesitate to use that power when it must be used in our national interest.

Even as we are determined in our defense, we shall also be determined in our efforts to reduce the potential of a nuclear holocaust. We are continuing the strategic arms limitation talks with the Soviet Union for the simple but very good reason that these negotiations offer the best hope for sanity in superpower relations. Ever since the beginning of serious arms negotiations with the Russians years and years ago, there have been political pressures either to speed up or to slow down the negotiations, and those pressures continue today. Instead, I have chosen a steady but persistent course based on a realistic appreciation of our national interests. Those interests do not lie in an uncontrolled nuclear arms race, but in maintaining an equitable strategic balance at the lowest possible level.

Those who argue that SALT talks jeopardize the security of the United States are badly mistaken. In Vladivostok, we began negotiating an agreement which, if successfully completed, will place equal ceilings on missiles, heavy bombers, and multi-headed warheads.

There are still many important issues to be resolved in the SALT talks. I do not know at this time whether we will succeed, but under no circumstances will we be stampeded by arbitrary deadlines or demagogic political charges. We will be guided solely by the national interests of the United States of America. If a sound agreement is reached, of course, I will submit it to the United States Senate for ratification.

My friends, this election year is still young. There is still time to restore reason and perspective to our debates over national security. Those who seek our Nation's highest office have an obligation, I believe, to spell out the alternative directions they proposed in our foreign policy and our defense policy. It is not good enough to criticize current policies while refusing to propose specific alternatives. Those who seek the Presidency must be equal to its burdens.

To charge that this administration—an administration that has fought for the two biggest defense budgets in history and for the first

time in 10 years is convincing the United States Congress to spend enough for defense—to charge that we have led our Nation into military inferiority is preposterous on its face.

The American people have had enough distorted allegations that we have become a second-rate power. We must see the world as it is. We must form our policies out of hard facts, not political fiction.

First and foremost is the fact that the United States today is the single most powerful nation on Earth—indeed, in all history—and we are going to keep it that way. Our economic power is far and away the largest and the most productive, producing an estimated 24 percent of the world's wealth with less than 6 percent of the world's population. At a time when the number of democracies in the world has dwindled to less than two dozen out of over 140 countries on this globe, we remain the best hope of freedom and the inspiration for liberty of all mankind.

I say that those with faith in America must speak the truth to the American people—the truth that we are the greatest nation on Earth; the truth that we have the strength to defend our interest and to resolve to uphold our values; the truth that we are strong, we can never relax our guard; the truth that for the first time since the days of Dwight Eisenhower, a President standing for election can say we are at peace; and, finally, the truth that we must actively engage in maintaining world peace and defending freedom.

I promise to you that I will do everything within the power of the Presidency to keep America strong—militarily, economically, and morally—as I have throughout my public life, but I need your help. Without your support, without the informed, intelligent, confident, constructive support of all the American people, no President can keep the ship of state on a safe, steady course. But with your help, our 200th birthday as a nation can be truly a rebirth of America.

For 200 years, we have more than justified the faith and far exceeded the wildest dreams of our Founding Fathers. Time and time again, we have repeated the hardships of Valley Forge and the sacrifices of Iwo Jima to protect and to defend our precious freedom. Our dedicated Armed Forces stand guard today in the same spirit.

America today is unsurpassed in military capability. We have the greatest industrial capacity in the history of mankind. Our farmers out-produce everyone in history. We are ahead in education, science, and technology. We have the greatest moral and spiritual resources of any modern nation.

Let us resolve today to build upon those great strengths, so that 100 years from now our great grandchildren can look back and say they, too, are proud of America and proud to be Americans.

Thank you very much.

77. Address by Secretary of State Kissinger¹

Lusaka, April 27, 1976.

United States Policy on Southern Africa

President Ford has sent me here with a message of commitment and cooperation.

I have come to Africa because in so many ways the challenges of Africa are the challenges of the modern era. Morally and politically, the drama of national independence in Africa over the last generation has transformed international affairs. More than any other region of the world, Africa symbolizes that the previous era of world affairs, the colonial era, is a thing of the past. The great tasks you face—in nation-building, in keeping the peace and integrity of this continent, in economic development, in gaining an equitable role in world councils, in achieving racial justice—these reflect the challenges of building a humane and progressive world order.

I have come to Africa with an open mind and an open heart to demonstrate my country's desire to work with you on these great tasks. My journey is intended to give fresh impetus to our cooperation and to usher in a new era in American policy.²

The United States was one of the prime movers of the process of decolonization. The American people welcomed the new nations into the world community and for two decades have given aid and encouragement to economic and social progress in Africa. And America's responsibilities as a global power give us a strong interest today in the independence, peace, and well-being of this vast continent comprising a fifth of the world's land surface. For without peace, racial justice, and

¹ Source: Department of State *Bulletin*, May 31, 1976, pp. 672–679. Kissinger delivered the address at a luncheon hosted by Zambian President Kenneth Kaunda. All brackets are in the original. Kissinger arrived in Lusaka on April 26 for talks with Kaunda on the political situation in Rhodesia, the third stop of a two-week visit to Africa. Between April 24 and May 6, Kissinger traveled to Kenya, Tanzania, Zambia, Zaire, Liberia, and Senegal for meetings with the leaders of those countries, and attended the UNCTAD conference in Nairobi May 3–6. In his memoirs, Kissinger recalled that the “principal purpose” of the Lusaka speech and the entire African trip, his first to the continent, was to “place the United States squarely behind majority rule in Southern Africa.” (Kissinger, *Years of Renewal*, p. 925)

² NSSM 241, April 21, ordered a review of U.S. policy toward Southern Africa. The study was to develop policy options based on a definition of U.S. interests in Southern Africa, the examination of majority rule and the likelihood of foreign involvement in Rhodesia, a description of scenarios for a settlement of the problem of Namibian independence, and an analysis of the impact majority rule in Rhodesia and Namibia would have on South Africa. See *Foreign Relations, 1969–1976*, volume XXVIII, Southern Africa, Document 84.

growing prosperity in Africa, we cannot speak of a just international order.

There is nothing to be gained in a debate about whether in the past America has neglected Africa or been insufficiently committed to African goals. The United States has many responsibilities in the world. Given the burden it has carried in the postwar period, it could not do everything simultaneously. African nations, too, have their own priorities and concerns, which have not always accorded with our own. No good can come of mutual recrimination. Our differing perspectives converge in a common purpose to build a secure and just future for Africa. In active collaboration there is much we can do; in contention or apart we will miss great opportunities. President Ford and the American Government and people are prepared to work with you with energy and good will if met in the same spirit.

So it is time to put aside slogans and to seek practical solutions. It is time to find our common ground and act boldly for common ends.

Africa is a continent of hope, a modern frontier. The United States from the beginning has been a country of the frontier, built by men and women of hope. The American people know from their history the meaning of the struggle for independence, for racial equality, for economic progress, for human dignity.

I am not here to give American prescriptions for Africa's problems. Your program must be African. The basic decisions and goals must be African. But we are prepared to help.

Nor am I here to set African against African, either among your governments or among factions of liberation movements. African problems cannot be solved, and your destiny cannot be fulfilled, except by a united Africa.

America supports African unity. We urge all other countries to do the same.

Here in Africa the range of mankind's challenges and potential can be seen in all its complexity and enormous promise.

The massive power and grandeur of nature is before us in all its aspects—as the harsh master and as a bountiful servant of mankind.

Here we can feel the rich and living cultures which have changed and invigorated art, music, and thought around the world.

And here on this continent we are tested, all of us, to see whether our future will be determined for us or by us, whether humanity will be the victim or the architect of its destiny.

The Issues of Southern Africa

Of all the challenges before us, of all the purposes we have in common, racial justice is one of the most basic. This is a dominant issue of our age, within nations and among nations.

We know from our own experience that the goal of racial justice is both compelling and achievable. Our support for this principle in southern Africa is not simply a matter of foreign policy but an imperative of our own moral heritage.

The people of Zambia do not need to be reminded of the importance of realizing this goal. By geography and economic necessity, Zambia is affected directly and grievously by strife in southern Africa. Political stability in this region means more to Zambia than to many others. Yet Zambia has chosen to stand by her principles by closing her border with Rhodesia and enduring the economic consequences. This is a testimony to the determination of the people of this country and to the statesmanship of its great leader, President Kaunda.

And it was in this city seven years ago that leaders of east and central African states proclaimed their Manifesto on Southern Africa.³

One is struck by the similarity of philosophy in the American Declaration of Independence and in the Lusaka Manifesto. Two hundred years ago Thomas Jefferson wrote:

We hold these truths to be self-evident, that all men are created equal, that they are endowed by their Creator with certain unalienable Rights, that among these are Life, Liberty and the Pursuit of Happiness. That to secure these rights, Governments are instituted among Men, deriving their just powers from the consent of the governed.

And seven years ago the leaders of east and central Africa declared here in Lusaka that:

By this Manifesto we wish to make clear, beyond all shadow of doubt, our acceptance of the belief that all men are equal, and have equal rights to human dignity and respect, regardless of colour, race, religion or sex. We believe that all men have the right and the duty to participate, as equal members of the society, in their own Government.

There can be no doubt that the United States remains committed to the principles of its own Declaration of Independence. It follows that we also adhere to the convictions of the Lusaka Manifesto.

Therefore, here in Lusaka, I reaffirm the unequivocal commitment of the United States to human rights, as expressed in the principles of the U.N. Charter and the Universal Declaration of Human Rights. We support self-determination, majority rule, equal rights, and human dignity for all the peoples of southern Africa—in the name of moral principle, international law, and world peace.

³ The Manifesto on Southern Africa was issued on April 16, 1969, at the conclusion of the Summit Conference of East and Central African States held in Lusaka. A summary of the Lusaka Manifesto, declaring the right of "all men to participate as equal members of the society in their own government" and condemning South Africa's apartheid regime is *ibid.*, Document 9.

On this occasion I would like to set forth more fully American policy on some of the immediate issues we face—in Rhodesia, Namibia, and South Africa—and then to sketch our vision of southern Africa's hopeful future.

The U.S. Position on Rhodesia

The U.S. position on Rhodesia is clear and unmistakable. As President Ford has said, "The United States is totally dedicated to seeing to it that the majority becomes the ruling power in Rhodesia." We do not recognize the Rhodesian minority regime. The United States voted for, and is committed to, the U.N. Security Council resolutions of 1966 and 1968 that imposed mandatory economic sanctions against the illegal Rhodesian regime.⁴ Earlier this year we cosponsored a Security Council resolution, which was passed unanimously, expanding mandatory sanctions.⁵ And in March of this year we joined others to commend Mozambique for its decision to enforce these sanctions even at great economic cost to itself.

It is the responsibility of all who seek a negotiated solution to make clear to the Rhodesian minority that the world community is united in its insistence on rapid change. It is the responsibility of those in Rhodesia who believe in peace to take the steps necessary to avert a great tragedy.

U.S. policy for a just and durable Rhodesian solution will therefore rest on 10 elements:

—First, the United States declares its support in the strongest terms for the proposals made by British Prime Minister Callaghan, then Foreign Secretary, on March 22 of this year: that independence must be preceded by majority rule, which in turn must be achieved no later than two years following the expeditious conclusion of negotiations. We consider these proposals a basis for a settlement fair to all the people of Rhodesia. We urge that they be accepted.

—Second, the Salisbury regime must understand that it cannot expect U.S. support either in diplomacy or in material help at any stage in its conflict with African states or African liberation movements. On the

⁴ Adopted on December 16, 1966, U.N. Security Council Resolution 232 (1966) imposed a series of economic sanctions on Rhodesia, including an embargo on the supply of oil and oil products. The text of the resolution is printed in *Yearbook of the United Nations*, 1966, pp. 116–117. U.N. Security Council Resolution 253 (1968), adopted May 29, 1968, extended existing sanctions against Rhodesian imports and exports to cover all commodities except medical, educational, and humanitarian supplies and tightened restrictions on both travel to Rhodesia and travel by Rhodesian passport holders. The text of the resolution is *ibid.*, 1968, pp. 152–154.

⁵ U.N. Security Council Resolution 388 (1976) was adopted unanimously on April 6. The text is *ibid.*, 1976, p. 157.

contrary, it will face our unrelenting opposition until a negotiated settlement is achieved.

—Third, the United States will take steps to fulfill completely its obligation under international law to mandatory economic sanctions against Rhodesia. We will urge the Congress this year to repeal the Byrd amendment,⁶ which authorizes Rhodesian chrome imports to the United States, an act inconsistent with U.N. sanctions. In parallel with this effort, we will approach other industrial nations to insure the strictest and broadest international compliance with sanctions.

—Fourth, to insure that there are no misperceptions on the part of the leaders of the minority in Rhodesia, the United States, on the conclusion of my consultations in black Africa, will communicate clearly and directly to the Salisbury regime our view of the urgency of a rapid negotiated settlement leading to majority rule.

—Fifth, the U.S. Government will carry out its responsibility to inform American citizens that we have no official representation in Rhodesia nor any means of providing them with assistance or protection. American travelers will be advised against entering Rhodesia; Americans resident there will be urged to leave.

—Sixth, as in the case of Zambia a few years ago, steps should be taken—in accordance with the recent U.N. Security Council resolution—to assist Mozambique, whose closing of its borders with Rhodesia to enforce sanctions has imposed upon it a great additional economic hardship. In accordance with this U.N. resolution, the United States is willing to provide \$12.5 million of assistance.

—Seventh, the United States, together with other members of the United Nations, is ready to help alleviate economic hardship for any countries neighboring Rhodesia which decide to enforce sanctions by closing their frontiers.

—Eighth, humanitarian provision must be made for the thousands of refugees who have fled in distress from Rhodesia into neighboring countries. The United States will consider sympathetically requests for assistance for these refugees by the U.N. High Commissioner for Refugees or other appropriate international organizations.

—Ninth, the world community should give its support to the people of Rhodesia as they make the peaceful transition to majority rule and independence and should aid a newly independent Zimbabwe. To this end, we are ready to join with other interested nations in a program of economic, technical, and educational assistance to enable an independent Zimbabwe to achieve the progress and the place in the

⁶ See footnote 9, Document 49.

community of nations to which its resources and the talents of all its people entitle it.

—Finally, we state our conviction that whites as well as blacks should have a secure future and civil rights in a Zimbabwe that has achieved racial justice. A constitutional structure should protect minority rights together with establishing majority rule. We are prepared to devote some of our assistance programs to this objective.

In carrying out this program we shall consult closely with the Presidents of Botswana, Mozambique, Tanzania, and Zambia.

We believe these are important measures. We are openminded with respect to additional actions that can help speed a resolution. The United States will consult closely with African leaders, especially the four Presidents, and with other friends on the Rhodesian problem. For the central fact that I have come here to stress is this: The United States is wholly committed to help bring about a rapid, just, and African solution to the issue of Rhodesia.

Namibia

Rhodesia is the most urgent but by no means the only critical problem in southern Africa. The status of Namibia has been a source of contention between the world community and South Africa for over three decades.

The Territory of South West Africa turned into a source of serious international discord following World War II. When the United Nations refused to accede to South Africa's proposal for annexation of the territory, South Africa declined to enter into a trusteeship agreement and since then has refused to recognize the United Nations as the legal sovereign. In 1966 the General Assembly terminated South Africa's mandate over the territory.⁷ In 1971 the International Court of Justice concluded that South Africa's occupation of Namibia was illegal and that it should withdraw.

The United States voted for the 1966 General Assembly resolution. We were the only major power to argue before the International Court that South African occupation was illegal. And in January 1976 the United States voted in favor of the U.N. resolution condemning the occupation of Namibia and calling for South Africa to take specific steps toward Namibia's self-determination and independence.⁸

We are encouraged by the South African Government's evident decision to move Namibia toward independence. We are convinced

⁷ U.N. General Assembly Resolution 2145 (XXI) was adopted October 27, 1966. The text of the resolution is in *Yearbook of the United Nations*, 1966, pp. 605–606.

⁸ U.N. Security Council Resolution 385 (1976) was adopted unanimously on January 30. The text of the resolution is in *ibid.*, 1976, pp. 782–783.

that a solution can be found which will embody equal rights for the entire population and at the same time protect the interests of all who live and work there. But we are concerned that South Africa has failed to announce a definite timetable for the achievement of self-determination, that all the people and all political groupings of Namibia have not been allowed to take part in determining the form of government they shall one day have, and that South Africa continues to deny the United Nations its proper role in establishing a free and independent Namibia.

Therefore the U.S. position is as follows:

—We reiterate our call upon the South African Government to permit all the people and groups of Namibia to express their views freely, under U.N. supervision, on the political future and constitutional structure of their country.

—We urge the South African Government to announce a definite timetable, acceptable to the world community, for the achievement of self-determination.

—The United States is prepared to work with the international community, and especially with African leaders, to determine what further steps would improve prospects for a rapid and acceptable transition to Namibian independence. We are convinced that the need for progress is urgent.

—Once concrete movement toward self-determination is underway, the United States will ease its restrictions on trade and investment in Namibia. We stand ready to provide economic and technical assistance to help Namibia take its rightful place among the independent nations of the world.

South Africa

Apartheid in South Africa remains an issue of great concern to those committed to racial justice and human dignity.

No country, no people, can claim perfection in the realm of human rights. We in America are aware of our own imperfections. But because we are a free society, our problems and our shortcomings are fully aired and made known to the world. And we have reason to take pride in our progress in the quest for justice for all in our country.

The world community's concern with South Africa is not merely that racial discrimination exists there. What is unique is the extent to which racial discrimination has been institutionalized, enshrined in law, and made all-pervasive.

No one, including the leaders of black Africa, challenges the right of white South Africans to live in their country. They are not colonialists; historically, they are an African people. But white South Africans must recognize as well that the world will continue to insist that the in-

stitutionalized separation of the races must end. The United States appeals to South Africa to heed the warning signals of the past two years. There is still time to bring about a reconciliation of South Africa's peoples for the benefit of all. But there is a limit to that time—a limit of far shorter duration than was generally perceived even a few years ago.

A peaceful end to institutionalized inequality is in the interest of all South Africans. The United States will continue to encourage and work for peaceful change. Our policy toward South Africa is based upon the premise that within a reasonable time we shall see a clear evolution toward equality of opportunity and basic human rights for all South Africans. The United States will exercise all its efforts in that direction. We urge the Government of South Africa to make that premise a reality.

In the immediate future, the Republic of South Africa can show its dedication to Africa—and its potential contribution to Africa—by using its influence in Salisbury to promote a rapid negotiated settlement for majority rule in Rhodesia. This, we are sure, would be viewed positively by the community of nations as well as by the rest of Africa.

A Vision of the Future

Southern Africa has all the prerequisites for an exciting future. Richly endowed with minerals, agricultural and hydroelectric potential, a favorable climate, and most important, great human resources, it needs only to overcome the human failure of racial strife to achieve bright prospects for all its peoples. Let us all strive to speed the day when this vision becomes a reality.

The United States stands ready to work with the nations of southern Africa to help them achieve the economic progress which will give meaning to their political independence and dignity to their struggle for equality.

As you know, Deputy Secretary Robinson, an expert in economic development, is accompanying me on this visit. This is the first time that an American Secretary of State and Deputy Secretary together have come on such a mission, reflecting the importance we attach to the economic development of southern Africa. Mr. Robinson and I are discussing development needs with African officials in the various capitals, and we shall continue these consultations at the UNCTAD [U.N. Conference on Trade and Development] meeting in Nairobi next week. After my return to Washington, based on what we have learned, we will urgently study a new aid program for this continent.

Africa and its friends face a dual challenge: immediate and long-term growth. In the short term, economic emergencies can arise from natural disasters or sharp swings in global economic conditions over which developing nations have little control. These economic

shocks must be dealt with if the nations of the region are to maintain their hard-won progress toward development. For example, the sharp drop in world copper prices has had a devastating impact on the economies of Zambia and Zaïre. The United States will deal with this problem in its bilateral assistance programs for these countries and in our programs for multilateral action—to be proposed at UNCTAD next week—for resource development, buffer stocks, and earnings stabilization.

But our basic concern must go beyond responding to emergencies. We need to develop urgently programs to lay the foundations for sustained growth to enable the developing nations of southern Africa to deal effectively with global economic shocks and trends.

Let me mention four that are especially relevant to southern Africa: trained local manpower, rural development, advanced technology, and modern transportation.

—For Namibia and Zimbabwe, training programs should be intensified now so that needed manpower will be ready when majority rule is attained. Existing programs to train Namibian and Zimbabwean refugees as administrators and technicians should be expanded as rapidly as possible. We have requested additional funds from Congress for this purpose. We urge other donors and international organizations to do more.

—Development for all of southern Africa involves a process of transforming rural life. We are prepared to assist in agricultural development, in health programs, in manpower training, in improving rural transportation, through both bilateral and multilateral programs.

—A revolution in development planning could be achieved by the use of satellites to collect vital information on crops, weather, water resources, land use, and mineral exploration. The United States has already shared with developing nations information from our earliest earth resources survey satellites. We are now prepared to undertake much larger programs to apply this technology to Africa, including training programs and the development of training facilities and satellite-receiving stations in Africa itself.

—Perhaps the most critical long-term economic need of southern Africa is a modern system of regional transportation. The magnitude of the effort extends beyond the capacity of any one nation or group of nations. For this reason the United States proposes that the World Bank undertake as a priority matter the organization of a multilateral consultative group of donors to develop a modern regional transportation system for southern Africa. For our part we promise our full cooperation in working out a long-term program and in financing appropriate portions of it.

And finally, I can announce today that we expect to triple our support for development programs in southern and central Africa over the next three years.

In addition, the United States has offered leadership in many international forums to promote development through multilateral cooperation. The industrial nations, the newly wealthy oil producers, and the developing countries themselves must collaborate for the goal of development. Africa is a principal beneficiary of the many U.S. initiatives in multilateral institutions and programs—to enhance economic security through supporting export earnings in the face of sharp economic swings, to promote growth through better access to capital markets and technology transfers, to accelerate agricultural production, to improve the conditions of trade and investment in key commodities, and to address the special needs of the poorest nations.

Many of the proposals we have made are already being implemented. Next week in Nairobi, I will put forward new proposals to further advance progress in relations between developed and developing nations.

Today I have outlined the principles of American policy on the compelling challenges of southern Africa.

Our proposals are not a program made in America to be passively accepted by Africans. They are an expression of common aspirations and an agenda of cooperation. Underlying the proposals is our fundamental conviction that Africa's destiny must remain in African hands.

No one who wishes this continent well can want to see Africans divided either between nations or between liberation movements. Africans cannot want outsiders seeking to impose solutions or choosing among countries or movements. The United States, for its part, does not seek any pro-American African bloc confronting a bloc supporting any other power. Nor do we wish to support one faction of a liberation movement against another. But neither should any other country pursue hegemonial aspirations or bloc policies. An attempt by one will inevitably be countered by the other. The United States therefore supports African unity and integrity categorically as basic principles of our policy.

There is no better guarantee against outside pressure from any quarter than the determination of African nations in defense of their own independence and unity. You did not build African institutions to see outside forces fragment them into competing blocs. The United States supports Africa's genuine nonalignment and unity. We are ready for collaboration on the basis of mutual respect. We do so guided by our convictions and our values. Your cause is too compatible with our principles for you to need to pursue it by tactics of confrontation

with the United States; our self-respect is too strong to let ourselves be pressured either directly or by outside powers.

What Africa needs now from the United States is not exuberant promises or emotional expressions of good will. What it needs is a concrete program, which I have sought to offer today. So let us get down to business. Let us direct our eyes toward our great goals—national independence, economic development, racial justice, goals that can be achieved by common action.

Africa in this decade is a testing ground of the world's conscience and vision. That blacks and whites live together in harmony and equality is a moral imperative of our time. Let us prove that these goals can be realized by human choice, that justice can command by the force of its rightness instead of by force of arms.

These are ideals that bind all the races of mankind. They are the mandate of decency and progress and peace.

This drama will be played out in our own lifetime. Our children will inherit either our success or our failure. The world watches with hope, and we approach it with confidence.

So let it be said that black people and white people working together achieved on this continent, which has suffered so much and seen so much injustice, a new era of peace, well-being, and human dignity.⁹

⁹ On May 13, Kissinger reported to the Senate Foreign Relations Committee on his African trip and the state of relations with African countries. Kissinger stated that a "sound relationship between America and Africa is crucial to an international structure of relations that promotes peace, widening prosperity, and human dignity." His trip, he argued, "laid a sound foundation" for "bringing about moderate, negotiated solutions to the urgent political problems of southern Africa; the long-term economic development of the continent; and strengthening our ties with Africa in the service of interests we share—peace, independence, prosperity, respect for human dignity, and justice." (Department of State *Bulletin*, June 7, 1976, pp. 713–719) In a speech to the National Urban League, August 2, Kissinger revisited many of these same themes, adding that America's ties with Africa were determined by "practical considerations," but also by a "profound human and moral dimension." (Ibid., August 23, 1976, pp. 257–265)

78. Address by Secretary of State Kissinger¹

Baltimore, May 9, 1976.

American Resolve and the Security of Israel

I want to take a few moments this evening to recall some of our basic objectives and opportunities in the world—the permanent interests and concerns for which this nation is responsible—and why our commitment to the security and survival of Israel is an essential element of our global policy.

We have been committed for 30 years to the maintenance of global peace. No other nation has the strength to do so without us. The United States for 30 years has been the engine of the world economy and the promoter of economic development. No other nation has the resources or technology or managerial skill to do so alone. Without our commitment there can be no security; without our dedication there can be no progress.

This role is not an act of altruism, but a matter of vital self-interest. Upheavals in key areas such as the Middle East menace our friends and allies, jeopardize our prosperity, and raise the risk of global confrontation. The Middle East war of 1973 brought a confrontation with the Soviet Union and contributed to the most severe recession in the postwar period.

But neither peace nor progress comes inevitably or automatically. These goals are mere abstractions if they are not pursued with strength, vision, and conviction. For a generation, America has been the leader in maintaining the balance of power, in offering help to friends to insure their survival, in mediating conflicts, in building and sustaining international cooperation for economic progress. We could not have done so without our strength; we would not have done so without our convictions.

Today we can be proud of where we stand.

After 35 years of continual tensions and intermittent conflict, America is now at peace; no American is at war anywhere in the world. Militarily, our power is vast and growing, superior in technology and in the most important categories of strategic strength. We have solid and secure allies. Our readiness and our resolve deter wars and buttress global stability.

¹ Source: Department of State *Bulletin*, June 7, 1976, pp. 720–725. Kissinger delivered the address upon receiving the Chizuk Amuno Synagogue Distinguished Achievement Award.

Economically, the United States and the great industrialized democracies have shown once again the resiliency and basic vigor of free economies. We have successfully come through a period of recession and inflation induced in large part by drastic and unwarranted oil price increases. The solidarity of our major alliances has dramatically proved itself in a new sphere of common endeavor—economic recovery and energy policy—adding another dimension of unity above and beyond our collective defense.

Our Founding Fathers were men of faith and vision. They had faith in the future of a free people. And they had the vision to understand, as Edmund Burke said, that “You can never plan the future by the past.”

We need these qualities as much today as 200 years ago: Faith, because, to our people, dedication to the cause of freedom transcends partisanship and ethnic or social division; vision, because while we must learn from the past, we are not, and must not become, its prisoner.

These qualities of faith and vision are characteristic also of another people—the people of Israel. They are qualities we need especially as we contemplate the future of the Middle East and seek to build there, together, a lasting peace.

There is no greater example of the power of faith than the creation of the State of Israel. For centuries it was a dream for the persecuted and oppressed; then it became a reality. And a reality it shall remain. The survivors never lost their faith, and they built a modern nation in the desert in our own lifetime. Now they dream of peace. And that, too, they will achieve.

The road ahead is almost certainly more difficult—but nonetheless inescapable—than the steps we have taken so far. But we are launched together on that road, and we shall continue together with confidence and dedication.

For our relations with Israel are central to and inseparable from the broad concept of our foreign policy. The United States has permanent and fundamental concerns in the world that reflect the values of our people. True to the origins of our own nation:

—We have always been inspired by moral aims, committed to use our power for the cause of freedom, justice, and international security.

—We have maintained a strong defense and supported our friends, knowing that we could not leave the future of freedom to the mercy of others.

—We have wielded our strength as a creative force for peace, promoting solutions to conflicts and new endeavors of cooperation, confident that mankind is not doomed to anarchy and destruction; that its power can be used for conciliation and progress.

—And we have exerted our leadership as well in the economic realm, conscious that the well-being of nations and peoples is a fundamental component of international order and of a better future.

These principles will guide our policy as we seek peace in the Middle East.

Morality and Foreign Policy

The genius of America has always been its moral significance. Since its birth America has held a promise and a dream to which others have clung and many have sought to emulate. As Gladstone said, "... the American Constitution is the most wonderful work ever struck off at a given time by the brain and purpose of man."

Americans have always believed that what we did mattered not just for ourselves but for all mankind. We have been the bulwark of democracy, a refuge for those fleeing persecution, and the most humanitarian nation in history.

Since the end of World War II global peace and prosperity have depended to an extraordinary degree upon America. Throughout this period America's might has always been used to defend, never to oppress. So it will be in the future.

The relationship between America and Israel rests fundamentally on this moral basis. If the world is to be peaceful and equitable, the conduct of nations must have an ethical foundation. Those who have suffered from its absence, who have been victimized by arbitrary power—and no people has been more than the Jewish people—know in their bones how without ethical principles the ruthless will rule and the weak will suffer. Peace with justice must have a special meaning for a people—like the Jewish people—who have, through history, sought it so fervently but experienced it so rarely.

For all these reasons, Americans look upon Israel as a loyal friend committed, as are we, to the principles of freedom and democracy. We value the part we played in creating the State of Israel and in sustaining its survival. The United States can never ignore its moral responsibility for the fate of nations which rely upon us as the ultimate defender of their survival and freedom. We are thoroughly convinced that Israel's survival is inseparable from the future of human dignity, and we shall never forget that Israel's security has a special claim on the conscience of mankind.

Nor will we forget that the true strength of friendship lies in our honesty and candor with each other. Our relationship with Israel is too important for us to delude ourselves with less than our honest opinions. We do not prove our friendship by ignoring the realities we both face. We undermine our common future if, for temporary expediency, we tell each other fairy tales. We prove our good intentions by

working together with dedication, facing hardship and reality for the common good, and above all by never forgetting how important our partnership is for all that we each seek in the world.

America's aim is a just and lasting peace in the Middle East, and so is Israel's. During the U.N.'s consideration of the Palestine question over 25 years ago, an American diplomat expressed the hope that the day will come when the Jews and Arabs in the Middle East will live together in the true spirit of Christian brotherhood. We may be amused by the phrase, but it reflects a basic aspiration. Israel is entitled to live with its neighbors in the same sense of safety and normalcy that is taken for granted almost everywhere else in the world.

The United States and Israel can debate over tactics, but never over the basic reality that our relationship with each other is special for reasons that transcend tactics. What ties us together is not legal documents, but a moral connection which cannot be severed.

A Strong Defense

The second strand of American policy is a realistic appreciation of the importance of American strength. Aspirations for a better world are empty without the strength to implement them. No one should understand better than the Jewish people that weakness is not a virtue and that righteousness alone is no protection in a world of insecurity and injustice.

There can be no security without equilibrium and no safety without the restraint which a balance of power imposes. Only when the rights of nations are respected by necessity, when accommodation supplants force, can mankind's energies be devoted to the realization of its higher aspirations.

For 30 years the United States has occupied a central place in the global balance of stability. Our strength or our weakness, our effectiveness or ineffectiveness, affect decisively the calculations of nearly every nation in the world and determine our ability to shape events to our purposes. We cannot surrender one strategic part of the world to those who oppose us and remain secure and unchallenged in another. So those who want America strong in one part of the world have a special obligation to keep it strong in all strategically important areas. Nations, wherever they are located, that rely on us cannot fail to be affected whenever America abdicates responsibility—whether in Asia or in Africa.

The American people have never been comfortable with weakness. We have never relished abdication. And when it is imposed on us by domestic divisions it has its inevitable reaction. It is reassuring to see the American people once again emphatically united on the necessity of a strong defense. This year's defense budget will allow us to con-

tinue to improve our military forces—to insure that no other nation can threaten us, our interests, or our friends.

As President Kennedy wrote, we did not ask to be “the watchmen on the walls of world freedom.”² But circumstances have made us so. History taught us that our own tranquillity depends on global stability. From Waterloo to Sarajevo, America benefited from the stability of a world balance of power which maintained global security and prevented international war. That responsibility now rests, in large measure, with us. It is a responsibility we cannot skirt.

The United States will keep its friends and allies strong enough to defend themselves with our support—to insure that peace is seen clearly by their adversaries to be the only feasible course.

We will not fail to provide for Israel’s security. American aid to Israel was \$437 million in fiscal year 1973; since then it has increased to 2.3 billions of dollars for the current fiscal year—a fivefold increase in three years. Israel now receives about a third of our total foreign assistance. Israel has received \$6 billion in aid since its founding; we have proposed \$4.1 billion for the next two years. Those who opportunistically question our dedication to the security of Israel should examine these statistics.

Maintaining a Stable Peace

Strength alone is not enough. It is useful only in the service of a concept of the national interest and when wielded with creativity, wisdom, and compassion to shape the course of events. Thus our true strength is not military power, but the dedication of a free people which knows its responsibility, which has a vision of what it seeks and the courage to seek it.

The United States has never been defeated for lack of military power. All our recent setbacks, from Indochina to Angola, have been self-inflicted; they have occurred because of divisions among ourselves that paralyzed our action.

Together there is little we cannot do. Divided, there is little we can attempt.

The most urgent challenge before America is a national consensus on our purposes and objectives. As a nation, we must maintain the balance of power and have the vision to fulfill positive aspirations. There is no ultimate safety in a balance of terror constantly contested. We must vigilantly protect our own security and that of our allies and

² For President Kennedy’s address prepared for delivery at Dallas, Tex., on Nov. 22, 1963, see “Public Papers of the Presidents, John F. Kennedy, 1963,” p. 890. [Footnote is in the original.]

friends, but we must also seek to build habits of communication and relationships of cooperation.

With respect to our adversaries, we are determined to resist moves to gain unilateral benefits by military pressure, direct or indirect. The United States will not accept any further Angolas. At the same time, we owe it to ourselves and to the world to seek to push back the shadow of nuclear holocaust, to slow the strategic arms race, to resolve political problems through negotiation, and to expand our relations on the basis of strict reciprocity.

This process is meant to serve, not to sacrifice, our interests and values. The state of relations between the United States and the Communist powers is vastly better today for us and for global peace than it was 10 years ago, when crises were frequent, when communication was rudimentary, and when the world did not have the luxury of criticizing efforts to reduce tensions.

Our policy in the Middle East, similarly, is designed to serve our most positive goals. The extraordinary steps that have been taken in the last few years between Arab states and Israel have brought us progress undreamed of a few short years ago. The process of negotiation between the parties is continuing; the United States remains in a pivotal position to promote a balanced negotiation, to support friends, and dampen conflicts. The Middle East today is at a moment of unprecedented opportunity:

—Israel has shown in negotiation the boldness for which it is renowned in battle, and that in turn has made possible concrete political steps toward a durable peace settlement.

—Some of the Arab countries are now at last speaking openly and wisely of making peace and bringing an end to generations of conflict.

—The United States has shown its determination and ability to promote a just and enduring solution between the parties, to prevent this region from again becoming the focal point of global crisis.

—If we continue to conduct our relationship with the major outside powers with reason and firmness, we can move toward a global environment of restraint that will enhance even further the possibilities of constructive negotiation and progress.

The negotiations ahead in the Middle East will present difficult obstacles and difficult decisions. We understand the complexity of Israel's position. Any negotiation will require Israel to exchange territory in return for political, and therefore much less concrete, concessions. Even Israel's ultimate goals—a peace treaty and recognition from its neighbors—are inherently intangible. But they would be the greatest step toward security since the creation of the State. We do not underestimate the dilemmas and risks that Israel faces in a negotiation; but they

are dwarfed by a continuation of the status quo. And we recognize our obligation, as the principal support for Israel's security, to be understanding of Israel's specific circumstances in the process of negotiations.

All of us who are friends of Israel and who are at the same time dedicated to further progress toward peace understand Israel's uncertainties—and at the same time we share her hope. There will be no imposed solutions; there should be negotiations between the parties that will eventually have to live in peace.

It is a delicate but careful process, because no American and no friend of Israel can be ignorant of what is at stake. Much work and many dangers—most immediately the situation in Lebanon—remain, but the peace process has come further than all but a very few dared hope.

As the process continues, the United States will not weaken Israel by failing to perceive its needs, or by failing to understand its worries, or by abandoning our fundamental commitment to its survival and security. In this process there is hope; in stagnation there are mounting dangers. Together we can achieve what a few years ago seemed a vain dream: a Middle East whose nations live at peace and with a consciousness of security.

A Prosperous World Economic Order

A fourth element of American foreign policy is our commitment to sustain the world economic order. A dominant issue of international relations for the next generation will be the economic division of our planet between North and South—industrial and developing—which has become as pressing an issue as the division between East and West. I have just returned from Nairobi, from addressing a meeting of the U.N. Conference on Trade and Development, where I put forward new ideas for multilateral cooperation.³

Peace would be fragile indeed in a world of economic stagnation or frustration, in an era of economic warfare or unrelenting hostility between the industrial world and the developing world. In the last few years the world community has been reminded dramatically by the oil embargo and the ensuing recession of the extent to which economic relations are an essential foundation of the international order. Bold new policies are needed to make the international economic system more secure and more dynamic. Therefore, just as we seek to move beyond a balance of power in East–West relations, so must we transcend tests of

³ For details of Kissinger's African trip, see footnote 1, Document 77. For Kissinger's address to the UNCTAD IV conference in Nairobi May 6, see Department of State *Bulletin*, May 31, 1976, pp. 657–672.

strength in North–South relations in favor of more creative and constructive relationships in tune with the sweep of human aspirations.

We do so in our own self-interest. As the world's strongest power, the United States could survive an era of economic warfare. But the American people would not be true to ourselves were we to turn our backs on the legitimate hopes of tens of millions for a better life. Our own self-interest requires us to use our preeminent economic strength to strengthen and build upon the interdependence of all nations in the global economy.

No other country has our opportunity to build long-term relations of partnership in helping nations to develop their resources and economies. All over the globe American economic strength is admired and sought; it should be seen by us not as a “giveaway” but as an unmatched advantage which can be creatively used to strengthen our diplomacy for peace and the prospects of a stable and just world order.

Israel, too, has made a great contribution to the cause of constructive relations between the advanced and the developing countries. The imagination and creativity which the pioneering settlers of Israel used to make the desert bloom have been generously offered to many developing countries. We support those initiatives, and we will do what we can to assist them.

Israel faces serious economic difficulties in the years ahead, partly because—let us face it squarely—Moses had some shortcomings as a petroleum geologist. In place of natural resources, Israel's economy must be driven by creativity, hard work, and determination—assets which fortunately are in abundance in that little country. To prosper, Israel must have access to world markets, and countries and companies that wish to trade with her must be free to do so.

The United States will continue to help Israel's economy overcome world recession, higher petroleum prices, and the costs of a strong national defense. The United States is committed to ending restrictions on Israel's rights to trade and on the rights of others to trade with Israel. Steps toward peace in the political and military field must include steps to end the economic warfare.

America and Israel

As America makes progress toward all its broad objectives of global peace and well-being, the world is made safer for all countries that rely on us. But if legislative battles and domestic divisions weaken America's leadership, it will not be America alone which pays the price. Our friends and allies will grievously suffer.

Americans and Israelis must work together creatively and boldly in the challenging period ahead. Diplomacy at its best is a process of creation, not of passive reactions to events. For Americans and Israelis

above all, who have always shaped actions out of purposes, there is no excuse for political wrangling that in perilous times makes coherent and purposive action impossible.

America has a special responsibility. Never has there been any question about our physical power. As our economy rebounds from recession, there is every reason for confidence about our long-term—and indeed permanent—superiority in the economic and technological strength that is the basis of our military power as well as of our economic welfare. The challenge to us at this point in our history is whether we can restore the consensus and national confidence that can make this power effective for our goals.

I am optimistic. We are not weak; we are only hesitant. It lies within us to remedy our difficulties.

The former Foreign Minister of France, Maurice Couve de Murville, said on the floor of the French Assembly three days ago:

The instability in the world is above all a result of the American crisis caused by the defeat in Viet-Nam and the Watergate affair, rather than by the increase in Soviet power . . .

Americans know that when all is said and done, there cannot be peace for one nation; there must be peace for all nations, or all are in jeopardy.

The world looks to us. This is one fact that I have found, whatever continent I have visited—Africa, Latin America, Asia, or Europe. Although we no longer enjoy the preponderant power we once had, we are still the strongest single country and a nation recognized throughout the world for its honesty, its decency and unselfishness. If we persevere, if we use our great moral and physical influence to maintain the balance of power, promote world prosperity, mediate conflicts, and put our considerable weight on the scales of justice—if, in short, we do as we have always done—we will usher in an unparalleled period of progress and peace.

President Roosevelt once said that his generation of Americans had a rendezvous with destiny. Let it be said of our generation of Americans that they have had a rendezvous with peace and with progress.

**79. Memorandum From the Deputy Secretary of State
(Robinson) to Secretary of State Kissinger¹**

Washington, June 22, 1976.

SUBJECT

North-South Challenge

I believe that our public statements haven't yet brought into focus the essentially political dynamics of the North-South challenge. The more "conservative" elements within our and other governments believe that the situation is basically static except for a growing discontent on the part of the LDC's; to preserve our democratic-free enterprise-market system, they would resist any significant change in our policies toward the "South." Although not yet clearly articulated, I believe that the evolving State Department concept reflects acceptance of the fundamental dynamics of the North-South relationship which makes essential an adjustment in our international economic relations so as to assure the survival of our market system.

The underlying trends which support the concept of a dynamic North-South relationship include the following:

(A) The world became intoxicated with the illusion of independence with the number of independent states almost quadrupling in 30 years from 40 to over 150 today.

(B) Many if not most of the newly independent states haven't the essential elements for a viable economic independence let alone the managerial competence to adjust economic enterprise to the ever changing international commercial realities. We are now witnessing the progressive unraveling of these economies with loss of the momentum created prior to the cutting of the life-sustaining umbilical cord to their "colonial exploiters." A sense of angry desperation now aligns these "masses" of the community of nations with the champions of radical change in the international economic order.

(C) At the same time that the world was on its independence kick there was a counter current in the form of a techno-commercial revolution which created an accelerating global economic interdependence. This trend impacted on both industrialized and developing worlds. While the LDC's were losing their independence, the industrialized na-

¹ Source: National Archives, RG 59, Records of Deputy Secretary of State Charles W. Robinson, 1976–1977, Lot 77D117, Box 6, CWR—Memos to the Secretary, April 1976–June 1977 (1 of 2). Confidential. The text of the memorandum was relayed to Kissinger, who was attending an OECD summit in Paris, in an unnumbered June 22 telegram. (Ibid., Box 3, CWR—Telegrams)

tions also became increasingly dependent on the LDC's—for energy and raw materials to balance expanding needs with decreasing availability at home and for markets for our expanding exports.

(D) These trends have intensified pressures for governmental and inter-governmental action on a broad range of economic issues. Interdependence inevitably will heighten demands for governmental interventions in the market place. This is seen most clearly today in the energy field but will develop in other fields of international economic relations. The issues are economic but also profoundly political. Thus the traditional distinctions between economic and political aspects of our foreign relations are no longer valid.

This synopsis illustrates our need to treat North-South issues as a dynamic challenge to mankind's sensitivities and imagination. Unless we develop equitable and effective means of responding to the reality of a rapidly changing world we will not be able to preserve or extend the basic elements of the democratic-free enterprise-market system.

What are the consequences of a continuation of these trends? An expanding number of LDC's will be offered the choice of a radical "new international economic order" or increasing dependence on multilateral financial institutions controlled by the industrialized nations—the IMF, IBRD, creditor clubs (and now, some would argue, IRB and IFAD). The conditions attached to these agencies' expanded assistance will be resented in the South as "neocolonialism"—benign, perhaps, but nonetheless a further erosion of their new independence. In this situation the politics of the "common front" will rally governments that should know better to the cause of international bureaucratic management of markets, production and prices through LDC-dominated institutions. This is the real objective of the UNCTAD common fund planners. It is the essence of the North-South confrontation.

What should we be doing to turn this set of mutual problems toward a more rational resolution? First, we must create a deeper understanding of the challenge within the U.S. Government, Congress and public. Second, we must establish a common understanding among the industrialized countries. Third, we must design a better orchestrated effort to adjust international economic institutions and all aspects of economic relations to the reality of interdependence while preserving the market system.

To achieve this the U.S. must take the lead in modifying and strengthening the concentric rings of international organizations in which we have strong influence to develop a more coherent and cohesive approach. These rings start with the U.S. at the center, moving out through an inner core of industrialized nations (including FRG, Japan, UK, France and the U.S.), to the OECD, then a CIEC type body with se-

lected participants representing global interests and finally to a global institution to provide formal legitimacy.

The industrialized-nation inner core would develop from bilateral and ad hoc arrangements. The OECD must be made more effective by strengthening and expanding the mandate of its Executive Committee. We must continue our efforts to build on this process, with the State Department controlling over-all coordination of international economic policies. This can be achieved through the OECD Executive Committee, with the Under Secretary of State for Economic Affairs playing the lead role for the United States.

CIEC can be a crucial element in reconciling the views of North and South. It is not too soon to begin our planning for CIEC in some modified form beyond its initial trial year. This will require an in depth analysis of the North-South issues and alternatives for modifying CIEC to gain both effectiveness and legitimacy.

The key requirement is to demonstrate readiness to cooperate and adjust. Neither supine concessions to radical demands nor a stand-pat “them versus us” resistance to change should be our posture. The over-all design of our responses to the challenge already has been largely articulated in your addresses to the U.N. Seventh Special Session² and to UNCTAD IV.³ The main elements are:

- broader and more meaningful trade concessions to LDC’s through the MTN and otherwise;
- further expansion of earnings-stabilization programs managed by existing international financial institutions;
- comprehensive steps to reduce price fluctuations in basic commodities produced by LDC’s, in some cases using buffer stocks which should be jointly financed by producers and consumers (the financing feature representing some change in U.S. policy);
- international measures to promote rational development of resources in LDC’s—the IRB proposal;
- increased sensitivity to the need for more liberal rescheduling of the external debts of LDC’s approaching bankruptcy;
- substantial expansion of the financing capacity of the international development banks;
- a serious, comprehensive effort to create systems for the more effective transfer and application of technology to the LDC’s, as outlined in your UNCTAD speech;

² See footnote 4, Document 63.

³ See footnote 3, Document 78.

—development and operation of a World Food Reserves system that gives greater food security to the LDC's as well as industrialized countries;

—more grants and other concessional terms on bilateral aid to the poorest LDC's;

—better coordination of both multilateral and bilateral aid so as to maximize developmental effects, including joint planning of aid priorities and programs among donors and recipients.

In all of these measures we must recognize the diversity of the LDC's, with their different potentials, problems and political outlooks. To summarize:

North-South relations must be treated with the creativity and urgency required by accelerating interdependence.

We will either make adjustments in the existing order so as to offer hope to the LDC's or risk seeing the democratic-free enterprise-market system become the dinosaur of the 20th century.

This task is a fundamental aspect of our international relations. It demands the elevation of North-South economic relations to a place of continuing priority in our foreign policy machinery, effective assertion of leadership by the State Department within U.S. Government councils dealing with international economic issues, and strengthening of the OECD process of politico-economic policy coordination to deal comprehensively with North-South issues.

80. Address by Secretary of State Kissinger¹

London, June 25, 1976.

The Western Alliance: Peace and Moral Purpose

[Omitted here are Kissinger's introductory remarks focusing on the life and legacy of Alistair Buchan, founder of the International Institute for Strategic Studies.]

¹ Source: Department of State *Bulletin*, July 26, 1976, pp. 105–115. All brackets, except those indicating the omission of unrelated material, are in the original. Kissinger delivered the address before the International Institute for Strategic Studies, inaugurating the Alastair Buchan memorial lecture series. He arrived in London on June 24 for meetings with British Prime Minister James Callaghan and Foreign Secretary Anthony Crosland.

The United States and a United Europe

In 1973, with Viet-Nam at last behind us, and fresh from new initiatives with China and the Soviet Union, the United States proposed that the collaboration of the industrial democracies be given new impetus.² Military security, while still crucial, was no longer sufficient to give content or political cohesion to our broader relationship or to retain support for it from a new generation. We faced important East-West negotiations on European security and force reductions, a fresh agenda of international economic problems, the challenge of shaping anew our relationship with the developing world, and the need to redefine relations between America and a strengthened and enlarged European community.

It is academic to debate now whether the United States acted too theoretically in proposing to approach these challenges through the elaboration of a new Atlantic Declaration, or whether our European friends acted wisely in treating this proposal as a test case of European identity. The doctrinal arguments of 1973 over the procedure for Atlantic consultations, or whether Europe was exercising its proper global role, or whether economic and security issues should be linked, have in fact been settled by the practice of consultations and cooperation unprecedented in intensity and scope. The reality and success of our common endeavors have provided the best definition and revitalization of our relationship.

There is no longer any question that Europe and the United States must cooperate closely under whatever label and that the unity of Europe is essential to that process.

In its early days, the European Community was the focus of much American idealism, and perhaps of some paternalism, as we urged models of federal unity and transatlantic burden sharing on our European friends. By now, leaders on both sides of the Atlantic have come to understand that European unity cannot be built by Americans or to an American prescription; it must result from European initiatives.

The evolution of European initiatives—both its successes and its setbacks—inevitably gives rise to new questions about whether the United States still welcomes European unification. Let me take this occasion to emphasize our conviction that European unity is crucial for Europe, for the West, and for the world. We strongly support and encourage it.

We have perhaps become a little more sophisticated about our contribution to the process. We no longer expect that it will grow from the desire to ease American burdens. If Europe is to carry a part of the

² See Document 8.

West's responsibilities in the world, it must do so according to its own conceptions and in its own interest.

Alastair Buchan wrote:

It is impossible to inspire Western Europe to political unity or to encourage Japanese self-reliance unless they have the freedom and confidence to define their interests in every sphere, interests which must be reconciled with those of the United States but not subordinated to them.

The United States endorses this principle wholeheartedly. It is not healthy for the United States to be the only center of initiative and leadership in the democratic world. It is not healthy for Europe to be only a passive participant, however close the friendship and however intimate the consultation.

We therefore welcome the fact that Europe's role in global affairs is gaining in vigor and effectiveness. A vital and cohesive Western Europe is an irreplaceable weight on the scales of global diplomacy; American policy can only gain by having a strong partner of parallel moral purposes.

Of course we do not want Europe to find its identity in opposition to the United States. But neither does any sensible European. Of course there will be disagreements between us of tactics and sometimes of perspectives, if not of ends. But I do not believe that we Americans have so lost confidence in ourselves that we must inhibit the role of others with whom we may have occasional differences but who share our highest values. The wisest statesmen on the two sides of the ocean have always known that European unity and Atlantic partnership are both essential and mutually reinforcing.

So let us finally put behind us the debates over whether Europe's unity has American support. We consider the issue settled. Let us, rather, address ourselves to the urgent challenges of mutual concern which a uniting Europe, the United States, and all industrial democracies must face together—common defense, East-West relations, and the international economy.

Security and the Democracies

Security is the bedrock of all that we do. A quarter century ago, the American defense commitment to Europe provided the shield behind which Western Europe recovered its economic health and political vitality. Today, our collective defense alliance—and the U.S.-Japanese relationship—continue to be essential for global stability. But the nature of security and strategy has fundamentally changed since the time when our alliances were founded:

—The Soviet Union has recovered from the devastation of World War II and pressed vigorously ahead on the path of industrial growth.

Possessing resources on a continental scale and imposing on its people enormous sacrifices in the name of its ideology, the U.S.S.R. has developed its economic strength and technology to a point where it can match the West in many sectors of industrial and military power. It shows no signs of changing its priorities.

—For centuries, it was axiomatic that increases in military power could be translated into almost immediate political advantage. It is now clear that in strategic weaponry, new increments of weapons or destructiveness do not automatically lead to either military or political gains. The destructiveness of strategic weapons has contributed to the emergence of nuclear stalemate. Neither side, if it acts with minimum prudence, will let the balance tip against it, either in an arms race or in an agreement to limit arms.

—Beneath the nuclear umbrella, the temptation to probe with regional forces or proxy wars increases. The steady growth of Soviet conventional military and naval power and its expanding global reach cannot be ignored. Conventional forces and military assistance to allies assume pivotal importance. We must insure that the strength and flexibility of all forces capable of local defense are enhanced. And we must conduct a prudent and forceful foreign policy that is prepared to use our strength to block expansionism.

These new realities demand from us steadiness, above all. Democratic societies have always fluctuated in their attitude toward defense—between complacency and alarmist concern. The long leadtimes of modern weapons and their complexity make both these aberrations dangerous. We cannot afford alternation between neglect and bursts of frenzy if we are to have a coherent defense program and public support for the necessary exertions. We need an allied defense posture that is relevant to our dangers, credible to both friends and adversaries, and justifiable to our peoples. And we must be prepared to sustain it over the long term.

It is imperative that we maintain the programs that insure that the balance is preserved. But we owe it to ourselves to see the military balance in proper perspective. Complacency may produce weakness, but exaggeration of danger can lead to a loss of will. To be sure, there has been a steady buildup of Soviet military power. But we have also seen to the steady growth and improvement of our own forces over the same period.

—We have always had to face Soviet ground forces larger than our own, partly because of the Soviet Union's definition of its needs as a power in the heart of the Eurasian landmass, with perceived threats on both flanks. Its naval power, while a growing and serious problem, is far weaker than combined allied naval strength in terms of tonnage, firepower, range, access to the sea, experience, and seamanship.

—The United States, for its part, is expanding its Army from 13 to 16 divisions through new measures of streamlining forces; we are increasing our combat forces in Europe; we plan to station a new Army brigade on the critical sector of the north German plain; we are augmenting our naval forces. Our European allies have completed major programs to build common infrastructure. We have undertaken new joint efforts of standardization and interoperability of allied forces.

—U.S. strategic forces are superior in accuracy, diversity, reliability, survivability, and numbers of separately targetable nuclear warheads. We have a commanding lead in strategic bombers. In addition, there are American deployments overseas and the nuclear forces of two Atlantic allies.

—Even with our different priorities, the economic and technological base which underlies Western military strength remains overwhelmingly superior in size and capacity for innovation. The Soviet Union suffers endemic weakness in its industry and agriculture; recent studies indicate that this chronic inefficiency extends even into their military sector to a much greater extent than realized before.

These strengths of ours demonstrate that our present security posture is adequate and that it is well within our capacities to continue to balance the various elements of Soviet power. To maintain the necessary defense is a question of leadership more than of power. Our security responsibility is both manageable and unending. We must undertake significant additional efforts for the indefinite future. For as far ahead as we can see, we will live in a twilight area between tranquillity and open confrontation.

This is a task for both sides of the Atlantic. Our defense effort within the alliance will be importantly affected by the degree to which the American public is convinced that our allies share similar perceptions of the military challenge and a comparable determination to meet it. The greatest threat to the alliance would occur if, for whatever reason—through misreading the threat, or inattention to conventional forces, or reductions of the defense efforts of allies, or domestic developments within NATO members—U.S. public support for NATO were weakened.

The challenge of building sufficient hardware is easier than those of geopolitical understanding, political coordination, and above all, resolve. In the nuclear age, once a change in the geopolitical balance has become unambiguous, it is too late to do anything about it. However great our strength, it will prove empty if we do not resist seemingly marginal changes whose cumulative impact can undermine our security. Power serves little purpose without the doctrines and concepts which define where our interests require its application.

Therefore let us not paralyze ourselves by a rhetoric of weakness. Let us concentrate on building the understanding of our strategic interests which must underlie any policy. The fact is that nowhere has the West been defeated for lack of strength. Our setbacks have been self-inflicted, either because leaders chose objectives that were beyond our psychological capabilities or because our legislatures refused to support what the executive branch believed was essential. This—and not the various “gaps” that appear in the American debate in years divisible by four—is the deepest security problem we face.

East-West Relations

As long ago as the Harmel report of December 1967,³ the Atlantic alliance has treated as its “two main functions” the assurance of military security and realistic measures to reduce tensions between East and West. We never considered confrontation—even when imposed on us by the other side—or containment an end in itself. Nor did we believe that disagreements with the Soviet Union would automatically disappear. On the contrary, the very concept of “détente” has always been applicable only to an adversary relationship. It was designed to prevent competition from sliding into military hostilities and to create the conditions for the relationship to be gradually and prudently improved.

Thus, alliance policy toward the East has two necessary dimensions. We seek to prevent the Soviet Union from transforming its military power into political expansion. At the same time, we seek to resolve conflicts and disputes through negotiation and to strengthen the incentives for moderation by expanding the area of constructive relations.

These two dimensions are mutually reinforcing. A strong defense and resistance to adventurism are prerequisites for efforts of conciliation. By the same token, only a demonstrated commitment to peace can sustain domestic support for an adequate defense and a vigilant foreign policy. Our public and Congress will not back policies which appear to invite crises, nor will they support firmness in a crisis unless they are convinced that peaceful and honorable alternatives have been exhausted. Above all, we owe it to ourselves and to future generations to seek a world based on something more stable and hopeful than a balance of terror constantly contested.

³ For text of the report (annex to the communiqué issued at the conclusion of the December 1967 ministerial meeting of the North Atlantic Council, see *Bulletin* of Jan. 8, 1968, p. 50. [Footnote is in the original. Officially titled “The Future Tasks of the Alliance,” but informally named for the Belgian Foreign Minister Pierre Harmel, the Harmel Report defined the future direction and objectives of the NATO alliance.]

However we label such a policy, it is imposed by the unprecedented conditions of the nuclear age. No statesman can lightly risk the lives of tens of millions. Every American President, after entering office and seeing the facts, has come to President Eisenhower's view that there is no alternative to peace.

Our generation has been traumatized by World War II, because we remember that war broke out as a result of an imbalance of power. This is a lesson we must not forget. But neither must we forget the lesson of World War I, when war broke out despite an equilibrium of power. An international structure held together only by a balance of forces will sooner or later collapse in catastrophe. In our time this could spell the end of civilized life. We must therefore conduct a diplomacy that deters challenges if possible and that contains them at tolerable levels if they prove unavoidable—a diplomacy that resolves issues, nurtures restraint, and builds cooperation based on mutual interest.

This policy has critics in all our countries. Some take for granted the relative absence of serious crises in recent years, which the policy has helped to bring about, and then fault it for not producing the millennium, which it never claimed. Some caricature its objectives, portraying its goals in more exalted terms than any of its advocates, and then express dismay at the failure of reality to conform to this impossible standard. They describe *détente* as if it meant the end of all rivalry; when rivalry persists, they conclude that *détente* has failed and charge its advocates with deception or naivete. They measure the success of policy toward adversaries by criteria that should be reserved for traditional friendships. They use the reality of competition to attack the goal of coexistence, rather than to illustrate its necessity.

In fact, this policy has never been based on such hope or gullibility. It has always been designed to create conditions in which a cool calculus of interests would dictate restraint rather than opportunism, settlement of conflicts rather than their exacerbation. Western policies can at best manage and shape, not assume away, East-West competition.

A pivot of the East-West relationship is the U.S.-Soviet negotiation on limitation of strategic arms. Increasingly, strategic forces find their function only in deterring and matching each other. A continuing buildup of strategic arms therefore only leads to fresh balances, but at higher levels of expenditures and uncertainties. In an era of expanding technological possibilities, it is impossible to make rational choices of force planning without some elements of predictability in the strategic environment. Moreover, a continuing race diverts resources from other needed areas such as forces for regional defense, where imbalances can have serious geopolitical consequences. All these factors have made arms limitation a practical interest of both sides, as well as a factor for stability in the world.

We have made considerable progress toward curbing the strategic arms race in recent years. We will continue vigorously to pursue this objective in ways which protect Western interests and reflect the counsel of our allies.

In defining and pursuing policies of relaxing tensions with the East, the unity of the industrial democracies is essential. Our consultations have been intensive and frequent, and the record of Western cohesion in recent years has been encouraging—in the negotiations leading to the Four Power Agreement on Berlin, in the mutual and balanced force reduction talks, in the SALT negotiations [Strategic Arms Limitation Talks], and in the preparation for the European Security Conference.

Allied cooperation and the habits of consultation and coordination which we have formed will be even more important in the future. For as the policy of relaxing tensions proceeds, it will involve issues at the heart of all our interests.

No one should doubt the depth of our commitment to this process. But we also need to be clear about its limits and about our conception of reciprocity:

—We should require consistent patterns of behavior in different parts of the world. The West must make it clear that coexistence requires mutual restraint, not only in Europe and in the central strategic relationship but also in the Middle East, in Africa, in Asia—in fact, globally. The NATO Foreign Ministers, at their Oslo meeting last month, stressed the close link between stability and security in Europe and in the world as a whole.⁴ We must endorse this not only by our rhetoric but above all by our actions.

—We should make clear the tolerable definition of global ideological rivalry. We do not shrink from ideological competition. We have every reason for confidence in the indestructible power of man's yearning for freedom. But we cannot agree that ideology alone is involved when Soviet power is extended into areas such as southern Africa in the name of "national liberation" or when regional or local instabilities are generated or exploited in the name of "proletarian internationalism."

—We should not allow the Soviet Union to apply détente selectively within the alliance. Competition among us in our diplomatic or economic policies toward the East risks dissipating Western advantages and opening up Soviet opportunities. We must resist division and maintain the closest coordination.

⁴ The text of the communiqué issued on May 21 at the conclusion of the North Atlantic Council Ministerial meeting at Oslo is in Department of State *Bulletin*, June 21, 1976, pp. 774–775.

The process of improving East-West relations in Europe must not be confined to relations with the Soviet Union. The benefits of relaxation of tensions must extend to Eastern as well as Western Europe. There should be no room for misconceptions about U.S. policy:

—We are determined to deal with Eastern Europe on the basis of the sovereignty and independence of each of its countries. We recognize no spheres of influence and no pretensions to hegemony. Two American Presidents and several Cabinet officials have visited Romania and Poland as well as non-aligned Yugoslavia,⁵ to demonstrate our stake in the flourishing and independence of those nations.

—For the same reason, we will persist in our efforts to improve our contacts and develop our concrete bilateral relations in economic and other fields with the countries of Eastern Europe.

—The United States supports the efforts of West European nations to strengthen their bilateral and regional ties with the countries of Eastern Europe. We hope that this process will help heal the divisions of Europe which have persisted since World War II.

—And we will continue to pursue measures to improve the lives of the people in Eastern Europe in basic human terms—such as freer emigration, the unification of families, greater flow of information, increased economic interchange, and more opportunities for travel.

The United States, in parallel with its allies, will continue to expand relationships with Eastern Europe as far and as fast as is possible. This is a long-term process; it is absurd to imagine that one conference by itself can transform the internal structure of Communist governments. Rhetoric is no substitute for patient and realistic actions. We will raise no expectations that we cannot fulfill. But we will never cease to assert our traditional principles of human liberty and national self-determination.

The course of East-West relations will inevitably have its obstacles and setbacks. We will guard against erosion of the gains that we have made in a series of difficult negotiations; we will insure that agreements already negotiated are properly implemented. We must avoid both sentimentality that would substitute good will for strength and mock toughness that would substitute posturing for a clear conception of our purposes.

We in the West have the means to pursue this policy successfully. Indeed, we have no realistic alternative. We have nothing to fear from

⁵ Nixon paid official visits to Romania (August 2–3, 1969), Yugoslavia (September 30–October 2, 1970), and Poland (May 31–June 1, 1972). Similarly, Ford visited Poland (July 28–29, 1975), Romania (August 2–3, 1975), and Yugoslavia (August 3–4, 1975) as part of a two-week European trip which also included stops in West Germany and Finland.

competition: If there is a military competition, we have the strength to defend our interests; if there is an economic competition, we won it long ago; if there is an ideological competition, the power of our ideas depends only on our will to uphold them.

We need only to stay together and stay the course. If we do so, the process of East-West relations can, over time, strengthen the fabric of peace and genuinely improve the lives of all the peoples around the world.

Our Economic Strength

One of the greatest strengths of the industrial democracies is their unquestioned economic preeminence. Partly because we are committed to the free market system which has given us this preeminence, we have not yet fully realized the possibilities—indeed, the necessity—of applying our economic strength constructively to shaping a better international environment.

The industrial democracies together account for 65 percent of the world's production and 70 percent of its commerce. Our economic performance drives international trade and finance. Our investment, technology, managerial expertise, and agricultural productivity are the spur to development and well-being around the world. Our enormous capacities are multiplied if we coordinate our policies and efforts.

The core of our strength is the vitality and growth of our own economies. At the Rambouillet economic summit last November,⁶ at the Puerto Rico summit next week,⁷ in the OECD [Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development], and in many other forums, the major democratic nations have shown their ability to work together.

But an extensive agenda still summons us. We will require further efforts to continue our recovery and promote noninflationary growth. We will need to facilitate adequate investment and supplies of raw materials. We must continue to avoid protectionist measures, and we must use the opportunity of the multilateral trade negotiations to strengthen and expand the international trading system. We need to reduce our vulnerability and dependence on imported oil through conservation, new sources of energy, and collective preparations for possible emer-

⁶ The economic summit at Rambouillet, France, November 15–17, 1975, was attended by Ford and Kissinger as well as the heads of state of France, West Germany, the United Kingdom, Italy, and Japan. The memoranda of conversations of the summit's four sessions are printed in *Foreign Relations, 1969–1976*, volume XXXI, Foreign Economic Policy, 1973–1976, Documents 122–125.

⁷ The summit meeting of the leaders of the United States, France, West Germany, the United Kingdom, Italy, Japan, and Canada was held in San Juan, Puerto Rico, June 27–28. See *ibid.*, Documents 148 and 149.

gencies. And we must build on the progress made at Rambouillet and at Jamaica last January⁸ to improve the international monetary system.

Our central challenge is to pool our strengths, to increase our coordination, and to tailor our policies to the long term. On the basis of solid cooperation among ourselves, we must deal more effectively with the challenges of the global economy—such as our economic relations with the centrally planned Communist economies and with the scores of new nations concerned with development.

East-West economic interchange, while small in relative scale, is becoming an important economic and political factor. This growth reflects our fundamental strength. It carries risks and complications, both political and economic. But it also presents opportunities for stabilizing relations and involving the Communist countries in responsible international conduct. If the democracies pursue parallel policies—not allowing the Communist states to stimulate debilitating competition among us or to manipulate the process for their own unilateral advantage—East-West economic relations can be a factor for peace and well-being.

We must insure that benefits are reciprocal. We must avoid large trade imbalances which could open opportunities for political pressure. We should structure economic relations so that the Communist states will be drawn into the international economic system and accept its disciplines.

When dealing with centrally controlled state economies, we have to realize that economic relations have a high degree of political content and cannot be conducted solely on the normal commercial basis. Obviously, profitability must be one standard, but we need a broader strategy, consistent with our free enterprise system, so that economic relations will contribute to political objectives.

The industrial democracies should coordinate their policies to insure the orderly and beneficial evolution of East-West relations. To these ends, the United States has proposed to the OECD that we intensify our analyses of the problems and opportunities inherent in East-West trade with a view to charting common objectives and approaches.

If the economic strength of the industrial democracies is important to the Socialist countries, it is vital for the developing world. These nations seek to overcome pervasive poverty and to lift the horizons of their peoples. They ask for an equitable share of global economic benefits and a greater role in international decisions that affect them.

⁸ The IMF Interim Committee met in Jamaica January 7–8. For a report on the meeting, see *ibid.*, Document 128.

The process of development is crucial not only for the poorer nations but for the industrial nations as well. Our own prosperity is closely linked to the raw materials, the markets, and the aspirations of the developing countries. An international order can be stable only if all nations perceive it as fundamentally just and are convinced that they have a stake in it. Over the long term, cooperative North-South relations are thus clearly in the interest of all, and the objectives of industrial and developing countries *should* be complementary.

However, the North-South dialogue has been far from smooth. Tactics of pressure and an emphasis on rhetorical victories at conferences have too often created an atmosphere of confrontation. Such attitudes obscure the fundamental reality that development is an arduous long-term enterprise. It will go forward only if both sides face facts without illusions, shunning both confrontation and sentimentality.

Far more is involved than the mechanical application of technology and capital to poverty. There must be within the developing country a sense of purpose and direction, determined leadership, and perhaps most important, an impulse for change among the people. Development requires national administration, a complex infrastructure, a revised system of education, and many other social reforms. It is a profoundly unsettling process that takes decades.

For many new countries it is in fact even more difficult than similar efforts by the Western countries a century ago, for their social and geographic conditions reflect the arbitrary subdivisions of colonial rule. Some face obstacles which could not be surmounted even with the greatest exertions on their own. Their progress depends on how well the international community responds to the imperatives of economic interdependence.

It is senseless, therefore, to pretend that development can proceed by quick fixes or one-shot solutions. Artificial majorities at international conferences confuse the issue. Confrontational tactics will in time destroy the domestic support in the industrial countries for the forward-looking policy which the developing countries so desperately need.

The industrial democracies have special responsibilities as well. Development requires their sustained and collective cooperation. They represent the largest markets and most of the world's technology and capital. They have an obligation to show understanding for the plight of the poorest and the striving for progress of all developing nations. But they do the developing countries no favor if they contribute to escapism. If they compete to curry favor over essentially propagandistic issues, contributions will be diluted, resources will go unallocated, and unworkable projects will be encouraged.

The developing countries need from us not a sense of guilt but intelligent and realistic proposals that merge the interests of both sides in an expanding world economy:

—First, we must develop further the mechanisms of our own co-operation. To this end the United States has made a number of concrete proposals at the recently concluded OECD meeting.⁹

—Second, the industrial democracies should coordinate their national aid programs better so that we use our respective areas of experience and technical skill to best advantage. [French] President Giscard d'Estaing's proposal for an integrated Western fund for Africa is an imaginative approach to regional development.

—Third, we should regularly consult and work in close parallel in major international negotiations and conferences. The Conference on International Economic Cooperation; the multilateral trade negotiations; U.N. General Assembly special sessions; world conferences on food, population, environment, or housing; and UNCTAD [U.N. Conference on Trade and Development] all can achieve much more if the industrial democracies approach them with a clear and coherent purpose.

—Fourth, we should stop conducting all negotiations on an agenda not our own. We should not hesitate to put forward our own solutions to common problems.

—And finally, we need a clear longer term strategy for development. The diverse elements of the process, including various forms of assistance, technology transfer, and trade and financial policy, must be better integrated.

Cooperation among developed countries is not confrontation between North and South, as is often alleged. The fact is that a responsible development policy is possible only if the industrial democracies pursue realistic goals with conviction, compassion, and coordination. They must not delude themselves or their interlocutors by easy panaceas, or mistake slogans for progress. We make the greatest contribution to development if we insist that the North-South dialogue emphasize substance rather than ideology and concentrate on practical programs instead of empty theological debates.

The Future of Democratic Societies

In every dimension of our activities, then, the industrial democracies enter the new era with substantial capacities and opportunities.

⁹ On June 21, Kissinger addressed the June 21–22 session of the OECD Council in Paris on "The Cohesion of the Industrial Democracies: The Precondition of Global Progress." For the text of his speech, see Department of State *Bulletin*, July 19, 1976, pp. 73–83.

At the same time, it would be idle to deny that in recent years the moral stamina of the West has been seriously challenged.

Since its beginnings, Western civilization has clearly defined the individual's relationship to society and the state. In southern Europe, the humanism of the Renaissance made man the measure of all things. In northern Europe, the Reformation, in proclaiming the priesthood of all believers and offering rewards for individual effort, put the emphasis on the individual. In England, the sense of justice and human rights and responsibilities evolved in the elaboration of the common law. Two hundred years ago the authors of our Declaration of Independence drew upon this heritage; to them every human being had inalienable rights to life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness. The state existed to protect the individual and permit full scope for the enjoyment of these rights.

Today in the West, 30 years after the Marshall plan, our deepest challenge is that a new generation must explore again the issues of liberty and social responsibility, in an era when societies have grown vastly in size, complexity, and dynamism.

The modern industrial society, though founded in freedom and offering prosperity, risks losing the individual in the mass and fostering his alienation. The technical complexity of public issues challenges the functioning of democracy. Mass media and the weakening of party and group structures further the isolation of the individual; they transform democratic politics, adding new elements of volatility and unpredictability. The bureaucratic state poses a fundamental challenge to political leadership and responsiveness to public will.

Basic moral questions are raised: How do we inspire a questioning new generation in a relativistic age and in a society of impersonal institutions? Will skepticism and cynicism sap the spiritual energies of our civilization at the moment of its greatest technical and material success? Having debunked authority, will our societies now seek refuge in false simplifications, demagogic certitudes, or extremist panaceas?

These questions are not a prediction but a test—a test of the creativity and moral fortitude of our peoples and leaders.

Western civilization has met such tests before. In the late 15th century, Europe was in a period of gloomy introspection, preoccupied with a sense of despair and mortality. The cities which had sparked its revival following the Islamic conquests were in decline. Its territory was being diminished by the depredations of a powerful invader from the East. Its spiritual, economic, and cultural center—Italy—was a prey to anarchy and dismemberment.

And yet Europe at that very moment was already well launched on one of the world's periods of greatest political and intellectual

advance. The Renaissance and Reformation, the great discoveries, the revival of humanistic values, the industrial and democratic revolutions—these were all to create the character and the dynamism of the Western civilization of which we, on both sides of the Atlantic, are the heirs.

Similarly today, the West has assets to meet its challenges and to draw from them the material for new acts of creation. It is our nations that have been the vanguard of the modern age. Intellectually and morally, it is our societies that have proven themselves the vast laboratory of the experiment of modernization. Above all, it is the Western democracies that originated—and keep alive today—the vision of political freedom, social justice, and economic well-being for all peoples. None of us lives up to this vision ideally or all the time. But the rigorous standard by which we judge ourselves is what makes us different from totalitarian societies, of the left or the right.

This, then, is our moral task:

—First, as democratic governments we must redeem, over and over again, the trust of our peoples. As a nation which has accepted the burden of leadership, the United States has a special responsibility: we must overcome the traumas of the recent period, eradicate their causes, and preserve the qualities which world leadership demands. In Europe, wherever there has been a slackening in governmental responsiveness to the needs of citizens, there should be reform and revival.

—Second, we must confront the complexities of a pluralistic world. This calls for more than specific technical solutions. It requires of leaders a willingness to explain the real alternatives, no matter how complicated or difficult. And it requires of electorates an understanding that we must make choices amidst uncertainty, where the outcome may be neither immediate nor reducible to simple slogans.

—Third, we must clarify our attitudes toward political forces within Western societies which appeal to electorates on the ground that they may bring greater efficiency to government. But we cannot avoid the question of the commitment of these forces to democratic values nor a concern about the trends that a decision based on temporary convenience would set in motion. At the same time, opposition to these forces is clearly not enough. There must be a response to legitimate social and economic aspirations and to the need for reforms of inadequacies from which these forces derive much of their appeal.

—Finally, the solidarity of the democratic nations in the world is essential both as material support and as a moral symbol. There could be no greater inspiration of our peoples than the reaffirmation of their common purpose and the conviction that they can shape their fortune in freedom.

We cannot afford either a perilous complacency or an immobilizing pessimism. Alastair Buchan posed his questions not to induce paralysis, but as a spur to wiser action and fresh achievement.

We know what we must do. We also know what we can do. It only remains to do it.

81. Memorandum From Stuart S. Janney and Paul L. Ahern of the Office of the Deputy Under Secretary of State for Management to the Deputy Under Secretary of State for Management (Eagleburger)¹

Washington, July 21, 1976.

SUBJECT

Foreign Policy Issues for Election Year 1976

The Ellsworth memo (attached)² listed seven issues of importance to the 1976 Presidential campaign. They were as follows: Cuba, China, Cyprus, the Middle East, the Soviet Union and Disarmament, OPEC and broader themes i.e. social justice, human rights, redistribution of wealth and Lone Rangerism.

While the Ellsworth memorandum is a valuable starting point, we believe that his list is in need of expansion and modification. We believe that there are at least eighteen issues which will play a role in the election year foreign policy debate. They are as follows:

1. *Style of diplomacy*—Carter will criticize the Ford/Kissinger foreign policy for excessive secrecy and charge that where mistakes have occurred they could have been prevented by placing greater trust in the judgment of the American people. This approach is similar to that employed by Carter in discussing domestic issues. Not only is it aimed at

¹ Source: Department of State, Files of Lawrence S. Eagleburger, Lot 84D204, Chron—July 1976. No classification marking. Not initialed by Ahern. Eagleburger wrote a note to Kissinger on July 27 on the first page of the memorandum: "FYI: Worth reading. We'll do more on this sort of thing by the end of the week." Kissinger's Executive Assistant Richard Aherne returned the memorandum to Eagleburger under a July 26 covering memorandum, describing it as "good and comprehensive." Aherne warned, however, that it did not consider the possibility that Carter would seek the repeal of the Byrd Amendment shortly after the Republican National Convention to be held in Kansas City August 16–19. The Democratic National Convention was held in New York July 12–15.

² Eagleburger wrote "(attached)" by hand here, but the referenced memorandum is not attached and was not found.

arousing public resentment at being left out of the process, but it is also designed to emphasize that foreign policy is not radically different from domestic policy and that a person who is competent in one can also successfully execute the other. The best response to criticism involving style is to emphasize how trivial such a charge actually is and to point out how clearly this indicates the lack of a viable alternative to present policy.

2. *Arms sales*—The Administration's policy of utilizing arms sales to strike a balance of conventional forces in regions of the world has a negative political aspect. While it is unlikely that Carter can articulate a specific alternative to current arms sales programs without deeply offending the many constituent groups which depend on such sales and looking impractical at the same time, there is a political advantage to expressing general concern over arms sales. In interviews and speeches Carter has proposed greater consultation with other members of the Western alliance and with the Soviet Union to reduce arms sales and failing in that he has suggested through advisors the possibility of unilateral acts of restraint in arms sales. We should expect criticism of America's role as the world's leading arms merchant to appear in all of Carter's foreign policy statements, but at the same time it is unlikely that a detailed counter proposal to present policy will emerge.

It may be advisable for the Secretary to express concern over the growing arms trade as an adjunct to a more detailed policy statement on nuclear proliferation (suggested in point 3).

3. *Nuclear Proliferation*—While the Administration has pursued opportunities for limiting the sale of technology which could be converted into weapons, it has failed to convey this record to the public. Contrary to fact, the Administration is pictured as callous to security, public safety and environmental concerns and oversensitive to the feelings of our allies who are engaged in selling dangerous technology to dangerous governments. Carter may have some difficulty articulating this view as he is so strongly committed to strengthening the Western Alliance.

Carter's speech at the U.N. on nuclear proliferation³ was well received and consequently other speeches on this subject can be expected. The significance of Carter's U.N. speech was not that he radically departed from present policy, but that he expressed more concern and more urgency than the Administration had previously expressed. The Secretary should consider giving a major address devoted entirely to the subject of nuclear proliferation in the near future.

³ Carter addressed the United Nations on nuclear energy and world order on May 13. For the text of this speech, see *The Presidential Campaign, 1976*, Volume 1, Part 1: *Jimmy Carter*, pp. 183–194.

4. *Overconcern as to Russian sensitivities*—This broad charge has appeared in interviews with certain key Carter foreign policy advisers. The gist of it is that the United States in recent years has paid too much attention to how the Russians feel on a given world situation and that this approach has immobilized the U.S. They argue that it is time we told the Russians that except for matters of central concern to Moscow we are going to proceed unfettered by their feeling as to the merits of our policy. While this criticism is so broad as to have little relevance to actual policy making, it will in all probability touch a responsive chord with the American people, who throughout the primary season have expressed a general restlessness and dissatisfaction with détente.

5. *Human Rights*—This issue has many aspects. It embraces the problems encountered by Jews in the Soviet Union attempting to emigrate as well as political repression in South America and elsewhere. As to the Russian situation, Carter is opposed to the Jackson approach of publicly and directly confronting and embarrassing the Soviet Union on human rights and therefore, this potential difference of opinion has been muted. The human rights issue will focus instead on American policy toward such governments as South Korea and Chile. We anticipate that Carter will express greater willingness to impose economic and political sanctions on countries that engage in torture and other unacceptable political behaviour than has the Ford Administration.

6. *The Face of Foreign Policy*—Carter will argue that the Ford/Kissinger foreign policy has been overtaken by world events and conditions. He will argue that the strategic thinkers who were predominant in foreign policy in the past should give way to those with an understanding of economics, the environment and problems of overpopulation. The Secretary should not wait for Carter to acknowledge the sensitivity that the Administration has displayed in dealing with these issues over the last several years. The Secretary should take every opportunity to emphasize that indeed economics, environment and population are of paramount importance and that they are treated as such by the Ford Administration.

7. *Cooperation with Congress*—The Carter nomination is in large part a product of the American people's exhaustion with issues. The public is not looking for an ideologue. Those who supported Carter during the primaries were willing to accept a candidate who was less than a one-hundred percent champion of their particular interests or viewpoint, but who as a result represented a unifying force with appeal to other constituencies. An easy way for Carter to further capitalize on the public's exhaustion with issues and willingness to accept generalities in place of specifics is to indicate that a Carter Presidency could co-operate fully and effectively with Congress as opposed to the present Administration with its record of vetoing over 50 pieces of legislation.

8. *Dealing with Russia*—The politically sensible way to address Angola and other examples of Russian aggression is to charge that the Administration failed to confront the Russians with their unacceptable behavior at an early enough stage in the process so that the Russians could have modified their behavior without substantial embarrassment. Carter has, in fact, criticized the United States for acting too late in Angola and then threatening too much. He promises to go to the Russians confidentially in the very earliest stages of a potential international crisis so that each side can modify its position in a way which will preserve the peace.

9. *OPEC*—This is not yet an issue in the campaign, but there is every reason to expect that it will be shortly. Ford is vulnerable to the charge that he has paid excessive attention to the sensitivities of Iran and Saudi Arabia and failed to exert maximum pressure on those countries and other members of OPEC to lower the price of oil. Carter's most effective approach would be to combine criticism of U.S. efforts to lower the world oil price with charges that we have also neglected human rights and too aggressively pursued arms sales. Clearly these issues merge in the Middle East.

10. *SALT*—Carter is likely to place major emphasis on the Administration's failure to follow up the Vladivostok Agreement with a satisfactory SALT II agreement. Carter will use this issue to strengthen ties with the liberal community without unduly antagonizing the Jackson wing.

Carter will attempt to make two complementary points:

First on substance, he will criticize the Administration for a failure to bargain with the determination and unity necessary to achieve a suitable agreement. He will repeat his pledge to work until the threat of nuclear destruction has been removed from all nations.

Second, he will fault the Administration for a failure to deliver on its promises. He will depict the SALT process as one of overpromise and underperformance.

If SALT marginally favors outside critics such as Carter, it also offers the Administration a most promising opportunity to demonstrate dynamic and competent leadership. The American people appreciate the importance of arms limitations, and a renewed effort ought to be made to convey the Administration's record to the American People.

But more important are the incalculable political benefits to be gained through a SALT II agreement. The polls have consistently shown that the Secretary and the President receive high ratings for their efforts to achieve world peace. Since Carter has brusquely dismissed the Reagan arguments on this subject, the door will be open after the Republican Convention for an agreement. Carter would criticize such an agreement at his political peril.

11. *North-South Dialogue*—It is unlikely that Carter will make specific criticisms of Administration proposals (U.N. Speech, UNCTAD, etc.) or that he will advance a detailed program of his own during the campaign. However, in this area as in others, his comments will focus on style and nuance instead of substance i.e. criticizing the Administration for a “poor attitude” in dealing with the LDC’s. He may charge that the U.S. has failed to adequately consult with our allies on North-South questions (e.g., the Nairobi vote),⁴ and to show adequate concern for the poorest of the poor.

There are several steps which can be taken to ensure that the Administration gets the best of whatever argument may take place on this subject.

First, Administration statements should emphasize that the United States leads in proposing workable solutions to the problems of hunger, population control, and economic development, that the Communist world is essentially irrelevant to this debate, and that our positions eschew rhetorical bombast for a clear understanding of economic and moral interests. It should be stated that the U.S. has not participated in these international conferences reluctantly but rather willingly and committed to maintaining a productive dialogue between the industrial world and the LDCs.

Second, to enhance the image of determination and continuity, the Administration should sound confident and forwardlooking in announcing plans for participation in international fora during the campaign, in the key December meetings, and beyond. A show of confidence in the merit of our proposals will demonstrate our determination to follow through on our efforts. Any position which is attacked both by the *Wall Street Journal* and by Carter must have something to commend it to reasonable people who are interested in seeing real progress.

12. *Bargaining Chip Diplomacy*—Carter avoided the traditional liberal position on the use of the ABM as a bargaining chip in his recent interview with the *Times*.⁵ While he was critical in the most general terms, he refused to rule out the possibility that, as President, he might be forced to use the same device himself. This is significant, coming from a candidate who has shown no reluctance to promise to “never ever” do many other things if elected.

⁴ At the UNCTAD IV meeting in Nairobi May 3–6, a resolution on a study of the U.S. proposal for an International Resources Bank was defeated. For more information, see *Foreign Relations, 1969–1976*, volume XXXI, Foreign Economic Policy, 1973–1976, Documents 304–305. See also Document 77.

⁵ The interview was held June 24 but not reported until July 7. (Leslie H. Gelb, “Carter’s Foreign Views Fit Liberal Democratic Mold,” *New York Times*, July 7, 1976, p. 1) Excerpts from the interview were published in the same issue.

13. *Defense Spending*—We do not foresee that this broad issue will have much impact in the general election, so long as Carter sticks to vague appeals to cut the “fat” from the defense budget in relatively small amounts (\$5–7 billion).

As the Reagan campaign fades, it is likely that the issue of defense spending will remain in the news only to the extent that the President stresses his support for a strong national security system.

14. *Africa Policy*—Carter will find it difficult to criticize U.S. policy and the Secretary’s efforts to solve the conflict in Southern Africa subsequent to the victory of the MPLA in Angola. He may, however, focus on U.S. Africa policy in the period 1969–1975 and allege serious neglect. He may use Angola as an example of how he would deal differently with the Russians (see item 8), but these points are not likely to have any major impact—especially in light of the Congressional cutoff of aid to Angola.

15. *Byrd Amendment*—This is a promising opportunity for Carter to draw a distinction between his style of leadership and Ford’s. He can question the commitment of the White House to the Lusaka policy in light of the Administration’s failure to press for repeal of the Byrd amendment⁶—so that the issue becomes one of competence to deliver on our promises quite apart from the merits of repeal itself. Furthermore, the Secretary’s strong presence in the formulation of this policy, and the White House’s hesitancy at the time of the Texas primary will allow Carter to use this issue, to raise, at least tacitly, the question of Ford’s own leadership ability in foreign affairs.

Therefore, politics as well as the merits of the African policy favor a major repeal effort in the Congress this fall. A serious lobbying effort can be successful. There is a new awareness of where long-term American interests really lie, even among the steel companies who are beginning to see the handwriting on the wall for the Smith regime. The large Democratic majorities will realize that, in light of their platform and other statements of policy, they have a major stake in a successful attempt at repeal.

Repeal of the Byrd Amendment this fall would be to the President’s political advantage since it would be a clear example of forceful and determined leadership on the part of his Administration. It would also tend to rebut Carter’s argument that the nation needs a Congress and a President of the same party (see point 7, *supra*).

16. *Cyprus*—The current stalemate offers Carter an opportunity to charge a lack of effective leadership on the part of the Administration. While he is severely limited in offering specific alternatives, he can at

⁶ See footnote 9, Document 49.

tempt to attract the support of AHEPA, other interested Greek Americans, and the liberal community at large, by reminding those groups of Administration insensitivity to their concerns at the outset of the crisis. We can expect that Carter will downplay the complexity of the Cyprus situation, and use the issue mostly as an example of Administration failure to press aggressively for a solution which is based on American interests and fundamental human rights.

The Cyprus issue need not be a political liability for the Administration. For this to be the case, the Administration must signal to the American People that the Greeks and Turks are currently negotiating in bad faith. Few realize the extent of the antagonism between the various groups in the dispute. The public impression that the missing factor necessary for a solution is a more determined American effort should be squelched as soon as possible. Strong statements by the Secretary or the President to this effect are overdue.

With regard to the DCA's with Greece and Turkey and the implications for NATO, the Administration must educate the American people to view the Cyprus situation from the perspective of our broader security interests. Carter, for all his talk of better cooperation with allies, will probably avoid mentioning the NATO implications of Cyprus; but the Administration should hit hard at this point. American interests in the southern flank of NATO must be brought more effectively to the public's attention—and the basic faults of Makarios, the Greeks, and the Turks should be exposed—so that any attempt by Carter to portray this problem as one of poor Greek Cypriot refugees suffering because of American recalcitrance can be effectively rebutted.

17. *Western Alliance*—Recent Bicentennial visits by political leaders of the Western Alliance and by Queen Elizabeth⁷ have reduced, if not eliminated, this issue. The best response to Carter comes from foreign leaders who note that relations between the U.S. and their country have never been better.

18. *Terrorism*—Republicans and Democrats are now rushing to embrace Israel following Entebbe.⁸ Of more importance is whether the Democrats will convince Americans that the Administration has talked much but done little to halt terrorism. It would be politically wise to preempt Carter in proposing international action against terrorists.

Conclusion

As you know, the public opinion polls show Carter with the largest lead in the history of public opinion polling for this stage of a

⁷ Queen Elizabeth II paid a State visit to the United States July 6–9.

⁸ The reference is to the Israeli commando raid mounted to free hostages held at Entebbe airport in Uganda July 3–4.

Presidential campaign. While we can expect erosion in this lead, there is still every reason to view Carter as the strong favorite to win the election in November. This has an important ramification for present U.S. foreign policy and the role that the Secretary can play in the fall campaign. On the one hand if the Republicans are to remain in office it is important for every member of the Ford Administration to vigorously attack Carter and to emphasize differences between the Ford record and what Carter proposes. On the other hand, so long as the polls favor Carter the Secretary dramatically weakens his ability to conduct United States policy by emphasizing differences between Ford and Carter on foreign policy. So long as other governments expect a change of Administrations in January, they will be reluctant to deal with a lame duck Secretary unless they perceive his foreign policy to be bipartisan in nature. This places the Secretary in a dilemma. It is necessary for him to act the partisan in order for Ford to be reelected, but it is also important to preserve his influence with other governments by appearing non-partisan. The course that the Secretary eventually charts between these conflicting demands will have an important effect on his relationship with the White House over the next few months and, of course, on the election.

We believe that the conflicting demands of partisanship and non-partisanship on the Secretary can best be met by an activist approach to foreign policy in the Fall. Campaigns have not traditionally been a good time for substantive accomplishment, but this campaign is significantly different. Present U.S. policy toward the major unresolved issues i.e., SALT, Middle East, and Southern Africa is virtually unchallenged. The reason for this is that Carter has not found a significant body of dissent to those policies. Since apparently present policy is approximately what the American people want, it makes good political sense to give them more of the same and in the process reduce Carter to "me tooism."

This will be a more pleasant way of spending the Fall months than bickering with an increasingly nervous White House over the Secretary's level of partisanship.

82. Briefing Memorandum From the Director of the Policy Planning Staff (Lord) to Secretary of State Kissinger¹

Washington, September 1, 1976.

Latin America: A Deceptive Calm?

This has been a good year in our relations with Latin America. Your two trips²—which included stops in no less than 10 countries—revealed impressive reservoirs of warmth and potential for cooperation. Above all, they confirmed your sense and ours that most problems in this hemisphere can be solved to mutual advantage.

The problems are many, however. And new issues arise constantly, sometimes endangering earlier progress. This memorandum assesses the general state of relations on the eve of your various encounters with Latin American officials and Foreign Ministers this fall.

The US in Ascendance

Recent events suggest that US prestige is again rising in Latin America:

- the Santiago OASGA³ went very well for us;
- official relations with major countries have improved noticeably; and
- except for parts of the Caribbean, anti-American posturings—and with them the Cubans—seem to have lost most of their appeal.

These developments reflect a basic trend toward economic and political conservatism. Latin Americans are increasingly sensitive to the need for good relations with the United States.

—The emergence of a new economic climate has been reported by sources as diverse as *Business Week* (which published a Special Report August 9 recounting growing opportunities for US firms in Latin America) and Sam Lewis and Charles Frank⁴ (who found a growing mood of pragmatism and a desire to play down ideology—particularly in contrast to the 1974 policy planning talks).

¹ Source: National Archives, RG 59, Policy Planning Council (S/PC), Policy Planning Staff (S/P), Director's Files (Winston Lord) 1969–77, Lot 77D112, Box 361, SEPT 1–15 1976. Confidential. Drafted by Luigi Einaudi (S/P) on August 31.

² Kissinger's first 1976 trip to Latin America, February 16–24, took him to Venezuela, Peru, Brazil, Colombia, Costa Rica, and Guatemala. His February 17 speech in Macuto, Venezuela, in which he summarized the state of U.S.-Latin American relations, is printed in Department of State *Bulletin*, March 15, 1976, pp. 313–321. On his next visit, June 6–13, Kissinger made stops in the Dominican Republic, Bolivia, Chile, and Mexico.

³ Held June 7–9.

⁴ Member of the Policy Planning Staff, Department of State.

—Politically, governmental changes in Argentina and Peru have accentuated a general swing to the right. The failure of the left has reduced the appeal of radical solutions and enhanced predispositions to cooperate with the United States.

The Role of Foreign Policy

This changed environment is due fundamentally to the renewed vigor of the US economy and to Latin America's inability to find acceptable substitutes for US enterprise and technology either domestically or from third parties. But our policies have helped. We have shown new flexibility toward Latin America recently on three levels:

—Bilaterally, we have made special efforts to reach mutual accommodations without attempting to dictate the domestic policies of the countries concerned. Our commitment to conciliation has been demonstrated by our acceptance of the legitimacy of Latin America's governments—even in the face of challenges to US interests that in the past might have provoked confrontation or even direct intervention. Our pragmatism in dealing with Venezuela's iron and oil nationalizations and our efforts to resolve the Marcona expropriation in Peru have demonstrated that investment disputes need not entail irreconcilable conflicts. These policies have contributed decisively to more favorable Latin American attitudes toward private investment and to a lessening of quasi-Marxist ideological preoccupations.

—Regionally, we have reaffirmed our commitment to the OAS, and to efforts to make it more responsive to Latin American concerns. In joining a majority move to end mandatory OAS sanctions against Cuba, we did more than remove a source of multilateral tension and shift attention to Cuba's own behavior as the reason for its continuing isolation. We also made clear our interest in the survival of the OAS and the Rio Treaty⁵ as instruments of inter-American cooperation. In Santiago, you supported the contributions of the OAS to the protection of human rights and to regional peace, and committed us to a Special General Assembly next year on cooperation for development.

—Globally, we have shown growing awareness of North-South concerns. Discussions of commodities, trade, debt and technology in the UN, UNCTAD and CIEC have had positive reverberations on bilateral relations and on the elaboration of possible regional initiatives through the OAS, ECLA and the IDB.

This record is based on gradual case-by-case progress, with no sweeping new programs or attempts to force countries into a single mold. Though inherently difficult to articulate in inspiring terms, such

⁵ See footnote 10, Document 28.

a pattern of pragmatic adjustment is congruent both with our limitations and Latin America's. Moreover, if we can sustain this approach and avoid major mistakes for a few more years, Latin America's growth may be sufficient to facilitate more constructive and balanced relations in the future.

Problem Areas

Some observers believe, however, that we may be on the verge of a new period of recriminations and mutual alienation. Their chief fear is that the implacable campaign now underway in South America to eradicate terrorism will provoke equally rigid American reactions in defense of human rights. The powerful emotions and frustrations thus unleashed on both sides, they argue, will inexorably destroy the gains of the past year and create fresh obstacles to cooperation for years to come.

Latin American conditions have always tended to elicit cataclysmic visions—and agonized responses—from American observers. Nonetheless, three problem areas seem particularly significant:

- limitations in our capacity to muster the resources to take advantage of our increased opportunities for cooperation;

- weaknesses in Latin America's capacity to respond constructively; and

- the disruptive potential of the human rights issue.

Of the three, the human rights issue is the most delicate, for it could bring out the worst aspects of our other difficulties.

Our limitations are substantial. Domestic political and economic conditions severely constrain our flexibility on investment disputes and access to markets. We have made—and can continue to make—piecemeal progress. Executive branch efforts have softened potential conflicts over trade with Brazil and Colombia, and investments with Venezuela and Peru. But the underlying problems remain, and increasingly affect our relationships even with Mexico. We cannot get Congress to make Venezuela and Ecuador eligible for GSP—let alone meet the desires of those Latin Americans who seek new regional trade preferences. Nor have we been responsive to advocates of the development of assistance, trading, and investment relations free from the threat of sanctions or countervailing actions.

Even if we could, it would probably be unwise to support the utopian preconceptions behind the legalisms of "collective economic security", Echeverria's Charter of Economic Rights and Duties of States,⁶ or

⁶ See footnote 5, Document 17. The Charter of Economic Rights and Duties of States was adopted by the U.N. General Assembly (Resolution 3281 (XXIX)), December 12, 1974. For the text of the Charter, see *Yearbook of the United Nations*, 1974, pp. 403–407.

the UNCTAD Code of Conduct for Technology Transfer. But the difficulties we have had in developing your own insights on science and technology suggest a deeper lack of practical flexibility in implementing even moderate and pragmatic initiatives for coping with the economics of interdependence. Meanwhile, our traditional bilateral economic and military assistance programs are increasingly meager and irrelevant to Latin American needs.

Latin America's weaknesses are just as apparent. Most hemisphere governments are so beset with immediate domestic problems that few real energies remain for anything else. Despite continuing institutional and economic growth, elite disorganization and popular pressures have created an underlying crisis of legitimacy and authority—in apparently stable countries like Mexico as well as in more obviously troubled countries such as Argentina, Uruguay and now Peru. The great dilemmas—migration and population growth, income maldistribution, unfavorable terms of trade and investment—regularly take a back seat to mundane emergencies over public services, gasoline prices and obtaining the (mostly private) loans to meet growing import bills.

Not surprisingly, therefore, the region's foreign affairs—always ambiguous in recent years—seem more difficult to categorize than ever. Everyone favors economic integration, but the Andean Pact⁷ falters. SELA is virtually still-born, leading everyone to agree that the OAS must survive, but no one is sure how to reform it. Sub-regional tensions—over the future of the Caribbean and of Cuba's role in it, over Bolivia's outlet to the sea or Belize's independence, between military governments and the few persisting democracies—fester, but never seem to produce a major crisis. Even Puerto Rico is becoming a long-term question mark.

Extra-hemispheric relationships are similarly in flux. The EEC discriminates economically—but, like Japan, is an increasingly important trading partner. Seen up close, other parts of the Third World seem backward—but not entirely impotent as allies. The Soviet Union remains a source of danger—but offers occasional benefits. Only China seems rather absent.

The one important generalization about the region's foreign affairs, then, is the one made earlier: most of its governments actively desire improved relations with the United States. And their new pragmatism may actually test our capacity for responsiveness more than did their previous unmeetable demands. Despite the difficulties, therefore, there is reason for optimism. The real short-term danger points are only two: Panama and human rights. Little need be said about the Canal

⁷ See footnote 5, Document 63. The Andean Pact expanded its membership with the addition of Venezuela in 1973, but Chile withdrew as a member state in 1976.

question: a failure to begin to conclude a new treaty relatively soon could severely damage inter-American relations. Human rights may be even less controllable.

The Human Rights Challenge

The tendency in several South American countries to fight terror with terror has led to a rash of killings, disappearances, and similar acts against “subversives”. Some of these acts are provoked by genuine threats, some are not. Some are officially sanctioned, some not. The distinctions are typically difficult. It is clear, however, that most of those targeted and hit are not terrorists.

In Argentina, the new storm center, a conservative military government is attempting to reestablish order after a period of uncontrolled proliferation of terrorist and counter-terrorist armies. International acceptance of the legitimacy of its efforts has been severely damaged by reports of indiscriminate “counter-terrorist operations”, some of which have been carried out with anti-Semitic fury by defiant local Nazis, apparently with police connections and even some official tolerance.

The resulting climate of insecurity and outrage—more abuses are to come—could wreak havoc on attempts to consolidate improved relations, not just with Argentina, but throughout Latin America. “Operation Condor”, the semi-secret, officially coordinated counter-terrorism effort involves five countries in addition to Argentina: Chile, Uruguay, Paraguay, Bolivia, and, significantly, Brazil. Because the governments concerned are all military-dominated and hence by definition illegitimate in some eyes, the human rights issue is stimulating a quasi-ideological reaction against “reactionary military dictatorships” and even against Latin America as a whole.

The result is that we are and will continue to be faced with a resurgence of paternalism and anti-militarism in American attitudes toward Latin America, combined with neo-isolationist anger at Latin America’s failure to follow a course more compatible with American ideals. In fact, the combined force of cultural attitudes, Congressional pressures, and bureaucratic habits are already pushing us toward general condemnations and denials of multilateral as well as bilateral assistance. The harbinger is clearly present in the Harkin Amendment, which requires us to vote against IDB loans to countries where there is a “consistent pattern of gross violations” of a long list of human rights.⁸ Furthermore, the only exception allowable under Harkin, that “such assistance directly benefit the needy”, reveals assumptions about the

⁸ The 1975 Harkin amendment, sponsored by Representative Tom Harkin (D-Iowa), revised the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961.

nature of Latin America and of politics in general that will rarely prove congruent with the requirements of relations with the increasingly complex societies and governments to our South.

Does it Matter?

Would even a worst-case scenario—in which some if not most Latin American countries wound up in defiant confrontation with the international community—make any measurable difference to the United States?

The answer, unfortunately, is yes. If South America were to become isolated, it would be heavily at our expense, morally and politically. The swing of the pendulum to the political right in Latin America—even the counter-terrorism campaigns in the Southern Cone—are being justified partly in the name of the West in general, and of the United States in particular. The failures that could lead to international opprobrium—and internal radicalization—would be listed—however unfairly—as *our* failures. And in the meantime, other powers with fewer inhibitions would position themselves to advantage. The Soviet Union has kept a low profile in Latin America recently, but its willingness to heavily subsidize military sales to Peru demonstrates its capacity to take advantage of our inflexibilities.

Furthermore, because we and the Latin Americans both stand to lose a great deal economically as well as politically, alienated interdependence is ultimately more likely than complete isolation. US direct investment is substantial. The exposure of commercial banks is even greater. Private efforts to salvage these economic interests would predictably outlast public patience, thereby just as predictably stimulating political controversies of the kind that already dog us with South Africa.

There is a more immediate problem as well: the human rights issue threatens to subject most if not all our bilateral and multilateral relations to unenforceable standards. We have been through this before—on both economic and military assistance. The pattern is now being repeated on Human Rights. Our inability to explain or control Latin American conditions leads first to criticism of the executive, then to Congressional restrictions, and finally to an apparent US unwillingness to cooperate.

It is difficult to escape the conclusion that the stakes are sufficient to warrant concern, and that some sort of continuing engagement is inevitable.

What Can we Do About It?

To argue that our relationships with Latin America are too manifold and intimate to escape is of course nothing new. It is in many ways

what you have yourself been arguing for three years: we need new ways to manage our interdependence, in this hemisphere as elsewhere. And the agenda is so vast that no single problem should be allowed to dominate relations, just as no single policy formula can encompass the full range of relations between the US and the varied societies of Latin America.

The limits on our flexibility are increasingly clear, however. There is precious little constituency in Congress for political realism towards Latin America. Support for even modest military programs has been dwindling steadily. And unless conditions improve noticeably in Argentina and Chile, nothing we can say will turn Congress around on human rights. Chile is not Iran or Korea—witness the unusual ban on even commercial arms sales.

This paper cannot attempt to lay out a detailed strategy on the human rights issue. But the basic requirement seems clear. Faced with the intractable realities of human rights, we have little choice but to develop forms of engagement that tolerate both cooperation and criticism. At Tlatelolco, faced with Latin American complaints about “US economic sanctions”, you responded that such measures could be overcome only through development of more cooperative and mutually responsive relations: new “rules of the game”.⁹ The New Dialogue demonstrated the difficulty of arriving at abstract rules.¹⁰ But the course of our relations since then also suggests that accommodations can frequently be worked out in practice. To do so we will need to demonstrate:

—to the American public and Congress, that the US government considers human rights one of several interests we seek to promote with balance and vision—but that it would be self-defeating to allow it to override all others; and

—to Latin America, that our commitments are practical and not abstract, that they involve cooperation as well as preaching.

Your two Latin American trips this year have set forth the elements of such a policy—of cooperation for development as well as for security, to advance human rights as well as economic progress. To lessen the disruptive impact of the growing storm over human rights, we will need to articulate this approach more fully in *all* of its dimensions. By showing sympathy for the victims and giving practical support to institutions that promote human dignity and the rule of law, we

⁹ In Kissinger’s February 21, 1974, address to the Tlatelolco Conference of Latin American Foreign Ministers in Mexico City (see Document 28), he elaborated on his idea of a “New Dialogue” between the United States and Latin America, which he first put forward in 1973 (see footnote 1, Document 18).

¹⁰ See Document 63.

can make clear our rejection of acts contrary to civilized values. By expanding trade and increasing the flow of technology and people—and working pragmatically to resolve the problems they create—we can increase mutually profitable cooperation and perhaps even alleviate some of the insecurities and poverty that contribute to abuses. We can do little more—and should probably do no less.

Two and a half years ago, on the eve of Tlatelolco, Mexican Foreign Minister Rabasa urged that the most important single thing you could do would be to declare publicly that there would be “No More Santo Domingos”. Today, after new “revelations” about Chile (and the CIA in general), some Latin Americans still talk about US “destabilization” plots. But those who take such talk seriously are probably fewer today than at any time since the early 1950’s. We have in fact succeeded in demonstrating our commitment to mutual accommodation rather than unilateral intervention.

It was thus not accidental that human rights could be discussed constructively at the OASGA. Because we had quieted fears of intervention, we could afford to make our views on human rights known. We can continue to do so, so long as we distinguish among conditions, countries and policy instruments, using more discrimination, specificity and perhaps even compassion than either we or Congress have routinely shown in the past.

The executive, not Congress, should set policy on human rights. Latin American governments should be made aware that we do not condone certain practices even if we cannot force their complete control or elimination. And Congress should be reminded that we have important national interests to promote in addition to human rights, that attempts to enforce explicit standards on other societies frequently have undesirable side effects, even that the visa, immigration and refugee policies Congress largely controls sometimes set a poor example of openness and respect for political rights. The watchwords are similar for both audiences: cooperation, not imposition or withdrawal; discrimination, not frustrated overreaction.

83. Memorandum of Conversation¹

Washington, October 3, 1976, 2:18–4:18 p.m.

PARTICIPANTS

President Ford

Dr. Henry A. Kissinger, Secretary of State

Brent Scowcroft, Assistant to the President for National Security Affairs

Kissinger: First, a few foreign policy things. I spoke to the editorial writers.² I needled Carter a bit. They asked me if I still believed there was no difference between the foreign policy views of the two candidates. I answered that. I said that when I said that, he had given one speech. Since then, he has displayed the full complexity of his thought! So now I wouldn't say that. Now Carter is going in several directions at once.

[Omitted here is discussion of the situations in the Middle East and Southern Africa.]

Kissinger: On the debate, you should not go on the defensive.

President: I have no intention of doing so.

Kissinger: He will say you are destroying the moral basis of our foreign policy.

President: I will say: What is more moral than peace? What is more moral than bringing peace in the Middle East? What is more moral than what we're doing in Southern Africa? There are about five things.

Kissinger: And what is more moral than bringing home 500,000 troops? The Democrats have gotten us into two wars.

President: I am well prepared on that.

Kissinger: He will hit also on secrecy. [Gives statistics on meetings.]

President: Good.

¹ Source: Ford Library, National Security Adviser, Memoranda of Conversations, 1973–1977, Box 21, Memoranda of Conversations—Ford Administration, October 3, 1976—Ford, Kissinger, Scowcroft. Secret; Nodis. All brackets, except those that indicate omitted material, are in the original. The purpose of the meeting, held in the Oval Office, was to discuss the upcoming foreign policy debate between Ford and Carter in San Francisco on October 6. An October 3 briefing paper produced by Eagleburger for the debate, outlining themes to be emphasized, Carter's anticipated statements on foreign policy issues, and suggested responses is in the Department of State, Files of Lawrence S. Eagleburger, Lot 84D204, Chron—October 1976. For the full transcript of the debate, see the *Public Papers: Ford, 1976–77*, Book III, pp. 2408–2436.

² For a transcript of Kissinger's October 2 interview with a panel at the meeting of the National Conference of Editorial Writers at Hilton Head, South Carolina, see Department of State *Bulletin*, November 1, 1976, pp. 541–554.

Kissinger: Another charge is that I am running foreign policy. The White House puts out that no, you overrule me frequently. That makes you look weak, as if we compete. You should look strong enough to have a strong Secretary of State. We are a partnership, with you making the decisions. We shape things in discussion—it is not a case of competing views.

Scowcroft: [Hands the President the 1974 Carter quote praising Kissinger.]

Kissinger: Carter said we were good friends and met frequently. I have met him twice in my life and once was a handshake at the Gridiron³ this year.

He will throw morality at you—using the State Department surveys⁴ I took. That is not true. We asked for criticisms and that is what we got. We asked what was wrong, not what was right. I told the editors that yesterday and got applause. It was a stupid way for us to go at it, but it shows our interest and a desire to get the views of the people.

Schlesinger is now with Carter.

Scowcroft: So says Dick Perle.⁵

Kissinger: When Schlesinger went to China,⁶ I told the Chinese that we didn't object to his going but not to use it for political purposes. The goddamned Chinese said we officially protested.

Carter might say, "Schlesinger says our relations with China are lousy." You could say it is based on the Shanghai Communiqué and if they have any complaints they should convey them to the United States Government, not to a private citizen. If he says the Chinese say we are weak on the Soviets, I would say China can't tell us how to conduct our policy just like the Soviets can't. The Chinese would like us to be in confrontation with the Soviet Union to take their chestnuts out of the fire.

³ The Gridiron Club, a prestigious Washington-based organization of political journalists, is noted for its annual dinner featuring remarks by the President and other prominent politicians.

⁴ Speaking before the Washington convention of the national Jewish organization, B'nai B'rith, September 8, Carter attacked the Ford administration human rights record, charging that the administration had placed power politics over human rights and had developed policies toward Eastern Europe, the Soviet Union, Chile, Cyprus, and South Korea with "insufficient emphasis on human liberties and 'basic American values.'" (Don Oberdorfer, "Carter Speaks on Human Rights," *Washington Post*, September 9, 1976, p. A8) Kissinger's reference to State Department "surveys" presumably refers to annual country human rights reports prepared by overseas posts. For more on the preparation of the 1976 reports, see *Foreign Relations, 1969–1976*, volume E-3, Documents on Global Issues, 1973–1976, Documents 257 and 258.

⁵ Richard Perle, staff aide to Senator Henry M. Jackson.

⁶ Schlesinger visited China at the invitation of Chinese officials September 6–23. (Telegram 217138 to Beijing, September 1; National Archives, RG 59, Central Foreign Policy File, D760332–0786)

I said yesterday to the editorial writers we have to preserve peace both by strength and by conciliation.

If he hits generally on being weak on the Soviets, point out his positions. He wants to cut the defense budget, prevent our giving military aid to Kenya and Zaire, withdraw from Korea, and let Communists into European governments.

I would say there have been two Democratic administrations since World War II and we have gotten into two wars; we've had two Republican Administrations and got into no war.

I honestly believe that is no accident. They extend our commitments and reduce our strength. Do you have these statements on Communists in Italy? I would not defend the soft on Soviets charge. I would attack him for making it.

[Discussion of Earl Butz]

Kissinger: [Gives the President the Keyes UPI ticker on secrecy⁷].

President: Let's call Schmidt [after seeing a vote projection].

Kissinger: Jack Valenti⁸ took some opinion polls and told Carter to stay away from me.

[Discussion of asking Carter to name his Secretary of State.]

Our Alliance relationships have never been better. There is not only official trust but close personal relations.

President: We have statistics showing the number of my meetings . . .

Kissinger: Okay, but I would say, "That really is not the central point. I challenge anyone to show that our relations in every aspect are not the best ever."

I spoke to a Frenchman who said it is amazing that that aristocrat Giscard could have such close affection for a mid-Westerner.

I would not even dignify it. I would say a man who could say this doesn't know what he is talking about.

[Discussion of Schlesinger]

What I would recommend after the election is that you unilaterally downgrade our representative in Taiwan to a Liaison Office but not make any deal at all and keep our defense relations.

You can be quite tough on the Chinese.

On the China-Taiwan issue, you can say we are moving toward normalization on the basis of the Shanghai Communiqué. The Shang-

⁷ Not further identified.

⁸ President of the Motion Picture Association of American and a former Special Assistant to President Lyndon B. Johnson from 1963 until 1966.

hai Communiqué sets out the goal but leaves the process to negotiations. We will continue toward normalization but the actual process is up to the negotiations, and I am not going to discuss it at this point.

He says we have departed from the moral basis of foreign policy. I would say we have restored the moral basis of our foreign policy. I would blast him on that.

If he raises the Sonnenfeldt Doctrine, I would say there is none.⁹ What we also say is: we encourage the greatest independence and freedom of action but do not encourage a revolution. We have not intervened before during revolutions. Does he want to encourage a revolution? You have taken the responsible course—Presidential visits and trade.

We won't imply there is possibility of revolution when three times in the past the Soviet Army marched in. Who would be willing to use United States troops for an issue like this?

The greatest possibility for freedom in Eastern Europe is an easing of tensions so they can maneuver. The worst situation for them is when the Soviet Army is on their necks. You visited three countries in Eastern Europe¹⁰ to symbolize our commitment to freedom in Eastern Europe. No Democratic President has ever been in Eastern Europe.

President: Didn't Kennedy go to Poland?

Kissinger: No, Nixon was the first, when he went to Romania.¹¹ I wouldn't just attack Carter. On foreign policy I would attack the Democrats also. Most Democrats agree our foreign policy is better.

Scowcroft: Isn't that dangerous?

⁹ See Documents 68 and 73. During a discussion of administration policy on Eastern Europe and the 1975 Helsinki agreement in the October 6 debate with Carter, Ford stated: "There is no Soviet domination of Eastern Europe, and there never will be under a Ford administration." When Max Frankel of the *New York Times* asked Ford if his comments meant that he believed "the Russians were not using Eastern Europe as their own sphere of influence and occupying most of the countries there and making sure with their troops that it's a Communist zone," Ford responded: "I don't believe, Mr. Frankel, that the Yugoslavians consider themselves dominated by the Soviet Union. I don't believe that the Romanians consider themselves dominated by the Soviet Union. I don't believe the Poles consider themselves dominated by the Soviet Union. Each of those countries is independent, autonomous; it has its own territorial integrity. And the United States does not concede that those countries are under the domination of the Soviet Union." (*Public Papers: Ford, 1976–77*, Book III, pp. 2416–2417) The resulting public controversy over Ford's remarks was discussed in an October 11 meeting among Ford, Kissinger, and Scowcroft. (Ford Library, National Security Adviser, Memoranda of Conversations, 1973–1977, Box 21, Memoranda of Conversations—Ford Administration, October 11, 1976—Ford, Kissinger)

¹⁰ See footnote 5, Document 80.

¹¹ See footnote 5, Document 80.

Kissinger: On domestic policy yes, foreign policy no. This is the man who wants to cut the budget, bring troops home and advocate revolution in Eastern Europe. This is the way to get us into war.

On Helsinki, the first point is there were 35 nations there, including the Vatican, not just the United States. Second, when he says it recognizes spheres of influence, it shows Carter doesn't know what he is talking about. Helsinki says nothing about the Soviet Union in Europe. It says that borders can't be changed by force, but only by peaceful means. To whose advantage is this? Ours or the Soviet Union's, with 70 divisions on the border? For the first time the Soviets have committed themselves to implementing human rights. They're not sticking to it right now but it gives us a standard to which we can hold them.

I am getting worked up. But this guy really burns me. He is a super liberal and now he is turning tough.

On grain, I don't like this answer [in Eagleburger's paper].¹²

Scowcroft: He said we messed up the grain deal in 1972. The implications are that he would use grain as a weapon.

You will get a question on an oil embargo.

President: I will say we don't expect one but we can work with them now to work it out, unlike 1973.

Kissinger: The first part is okay but on the second I would say we won't accept an embargo, but I won't telegraph what I would do. Our policy is designed to avoid an embargo, but we will certainly deal with it if it happens.

On nuclear proliferation, he again doesn't know what he is talking about. We organized the suppliers. You have a policy but you are waiting to announce it until you have coordinated with our allies. Carter would do it unilaterally and in fact against our allies.

If you win this one, the third debate won't matter.

On human rights: What has any Democratic Administration done for human rights and when? We have brought Jewish emigration from 400 in 1968 to 35,000 in 1973 until Congress interfered. There is a difference: We believe in action, not talk.

When he talks dictatorship, say it is easy to make declarations, but a President has the responsibility for the security of the United States and he must deal with the world as it is. It was the Democratic killing of Diem¹³ which got us sucked irrevocably into Vietnam. We are working

¹² See footnote 1 above.

¹³ South Vietnamese President Ngo Dinh Diem was assassinated November 2, 1963, during a military coup.

on a practical basis; what Carter proposes is either ineffective, dangerous or both.

On intelligence. He says people have been assassinated. I would say most of that was under the Democrats. Then I would say one of the most irresponsible things ever done to our intelligence was done by a Democratic Congress.

President: They have talked and done not a goddamned thing. I put in the changes.

Kissinger: I would say there was a reckless assault on intelligence by the Democratic Congress and you took responsible action.

President: Did you say all assassinations?

Scowcroft: Except for a little planning under Ike.

Kissinger: If they bring Chile into the assassination business I would say: read your own Church report.¹⁴

On the Middle East, I would say the Democrats had no relations with the key Arab states. We have restored the balance and you are certainly not going to play politics with so volatile and dangerous an area.

I don't have an Israeli policy. I have an American policy. Say Rabin said our relations are at their peak.

President: Can I say the key Arab states didn't have relations with us?

Kissinger: Absolutely. I wouldn't use the actual amount of aid except if he does, to show he doesn't know what he is talking about.

President: I feel good about this one.

Kissinger: Here you can refute you have no vision of the future. Say: I will bring peace.

On the Third World, I would start with the World Food Conference.

On Defense, I don't know what Schlesinger can have him do.

President: I am ready for him.

Scowcroft: Arms sales.

Kissinger: He is using the wrong figures. He is saying \$7.5 billion for the Saudis. Over \$6 billion of that is for barracks, etc. I would hit him on it.

The biggest sales go to Israel and Iran, two countries who have made a big contribution to stability in the Middle East.

What is the threat to Iran? The Soviet Union, Iraq. The threat to Iran is from countries we would also consider a threat. Iran refused to

¹⁴ See footnote 6, Document 66.

impose an embargo in 1973—even on Israel. Truman threatened the Soviet Union on Iran's behalf in 1946.

Giving arms doesn't get us involved; not giving them would get us involved because their weakness would invite aggression and we would have to go in to bail them out.

The third category of aid goes to countries like Kenya and Zaire who have Soviet-equipped neighbors.

Most of the aid goes to Israel, Iran, and Saudi Arabia—for infrastructure—leaving only bits and pieces for the rest of the world.

84. Interview With Secretary of State Kissinger¹

Washington, undated.

Q. A number of serious charges have been made against you, and the Times thought you should have the opportunity to answer them. The first charge is that in a solemn world you tried to be funny.

Secretary Kissinger: In this job you have only two choices: you are either funny deliberately or you are funny unintentionally.

Q. Are you in a lighthearted mood, or do you want to be serious?

Secretary Kissinger: Frankly, I am more serious.

Q. What does it add up to? What legacy have you left behind?

Secretary Kissinger: Well, I really do not know whether on my last day in office I am in the best position to evaluate. Just before I came here I wrote an article in which I said the world is bipolar militarily, multipolar politically, and fragmented economically. When you talk of world order now you have to take account of each of these realities and also the fact that probably history will record this as one of the philosophical revolutions of history.

In the nature of things, this task could not have been completed—even without Watergate. That is the basic thing. I think in one way or another the relationship between China, the Soviet Union, the indus-

¹ Source: Department of State *Bulletin*, February 7, 1977, pp. 102–107. All brackets are in the original. Kissinger was interviewed by James Reston, Hedrick Smith, and Bernard Gwertzman of the *New York Times*. The interview appeared in the *Times* on President Carter's inauguration day. ("Excerpts From Interview With Kissinger: Eight Years in Washington Evaluated," *New York Times*, January 20, 1977, p. 16)

trial democracies, the United States, and the developing world—this five-sided aspect—is a permanent feature of the future.

I think that in our relations with the industrial democracies, what I proposed in 1973 has been more or less accomplished. The method I chose as a formal declaration turned out not to be the right one, but the reality is that now the industrial democracies talk not just about their military security but their political and economic future has been achieved.

Now, this has to be strengthened, because if the cohesion can be increased, then both the dialogue with the East and the dialogue with the South can be conducted with enormous confidence.

We, the industrial democracies, transfer 90 percent of all the real resources that go to the developing world, so if we can develop a unified approach we, and only we, can make a significant contribution to development.

In the East-West dialogue I refuse to be mesmerized by Soviet strength. It is real, but there are also real weaknesses, and I think a combination of diplomacy, negotiation, and strength can keep this in check.

Q. When you look back on this do you look back with pride, with sadness, anger, or what?

Secretary Kissinger: Certainly not with anger. I look back with some pride.² I think if you compare the world report in 1969 with the world today, you must consider it more peaceful, more hopeful, and with more chance for progress. On the other hand, I look back with sadness because of the anguish that the country suffered during this period, the bitterness of the debate on Vietnam, in the disintegration of authority on the Watergate, the destruction of some people I knew, and in the sense of things that one would have liked to accomplish and didn't quite finish.

Q. What in particular?

Secretary Kissinger: Well, I would have liked to have finished the SALT [Strategic Arms Limitation Talks] agreement.

Q. Why wasn't it finished?

Secretary Kissinger: I think it was partly the other side, partly the election, and partly internal disputes within the Administration.

² In a separate article, January 20, Reston quoted Kissinger as stating that it was his "fate" to be in office "when the United States had found a new approach to its foreign policy, one that understood the world's currents and its number of complexities. The foreign policy that we inherited was the vestige of what was created in the 1940's, but which no longer corresponded to the realities of the situation in the late '60's." (James Reston, "Kissinger Looks Back on 8 Years And Expresses Pride in Record," *ibid.*, January 20, 1976, pp. 1, 16)

Q. How do you feel about the future of Western civilization?

Secretary Kissinger: I think the West has material strength to deal with all of its problems. It has the resources to deal with a North-South dialogue; it has the capacity, militarily, to prevent aggression; and it has the ability to conduct an effective diplomacy. What it needs is imagination, dedication, and a view of the future. I believe that is attainable.

Q. Do you think the prospects are better now than they were two years ago?

Secretary Kissinger: Yes, because we have gotten through Watergate and because we have made great progress in strengthening the dialogue with the industrial democracies, because unless the free peoples live together, we will not be able to solve either the East-West or North-South problem.

Q. When you look back, what are the four or five moments that you think about with most pride? Are there some things that come to your mind immediately?

Secretary Kissinger: Of course landing in China was a tremendous experience. When Le Duc Tho put on the table the proposal which I knew would end the Vietnamese war, that was a tremendous feeling because I thought, not knowing that Watergate was coming, that it would unify the American people again, which, if you look at my press briefings between 1969 and 1973, was my overwhelming concern; the SALT agreement; the signing of the Shanghai communiqué; the first disengagement agreement between the Egyptians and Israel; and strangely enough, the first Rambouillet summit, because it meant that at least we were beginning to pull the industrial democracies together. Finally, I was terribly moved when President Kaunda got up at the end of my Lusaka speech and embraced me. I thought that was a moving occasion.

Q. The African diplomacy that you put so much effort into last year, has it sort of stalled and fizzled out because of the elections?

Secretary Kissinger: Well, I think the elections slowed it down because all of the participants are waiting to see what the new Administration is going to do and to see whether the terms of reference can be changed. But I think once Smith [Ian D. Smith, of Rhodesia] made his basic speech the course was set for settlement.

I cannot tell you what the exact terms will be, but those are not as fundamental as the fact that Smith is committed to majority rule.

Q. What were your nightmares during this period?

Secretary Kissinger: One nightmare that I am sure my successors will have as well is to make sure that some crisis does not escalate into nuclear war and that unthinkingly we contribute to a massive conflagration.

The second nightmare was that the Vietnam war would so split our country that reconciliation would be totally impossible. That was immediately followed by the nightmare of preventing the collapse of executive authority from leading to foreign challenge, of managing a major crisis in the Middle East when our own executive authority was under assault.

In the last period my nightmare was that America might become so absorbed with itself and so purist and so critical of itself that it would forget that it is the key element for security, progress, and freedom in the world. I think all of these nightmares are on the way to being solved.

Q. And the agenda for the rest of 1977?

Secretary Kissinger: I think for 1977 we have some rather positive prospects. I think in 1977 a SALT agreement ought to be attainable. The objective conditions for making progress in the Middle East are better than they have been probably at any time since the creation of Israel.

I do not want to put my successor on the spot by pretending it will be easy. It will be a murderously difficult, complicated effort. All I am saying is the conditions exist for a heroic effort.

I think we can make a breakthrough on law of the seas this year. I think we have already made major progress, and we can consolidate and extend it, on nonproliferation. I think we can carry the Rhodesian and Namibian matters to a conclusion this year. I do not see any overwhelming crises in 1977 unless things in Africa get totally out of control, but I don't really expect that.

Q. Panama?

Secretary Kissinger: Panama is another matter that I think will be settled this year.

Q. You were talking earlier about getting together with the industrial democracies. What about energy supplies and our relations particularly with the Arab world? We have a respite for six months because of the Saudi decision on prices, but we really have not settled that problem.³

Secretary Kissinger: On energy we created the International Energy Agency, which I believe is an extremely useful institution. We have worked out within it a common policy to prevent selective embargoes and to obligate industrial democracies to support each other. It has a good program for developing alternative sources and for conservation. The missing link has been the refusal of the United States to implement what this program foresees in the area of alternative sources,

³ At the meeting of OPEC Oil Ministers in Doha December 15–17, 1976, Saudi Arabia and the United Arab Emirates refused to go along with the decision to raise oil prices.

of conservation, and since we consume 40 percent of the energy of the industrial democracies we can write whatever plan we want, but unless we implement it, it will not really help.

We must work to prevent a situation from continuing where every six months or a year the West waits impotently while a group of nations that do not have identical interests decides about its economic future.

We got through the last OPEC [Organization of Petroleum Exporting Countries] meeting, but unless we have changed the objective conditions in which energy is being dealt with, we will face the same problem again. The key is for the nations that are assembled in the International Energy Agency to develop a major program of alternative sources, a significant program of conservation, and to use all other political tools to encourage restraint among the oil producers. Otherwise, as you look four or five years ahead, it is frivolous to assume that sometimes decisions will not be taken that could be potentially catastrophic for our economy.

We were lucky this year, or skillful or able, but you cannot do it every year.

Q. Would you agree that until very recently the perception of other countries, particularly in the Third World, was that this country and its leadership did not care much about their problems?

Secretary Kissinger: It is forgotten today that until the end of 1972 we were heavily preoccupied with the war in Vietnam and with the relationships it took to extricate ourselves. For example—putting aside the Third World for a moment—we could not really make great progress in relations with Western Europe as long as in every Western European country the issue of Vietnam was an inhibition to closer relations with the United States. So the war had to be ended first. I think it is true that until 1973 we did not give it systematic major attention.

From the end of 1973 on, and in the last three years, I think the Third World has been a focal point, and if you look at the agenda of these discussions in food, in financing, and in the development and the transfer of technology, the entire international agenda was put forward by us. There is almost no other agenda.

Q. Is there any validity to the argument that essentially what this record is that you have left here is essentially a brilliant negotiating record, tactically very good but strategically weak?

Secretary Kissinger: Well, I am not the best judge of this; but I have to say that I pass on a world that is at peace, more at peace than in any previous transition, in which, in addition, in every problem area solutions can be foreseen even if they have not been fully achieved and the framework for solutions exist, in which the agenda of most interna-

tional negotiations was put forward by the United States. Therefore it cannot be entirely an accident, and it cannot be a series of tactical improvisations.

I think it would be more useful to debate the nature of the design than to deny that there has been a design. The denial shows lack of understanding of the nature of foreign policy.

The surface expression of our Middle East policy was shuttle diplomacy, but the conditions that made shuttle diplomacy possible were created over four years of a rather painful accumulation of new answers. There may be some people who remember an interview I gave in 1970 in which I said what our strategy would be in the Middle East and people laughed about it.⁴ So I think there has been a design, and my associates will certainly confirm that whenever a problem came up we would spend hours here every morning before we went into any tactics trying to figure out where this thing should go. So I disagree with that.

We would almost never accept here a discussion of a tactical move without accompanying description of what the implications were over a considerable period of time.

When you take the Lusaka speech,⁵ we spent weeks here analyzing where we should try to go in Africa and how we could balance our concern for majority rule with our equally strong concern to prevent the radicalization of all of Africa, and it was not simply a tactical device to get through a few weeks' period. In fact there was no demand for it at all.

Q. On the strategic relations with the Russians and the Chinese, are they likely to come back together again? Is there something we have to worry about? Are there differences we can still exploit?

Secretary Kissinger: I think it is a mistake to define the Sino-Soviet relationships in terms of our exploiting their differences. Their differences came about without our comprehending it at the time. We did not create them; we cannot exploit them; we can only base our policy on the fact that China is doing us no favor, is not opposing Soviet hegemony as a favor to us; and therefore we have to understand the fundamental trends that affect these countries.

I believe it is important that the People's Republic of China continue to perceive us as interested in maintaining a world equilibrium. If they feel we have lost our interest in it or our comprehension of it or our willingness to preserve it, then they will draw the inevitable conclu-

⁴ Presumably a reference to Kissinger's interview with *Washington Post* reporters on December 17, 1970. See *Foreign Relations, 1969–1976*, volume I, Foundations of Foreign Policy, 1969–1972, Document 83.

⁵ Document 77.

sion, which will be to make whatever accommodation they can get, or they will try to find some other means of protection, such as organizing the Third World against both of us.

You can take either one of those courses. I believe that of course the Soviet Union is a superpower and as such impinges on us in many parts of the world. It is a growing military power that in many respects has the capacity to threaten our survival.

I believe, however, that the military problem is soluble. I believe the Soviet Union as a system is beset by tremendous weaknesses. There is no Communist state in the world that has managed to achieve spontaneous support of its population.

The states of Eastern Europe have to appeal to a sort of bourgeois nationalism to maintain a modicum of legitimacy; and to imagine that societies that are doing well in certain high-priority areas of military technical knowledge but that have never solved effectively the problem of distribution and of even simple administration, that those societies can launch themselves on an indeterminate course of world domination without grave hesitation, seems to me unrealistic.

Yes, we have to build up enough military forces to resist them, but we have to know what forces are relevant. I believe that to achieve a usable military superiority in the field of strategic nuclear weapons is extremely unlikely and relatively easy to prevent and the obsession with it detracts us. I would say that if there is a conflict between the Soviet Union and us, it is much less likely to occur as a result of a Soviet attack, deliberate attack, on a vital interest of the United States than as a result of a conflict that maybe neither of us saw, into which we are drawn through a series of escalating moves.

In other words, I think World War I is a better guide to our dangers than World War II.

Q. In retrospect, should we have gotten into major economic deals with the Russians?

Secretary Kissinger: The curious thing is that when we came in in 1969 we developed the theory of linkage. The theory of linkage was that the Soviet Union would get economic concessions in return for political stabilization. At that time we were criticized because we were told that we should simply go ahead with the economic programs because they were produced as political stabilizers.

Q. Is it possible for our people to achieve the kind of security that they would like to have without creating such a sense of insecurity in the minds of our adversaries as to be dangerous to the world?

Secretary Kissinger: I think it is the essence of the new circumstances I have described that no nation can achieve absolute security. Absolute security for one nation means absolute insecurity for all na-

tions. We have to be satisfied now with relative security, with security that makes it extremely improbable that our vital interests are threatened but still one that is not totally predominant in the world.

The first time we gave a credit to the Soviet Union was after the Berlin agreement of 1971, and I would say without exception all the economic agreements we made with the Soviet Union were parallel to some political agreement. All of our economic agreements were tied to specific projects. We did not give general unrestricted credit, and the total amount was something like \$400 million. As a result of our own domestic debate, in effect a freeze was put on this evolution. The truth of this has been that the Europeans and Japanese have given about \$10 billion of unrestricted credit to the Soviet Union.

The Europeans and Japanese are in a much worse situation than we to insist on a political quid pro quo, and I have always fully believed that economic programs allied to specific political foreign projects create the possibility first of making specific foreign policy agreements, and, secondly, creating incentives for cooperation, incentives for restraint.

If you think of some of these projects that would take 15 years to implement before there would be any return and if you think of the fact that in 15 years other powers would have risen that would take some of the load of containing the military threat, that is not something that one should simply ignore.

Q. What about a link with force reduction talks in Vienna?

Secretary Kissinger: Well, I do not want to prescribe to the new Administration what they should link it to, but they will find enough things to link it to if they analyze the situation. No, it is not dead, and I think Berlin should be actively pursued.

Q. If you were carrying on, is that something you would link, large-scale economic involvement, yourself?

Secretary Kissinger: I don't know whether I would link it above all the restraints in peripheral areas.

Q. "Absolute security for one nation is absolute insecurity for other nations." Would you use that principle in the Middle East as well as in a strategic relationship?

Secretary Kissinger: The problem in the Middle East is to balance physical security against legitimacy. There is no question that Israel's physical security is best guaranteed by the widest extension of its frontier and at no other point are they as physically secure as at the maximum point of their extension.

On the other hand, politically and in the long term, they may be militarily even less secure if they do not achieve legitimacy. Now, how to balance these factors is the dilemma of the Middle East settlement.

Q. How can our aid to Israel be balanced?

Secretary Kissinger: I believe that Israel must have a sense of security in the military field or it cannot negotiate effectively and we must not, in attempting to press for a settlement, break the spirit of Israel and its ability to defend itself.

Q. Let me ask you—I want to be personal because it is not just a tour of the horizon we are doing here, it is you who is leaving. What has this experience done to you?

Secretary Kissinger: It is going to be quite a sight when they carry me out at noon on the 20th, like Sewell Avery.⁶ That may be the only way they will get me out of here.

Q. Seriously, what did it do to you?

Secretary Kissinger: Again, I am sure I will be more thoughtful about that two months from now than now. I have said repeatedly, maybe too often in recent days, that the quality that most outsiders do not understand is the athletic aspect of decision-making so that you really have to react in very short timeframes that do not permit time for reflection.

I think I have developed great compassion for my successors. I do not think you can leave this office—before I came to Washington I thought it was very thrilling to be called down here as a consultant and I thought it was important for me to pick on the incumbents and for all I know I may wind up doing that. I have my doubts now on the utility of outsiders—I am sure I will do my utmost to avoid volunteering advice to my successors.

I really think what this country needs now is a period of tranquility and confidence and that those of us who have seen this process have an obligation to help build that confidence. That is what I would most like to do.

⁶Sewell Avery, a former president of the Montgomery Ward department store chain. Kissinger's reference is to Avery's refusal in 1944 to comply with National War Labor Board unionization guidelines, resulting in his bodily removal from his office by National Guardsmen.

Index

References are to document numbers

- Abrams, Gen. Creighton W., 29
Acheson, Dean, 16, 24
Africa (*see also* Angola):
 As U.S. election issue, 81, 84
 French aid proposal for, 80
 Kissinger's visits to, 77, 78
 Nixon Doctrine's effect on, 9
 Oil embargo, 22, 23
 Southern, 74, 77, 81
 Soviet role in, 74
 Transportation infrastructure
 development in, 77
 United States, relations with, 55
 Unity of, 77
 U.S. policy toward, 77
 U.S. support for self-determination
 in, 67, 74, 77
Agency for International Development
 (AID), 63
Agenda for the Americas, 28
Agendas for the future, 57, 59
Agnew, Spiro T., 11
Agreements, international:
 Antiballistic Missile (ABM) Treaty
 (1972), 36, 62, 69
 Egyptian-Israeli Disengagement
 Agreement (Jan. 1974), 25, 35, 84
 Egyptian-Israeli Disengagement
 Agreement (Sept. 1975), 63
 General Agreement on Tariffs and
 Trade (GATT), 32
 Helsinki Agreements (1975), 69, 83
 Jamaica Agreement (Jan. 1976), 80
 Kellogg-Briand Pact (1928), 56
 Munich Pact (1938), 71
 Nassau Agreement (1962), 23
 Nuclear Non-proliferation Treaty
 (NPT), 54
 On underground nuclear testing, 45
 On the Prevention of Nuclear War
 (1973), 14, 23
 Quadripartite Agreement on Berlin
 (1971), 7, 8, 62, 71, 80
 Rio Treaty (1947), 28, 82
 SALT I, 12, 13, 25, 26, 35, 84
 Syrian-Israeli Disengagement
 Agreement (May 1974), 30, 34, 35
 Agreements, international—*Continued*
 Treaty of Constantinople (1888), 33
 Treaty of Moscow (1970), 8
 U.S.-Soviet Incidents at Sea
 Agreement (1972), 35
 U.S.-Soviet Trade Agreement (1972),
 55
 Vladivostok Agreement (Nov. 1974),
 48, 50, 51, 55, 57, 61, 62, 76
Agricultural production, 26, 34
Agricultural protectionism, 8
Agriculture, U.S. Department of, 47
Ahern, Paul L., 81
Aiken, George D., 33, 36
Akalovsky, Alexander, 61
Albania, 10
Albert, Carl B., 33, 35
Aleksandrov-Argentov, Andrei M., 61
Algeria, 30, 33, 52
Allende Gossens, Salvador, 49
Alliances, U.S., 2
American community, 28
American Hellenic Educational
 Progressive Association (AHEPA),
 81
American Legion, 43
American Society of Newspaper
 Editors, 58
Amnesty for draft-resisters, 6
Andean Pact, 18, 63, 82
Andersen, Knud B., 23, 24
Anderson, Adm. George, 15
Anderson, Jack, 15
Anderson, John B., 52
Anderson, Robert, 42
Angola:
 As U.S. election issue, 81
 As U.S. national security issue, 66
 Cuban military intervention in, 64,
 66, 67, 72
 Implications for future U.S. foreign
 policy of, 67
 Soviet role in, 64, 66, 67, 72
 U.S. ban on covert support in, 64, 66,
 67
 U.S. objectives in, 67, 74

- Angola—*Continued*
U.S. response in, 70, 81
- Anti-Americanism:
In Europe, 29
In France, 30
In Japan, 29
In Latin America, 11, 13
- Anti-ballistic Missile (ABM) Treaty
(1972), 36, 62, 69
- Anti-ballistic missiles (ABMs), 36, 62, 69, 81
- Anti-war demonstrations, 12
- Apartheid, 77
- Apollo-Soyuz Test Project (ASTP), 59, 61, 62
- Arab-Israeli dispute, 22
- Arab League summit (Rabat, 1974)
- Arab-Israeli War (1973). *See* Yom Kippur War (1973).
- Arab League summit (Rabat, 1974), 53
- Arab oil embargo (*see also* Geneva Conference (1973); Middle East; October 1973 War):
African position, 22, 23
Congressional response to, 55
Energy conservation as affected by, 21, 23, 27
European/Japanese approach to, 22, 23
Israeli-U.S. relations and, 40
Lifting of, 25, 33
Saudi role in, 40, 52
Soviet position, 30
U.S. response to, 21
- Arab states, 30
- Arafat, Yassir, 30
- Arends, Leslie, 33
- Argentina, 30, 82
- Armocost, Michael, 58
- Arms control, 57, 59, 80
- Arms race, 46
- Arms sales, 49, 52, 81, 82, 83
- Armstrong, Anne L., 11, 20, 33
- Armstrong, Willis C., 4
- Ash, Roy L., 20, 39, 50
- Asia, 9, 65
- Assad, Hafez, 33, 35, 52, 53
- Assassinations, 83
- Associated Press, 8
- Association of Southeast Asian Nations (ASEAN), 65
- Atlantic Declaration (1974), 36, 80
- Atlantic partnership (*see also* Cooperation):
As U.S. election issue, 81
- Atlantic partnership (*see also* Cooperation)—*Continued*
Consultation, 46, 80
Détente and, 24, 36
East-West relations, 80
European unity and strains in, 8, 9
Necessity for, 24, 80
- Australia, 54, 55, 65
- Autarky, 28
- Avery, Sewell, 84
- Azores, 20
- Azorian project, 40
- Bahr, Egon, 23
- Balance of payments, 8, 36
- Balance of power, 9, 19, 78
- Ball, George W., 53
- Bangladesh, 15, 17
- Bargaining chip diplomacy, 81
- Baroody, William J., Jr., 20, 50
- Bartholomew, Reginald, 60, 74
- Beall, John G., 52
- Bedouins, 52
- Beef, 34
- Belgium, 30
- Belize, 82
- Bell, Alphonzo, 52
- Bellmon, Henry, 52
- Berger, Marilyn, 30
- Berger, Warren E., 16
- Berlin, 17, 20, 29, 35
Quadrupartite Agreement on, 7, 8, 62, 71, 80
- Bicentennial celebration, 57, 70, 71, 76
- Biester, Edward G., Jr., 49, 52
- Bingham, Jonathan B., 49
- Birth control, 32
- Black September, 4
- Blair, William M., 46
- B'nai B'rith, 83
- Boggs, Thomas Hale, 40
- Bogotá foreign ministers meeting (Nov. 1973), 28
- Bolivia, 63, 82
- Border change, 83
- Borg, Parker W., 49
- Boston World Affairs Council, 71
- Botswana, 77
- Boumediene, Houari, 32, 34
- Brademas, John, 53
- Bradlee, Benjamin, 30
- Brandt, Willy, 23, 30, 36, 46
- Bray, William G., 33
- Brazil, 26, 63, 82

- Bremer, L. Paul, 53
 Brennan, Peter J., 11, 20, 50
 Brezhnev, Leonid I.:
 Agreement on the Prevention of
 Nuclear War (1973), 14
 Détente, 61
 Ford's meeting with (Vladivostok,
 Nov. 1974), 48, 60, 62
 Ford's relationship with, 48
 Helsinki Summit, 61, 62
 Jackson-Vanik Amendment, 20
 Nixon's Moscow talks with, 35, 36
 Nixon's relationship with, 22, 29
 People's Republic of China military
 strength, 26
 Strategic Arms Limitation Talks, 26
 Succession issues, 10
 U.S. Middle East discussions with, 36,
 48
 U.S.-Soviet relations, 50
 Visits:
 United States (June 1973), 3, 10, 11,
 12, 14, 30, 33, 36
 United States (1975, proposed), 55,
 61
 Brimelow, Thomas, 23
 Brinegar, Claude S., 20, 50
 Brokaw, Thomas, 25, 66
 Brooke, Edward W., 33
 Broomfield, William S., 33
 Brown, Gen. George S., 38, 39, 40
 Bruce, David K.E.:
 Appointment as head of USLO in
 Beijing, 7
 Backchannel to White House for, 10
 Consultations with White House, 30
 Difficulties in foreign policy
 implementation, 53
 Nixon's talks with, 10
 Buchan, Alistair, 80
 Buchanan, John Hall, Jr., 49
 Buchen, Philip W., 50
 Bulgaria, 23, 68
 Bundy, McGeorge, 23, 48, 53
 Burch, Dean, 33
 Bureau of Inter-American Affairs, 18
 Burger, Warren E., 37
 Burke, Edmund, 78
 Burma, 54
 Bush, George H.W., 11, 20
Business Week, 50, 82
 Butz, Earl L.:
 Agricultural production, 26, 34
 Cabinet meetings, 11, 34, 50
 Butz, Earl L.—*Continued*
 Foreign policy issues for 1975, 50
 International Food Review Group, 47
 NSC system, 39
 Resignation of, 83
 Byrd, Harry F., Jr., 35
 Byrd Amendment (1971), 49, 77, 81
 Byrnes, James, 17

 Cabinet meetings, 11, 20, 34, 40, 50
 Callaghan, James, 77, 80
 Calvo, Carlos, 28
 Calvo doctrine, 28
 Cambodia:
 Communist victory in, 55
 DRV failure to withdraw from, 6, 11
 Mayaguez incident, 60
 Negotiated settlement in, 41
 Paris Peace Accords (1973), 1, 6
 United States, relations with, 15
 U.S. evacuation of, 55
 U.S. military assistance to, 52, 55
 U.S. military intervention in, 6, 26
 Vietnamese Democratic Republic
 hegemony over, 54
 Campbell, J. Phil, 20
 Canada, 23, 30, 62
 Caribbean, 20
 Caribbean Free Trade Area, 18
 Carlucci, Frank C., 11
 Carstens, Karl, 23
 Carter, Jimmy, 77, 81, 83, 84
 Case, Clifford P., 51
 Casey, William J., 4, 20
 Castro Ruz, Fidel, 60
 Ceausescu, Nicolae, 62
 Cederberg, Elford A., 33
 Center for the Study of Democratic
 Institutions, 19
 Central American Common Market, 18
 Central Intelligence Agency (CIA):
 Angola, 67
 Chilean role of, 82
 Congressional overseeing of, 53, 55,
 67
 Cyprus, 38
 NSC meetings, 26
 "Problem Issues on the International
 Scene" (paper), 38
 U.S.-Soviet relations, 38
 Vietnam War, 38
 Central Treaty Organization (CENTO),
 56
 Chaban-Delmas, Jacques, 23

- Chancellor, John, 66
Chapin, Dwight L., 42
Charter of the Economic Rights and Duties of States, 17, 28, 32, 82
Chauvinism, 46
Chemical warfare, 45
Cheney, Richard B., 75
Chicago Council of Foreign Relations, 76
Chicago Tribune, 69
Chile, 49, 63, 81, 82, 83
China, People's Republic of (*see also* Sino-Soviet dispute):
 As U.S. election issue, 81, 83
 Europe, relations with, 3
 Hegemony as seen by, 4
 India, relations with, 10
 Japan, relations with, 3, 10
 Kissinger's views on, 3, 15
 Latin America, relations with, 82
 Military strength of, 26
 NATO as seen by, 10, 29
 Nuclear weapons development, 36
 Soviet alliance with, possible, 26
 Soviet attack on, possible, 15
 Soviet-U.S. relations as affected by, 3, 72
 Succession issues, 3, 10
 United States, relations with:
 Establishment of, 7, 12, 35, 55, 65
 Ford's re-affirmation of, 41, 55
 In the early Cold War era, 9
 Kissinger's visits, 3, 84
 Maintenance of, 50, 60
 Nixon's approach to, 2, 9
 Republic of China's role in, 25, 50
 Sino-Soviet dispute and, 3, 10
 Turkish aid cut-off's effect on, 52
 U.S. leverage in, 52
 U.S. perspectives on, 17
 Vietnam War, 3, 26
 U.S. policy toward, 72
 Vietnam War role of, 29
China, Republic of:
 United States, relations with, 3, 26, 83
 U.S.-PRC relations, role in, 25, 50, 52, 54, 72
Chizuk Amuno Synagogue
 Distinguished Achievement Award, 78
Chou En-lai. *See* Zhou Enlai.
Christian A. Herter Memorial Award, 70
Chrome, 49, 77
Church Committee, 67
Church Report, 83
Churchill, Winston L.S., 27
Cienfuegos crisis (Aug. 1970), 2, 29, 36
Clark, Richard C., 64, 70
Clements, William P.:
 Cabinet meetings, 20
 Kissinger's trip to Moscow (Mar. 1974), 29
 NSC meetings, 26
 Presidential transition, 38, 40
Climate change, 32
Cochran, William Thad, 52
Code of Conduct for Technology Transfer, 82
Coexistence, 17, 19
Cohen, William S., 52
Colby, William E.:
 Allende's overthrow, 49
 Hughes Glomar Explorer mission, 40
 Kissinger's meetings with, 25, 30
 NSC meetings, 26
 NSC system, 39
 Presidential transition, 39, 40
 Special Actions Group meeting, 38
Cold War, 9
Cole, Kenneth R., Jr., 20
Collective defense, 80
Colombia, 63, 82
Colorado River salinity dispute, 28
Colson, Charles W., 1, 52
Committee for a Free China, 26
Commodities, 32, 44
Common law, English, 80
Communications, 32
Communism's weaknesses, 46
Community, 17
Competition, 23, 25, 45, 46
Conable, Barber B., Jr., 52
Conference for Security and Cooperation in Europe (CSCE):
 Agreement for holding of, 54
 European position, 23, 36
 Final Act, 62
 Ford's participation in, 60, 62
 Soviet position, 36
 U.S. position, 45
Conference of Tlatelolco (Mar. 1974), 28, 33, 63, 82
Conference on International Economic Cooperation (CIEC), 71, 79, 80, 82
Congo, Democratic Republic of, 17

- Congo, Republic of (Brazzaville), 67
- Congress, Acts of (*see also* Jackson-Vanik Amendment):
- Agricultural Trade Development and Assistance Act (1954), 59
 - Byrd Amendment (1971), 49, 77, 81
 - Case Act (1972), 51
 - Defense Appropriations Act (1976), 64, 66
 - Foreign aid bill (1974–1975), 49
 - Foreign Assistance Act (1961), 28, 52
 - Foreign Assistance Bill 65–34, 4
 - Foreign Military Sales Act, 52
 - Gonzales Amendment (1972), 28
 - Harkin Amendment, 82
 - Hickenlooper Amendment (1961), 28
 - Mansfield-Scott bill, 55
 - Military Procurement Act (1971), 49
 - P.L. 93–448, 52
 - P.L. 95–12, 77
 - Ryan Amendment, 53
 - Tonkin Gulf Resolution (1964), 54
 - Trade Act (1974), 5, 19, 31, 50, 52, 55, 61
 - Trade Reform Bill (1973), 8, 19, 31
 - War Powers Resolution (1973), 51
- Congress, U.S.:
- Arab oil embargo, 55
 - CIA oversight by, 53, 55, 67
 - Cyprus action by, 52, 53, 55, 66
 - Defense budget, 2, 26
 - Détente, 52, 70
 - Energy conservation and development, 55
 - Ford's meetings with leaders of, 22, 33, 57
 - Ford's relations with, 66
 - Ford's speeches to joint session, 48, 55, 58
 - Foreign policy role of, 58
 - Generalized System of Preferences (GSP) eligibility, 82
 - Intelligence services as monitored by, 53, 55, 67
 - Inter-American dispute resolution, 28
 - Isolationism in, 13
 - Kissinger's meetings with leaders of, 22, 33, 49
 - Nixon's meetings with leaders of, 22, 33, 36
 - Nixon's messages to, 5, 9
 - Panama Canal Treaty, 75
 - Presidential foreign policy decisions restricted by, 51
- Congress, U.S.—*Continued*
- Rogers's Annual Reports on U.S. Foreign Policy, 7
 - Southern Africa, 74
 - Wednesday Group, 52
 - White House relations with, 1, 66, 81
- Connally, John, 40
- Consensus, 9, 19
- Consultation, 46
- Cooperation (*see also* Atlantic partnership; Détente):
- As step toward détente, 17
 - Competition and, in détente, 45, 46
 - Economic, 51
 - Era of, 35
 - On food and energy issues, 36, 44
 - UNCTAD IV conference proposals on, 78, 79
 - White House-Congressional, 81
- Copenhagen summit (Dec. 1973), 29, 30
- Copper, 77
- Corn, 34, 46
- Costa Rica, 82
- Coughlin, Robert L., 52
- Council of Economic Advisors (CEA), 47
- Council of International Economic Policy (CIEP), 5, 47
- Council of the Americas, 13
- Couve de Murville, Maurice, 78
- Covert actions, 53
- Cranston, Alan, 49
- Creditor clubs, 79
- Cromer, Lord, 23
- Crosland, Anthony, 80
- Cuba:
- Angolan intervention by, 64, 66, 67, 72
 - As U.S. election issue, 75, 81
 - Canadian trade with, 30
 - Cienfuegos crisis (Aug. 1970), 2, 29, 36
 - Economic sanctions against, 82
 - Reagan's charges of U.S. weakness in, 75
 - Southern African role of, 74
 - Soviet-U.S. relations and, 29
 - U.S.-Latin American relations as affected by, 60, 63
 - Weapons training for Peru, 49
- Cuba, José de, 13
- Curzon, Lord, 35

Cushman, Gen. Robert E., Jr., 29

Cyprus:

- As U.S. election issue, 81
- CIA paper on, 38
- Congressional action over, 52, 53, 55, 66
- Greek-Turkish dispute over, 55
- Human rights issues, 83
- Kissinger-Gromyko meeting in, 34
- Overthrow of Makarios Government, 52
- Political talks on, 50
- U.N. role in, 17
- U.S. role in, 44, 60

Daughters of the American Revolution (DAR), 75, 76

Davignon, Etienne, 30

Davis, Jeanne W., 38

Dayan, Moshe, 23, 25

DeGaulle, Charles, 19, 23

Dean, Robert, 13

Declaration on Atlantic Relations (1974), 36, 80

Decolonization, 71

Defense, U.S. Department of:

- All-volunteer force, creation of, 12
- Budget of:
 - As U.S. election issue, 81
 - Congressional cuts in, 2
 - Defense Appropriations Act (1976), 64, 66
 - Exception from cuts in, 34
 - Increases requested in, 26, 76
 - Kissinger's input on, 4, 25
 - Nixon-State Department meeting on, 4
 - Nixon's speeches on, 6
- "Guns vs. butter" issue, 11
- Selective Service System (SSS), 12
- Vietnam War, 56

Democratic societies, 80

Democratic solidarity, 80

Deng Xiaoping, 65

Dent, Frederick B., 11, 20, 39, 50

Denton, Capt. Jeremiah A., Jr., 6

DePalma, Samuel, 4

Derwinski, Edward J., 73

Détente (*see also* Cooperation):

- Advantages of, 29, 30
- Alternative to, 31
- As U.S. election issue, 69
- As watered-down, 75
- Atlantic partnership and, 24, 36

Détente (*see also*

Cooperation)—*Continued*

- Competition and cooperation in, 45, 46
- Congressional attitude toward, 52, 70
- Cooperation as a step toward, 17
- Criticism of, 59, 60, 70, 80
- For prevention of nuclear war, 22, 31
- Future process for, 45
- Helsinki Summit discussion of, 61, 62
- Increasing Soviet military strength and, 68
- Jackson-Vanik Amendment's effect on, 19
- MFN status' effect on, 19, 29, 60
- Nixon-Kissinger talks on, 25
- In the post-Vietnam War era, 58
- Reagan's view of, 69
- Solzhnitsyn's deportation's effect on, 35
- Soviet role in Angola and, 64
- Soviet view of, 20
- Trade Reform Bill's effect on, 19, 31
- U.S. view of, 9, 13, 22, 64

Developing nations, 51

Diego Garcia, 54

Dillon, C. Douglas, 23, 53

Dinitz, Simcha, 33

Diplomatic secrecy, 12, 81, 83

Disarmament, 12, 81

Dispute resolution, 28

Dobrynin, Anatoly F.:

- Absence from Washington of, 30
- Détente, 20
- Jackson-Vanik Amendment, 19
- Kudirka incident, 49
- Middle East, 48
- Presidential transition, 42
- Rockefeller nomination, 48

Dominican Republic, 82

Domino theory, 2

Donaldson, William H., 23

Donelan, Joseph F., Jr., 4

Donovan, Hedley, 42

Douglas-Home, Alec, 23

Draft evaders, 43

Drug culture, 46

Drug trafficking, 9

Duckett, Carl, 26

Dunlop, John T., 20

Durant, Will, 66

Dymshits, Veniamin, 61

- Eagleburger, Lawrence S., 53, 58, 75
 Congressional Wednesday Group meeting, 52
 Ford-Carter foreign policy debate, 83
 Foreign policy issues for election year, 81
 Kissinger's status in Washington, 70
 East-West Center, Honolulu, 65
 East-West relations, 80
 East-West trade, 19, 36, 55, 80, 84
 Eastern Europe, 68, 73, 75, 80, 83, 84
 Echeverría, Luis, 13, 17, 28, 32, 82
 Economic assistance program, U.S., 33, 34
 Economic Club of Detroit, 64
 Economic coercion, 28
 Economic Commission for Latin America (ECLA), 82
 Economic development, 17, 32, 51, 60, 80, 81
 Economic Policy Board, 47
 Economic renewal, 51
 Economic sanctions, 81, 82
 Ecuador, 55, 63, 82
 Egypt:
 Disengagement agreement with Israel (Jan. 1974), 25, 35, 84
 Disengagement agreement with Israel (Sept. 1975), 63
 Israel, relations with, 25, 35, 52, 53, 55, 84
 October 1973 War, 19, 22, 25
 Soviet Union, relations with, 22, 33
 Syria, relations with, 52
 U.S. economic assistance to, 33
 U.S. military assistance to, 40
 U.S. talks with, 48
 Ehrlichman, John D., 8, 30, 42
 Eid, Guy, 4
 Einaudi, Luigi, 82
 Eisenhower, Dwight D., 12, 45, 76, 80, 83
 Elections:
 Israel (1973), 22, 25
 United States (1976):
 DOD budget as issue in, 81
 Ford-Carter foreign policy debate, 83
 Foreign policy issues during, 69, 71, 75, 81, 83, 84
 New Hampshire Presidential Primary, 69
 Texas Presidential Primary, 81
 Eliot, Theodore L., Jr., 4
 Elizabeth II, Queen, 81
 Ellsberg, Daniel, 30
 Ellsworth, Robert F., 38, 40, 81
 Energy Action Group, 24, 27
 Energy conservation and development:
 Arab oil embargo's effect on, 21, 23, 27
 Congressional action on, 55
 Need for, 32, 60, 80, 84
 Renewable, 32
 U.S.-Soviet exchange on, 36
 WIN program, 48
 Energy cooperation, 36, 44
 Energy crisis, 24, 27, 44, 46, 84
 Energy policy, U.S., 52
 Energy prices, 38
 Enhance Plus, 3
 Entebbe raid (July 1976), 81
 Environmental issues:
 Climate change, 32
 Pollution, 9
 Population growth, 17
 Quality of life, 17
 Environmental warfare, 36, 45
 Esch, Marvin L., 52
 Ethiopia, 49
 Europe:
 Agreement on the Prevention of Nuclear War (1973), 23
 Anti-Americanism in, 29
 Arab oil embargo, 22, 23
 Communist role in governments of, possible, 71, 73, 83
 CSCE, 23, 36
 Energy cooperation, 36
 Fears of possible Middle East events, 23
 Force reductions in, 12
 Identity of, 24, 46
 Isolationism in, 2
 Kissinger's speech on the Year of, 8, 23, 24, 30, 36, 46
 Kissinger's view of, 30
 MBFR talks, 23, 24, 36
 Nixon Doctrine's effect on, 9
 People's Republic of China, relations with, 3
 Soviet trade with, 36, 55, 84
 Strategic Arms Limitation Talks, 23, 24
 United States, relations with, 2, 23, 24, 25, 29, 42, 46, 58, 80
 U.S. defense of, 8

Europe—*Continued*

- U.S. desire for hegemony as charged by, 15, 23, 36
 - U.S. leadership as seen in, 53
 - Vietnam War as opposed in, 2
- European Community (EC):
- Arab-Israeli dispute, 22
 - Arab relations with, 30
 - British membership in, 54
 - Canada, relations with, 23
 - Changes in U.S. perspectives on, 80
 - Competition with United States for Japan, 23, 25
 - Copenhagen summit (Dec. 1973), 29, 30
 - Energy crisis, 24
 - French leadership of, 25
 - Grain stockpiling, 60
 - Japan, relations with, 23
 - Latin America, relations with, 82
 - Nature of European identity as discussed within, 24
 - Technical assistance to Arab States, 30
 - U.S. friction with, 8, 15, 25, 36, 50
- European Security Conference, 2, 8, 80
- European unity:
- Strains in the Atlantic partnership and, 8, 9
 - U.S. support for, 24, 80
- Evans, Rowland, 73
- Everett McKinley Dirksen Forum, 69
- Executive Club of Chicago, 31
- Export-Import Bank, 50, 51
- Expropriation of U.S. property, 28, 82
- Fahmy, Ismail, 38
- Faisal bin Abdul-Aziz Al Saud, 22, 23, 34, 35, 52
- Famine, 32
- Farrell, Robert E., 50
- Fielding, Lewis, 30
- Finland, 61, 62, 80
- First International Economic Report (1973), 5
- Fisher, Dean, 25
- Flanigan, Peter M., 20, 33
- Flexible response, 8
- Foisie, Philip, 30
- Food cooperation, 36, 44
- Food for Peace program, 59
- Food production in LDCs, 60
- Food scarcity, 17, 44, 46, 47
- Food security, 26, 32, 34, 79
- Food stockpiling, 34, 60, 79
- Force reduction talks. *See* Mutual and Balanced Force Reductions (MBFR).
- Ford, Gerald R.:
- Angola, 66
 - Arab-Israeli dispute, 22
 - Brezhnev's relationship with, 48
 - Cambodia, 55
 - Congressional relations with, 66
 - Cooperation, 51
 - CSCE participation by, 60, 62
 - Cyprus, 44
 - Debate with Carter, 83
 - Détente, 61, 62, 64
 - DOD budget increase requested by, 76
 - Draft evaders, 43
 - Eastern Europe seen as free from domination by, 83
 - Economic development, 51
 - Election campaign (1976), 69, 75, 76, 81, 83
 - Energy conservation and development, 55
 - Food scarcity, 44, 47
 - Foreign policy assessment of first year in office of, 60
 - Foreign policy issues for 1975, 50
 - Geneva Conference (1973), 48
 - Inauguration of, 37
 - Jackson-Vanik Amendment, 20, 51
 - Japan, 55
 - Legislative restrictions on Presidential foreign policy decisions, 51
- Meetings:
- With Brezhnev in Vladivostok, 48, 60, 62
 - Brokaw interview (Jan. 1976), 66
 - Cabinet, 40, 50
 - Helsinki Summit, 61, 62
 - NSC, 26, 40
 - With Park Chung Hee (Nov. 1974), 60
 - With Republican Congressional leadership, 57
 - With bipartisan Congressional leadership, 22, 33
 - With Kissinger, 48
 - With Kissinger and Scowcroft, 83
 - With Mao Zedong, 65

- Ford, Gerald R.—*Continued*
 Meetings—*Continued*
 With Schmidt, 62
 Memoranda:
 To Armed Forces members, 38
 From Kissinger, 53
 Messages to heads of government, 38
 Middle East, 41, 44
 News conferences, 51, 64
 Pacific Doctrine, 65
 Paris Peace Accords (1973), 40, 41
 Peace through strength, 43
 People's Republic of China-U.S.
 relations, 41, 55
 Presidential transition, 37, 38, 40, 41, 42
 Reagan's charges answered by, 69
 Reconciliation in the post-Vietnam
 War era, 57
 Rhodesia, 77
 Rockefeller nomination, 48
 Southern Africa, 77
 Soviet-U.S. relations, 41
 Soviet use of radiation at U.S.
 Embassy Moscow, 70
 Speeches:
 Chicago Council of Foreign
 Relations (Mar. 1976), 76
 Congressional Joint Session (Oct.
 1974), 48
 Congressional Joint Session (Apr.
 1975), 48, 55, 58
 CSCE (Aug. 1975), 62
 DAR (Apr. 1976), 75, 76
 East-West Center, Honolulu (Dec.
 1975), 65
 Everett McKinley Dirksen Forum
 (Mar. 1975), 69
 Inauguration (1974), 37
 Meet the Press interview, 64
 Navy League of the United States
 (Apr. 1975), 57
 North Atlantic Council (May 1975),
 60
 State of the Union (Jan. 1974), 55
 Tulane University (Apr. 1975), 57
 UNGA (Sept. 1974), 44
 In the U.S. House of
 Representatives, 41, 51
 Veterans of Foreign Wars (Aug.
 1974), 43
 White House Conference on
 Domestic and Economic
 Affairs, 55
- Ford, Gerald R.—*Continued*
 Trade Act (1974), 31
 U.S. military aid to Israel, 40
 U.S. military assistance policy, 52
 U.S. policy toward the Soviet Union,
 72
 Vietnam Republic aid request, 55
 Visits:
 California (Apr. 1975), 54
 Federal Republic of Germany (July
 1975), 62
 Helsinki (July–Aug. 1975), 61, 62
 Japan & Korea (Nov. 1974), 48, 51,
 55, 60, 65
 People's Republic of China,
 Philippines, Indonesia (Dec.
 1975), 65
 People's Republic of China (1972),
 41
 People's Republic of China (Dec.
 1975), 55, 60
 Poland (July 1975), 62, 80, 83
 Romania (Aug. 1975), 80, 83
 Vladivostok (Nov. 1974), 48, 55, 60,
 62
 Yugoslavia (Aug. 1975), 80, 83
 Whip Inflation Now (WIN) program,
 48
Foreign Affairs (magazine), 23
 Foreign policy, U.S. (*see also* Morality in
 foreign policy; Pragmatism in
 foreign policy):
 As U.S. election issue, 69, 71, 75, 81,
 83, 84
 Assessment of Ford's first year in
 office, 60
 Congressional role in, 58
 Difficulties in implementation of, 53
 Elements of, 78
 Issues for 1975, 50
 Nixon's annual reports on, 9
 Paris Peace Accords as major
 achievement in, 7, 26
 Role in Latin America of, 82
 Watergate's effect on, 15, 38, 46
Fortune, 48
 40 Committee, 38, 53
 France:
 African aid proposal of, 80
 Agreement on the Prevention of
 Nuclear War (1973), 23
 Anti-Americanism in, 30
 Arab-Israeli dispute, 22
 EC leadership role of, 25

France—*Continued*

- Foreign policy of, 29
 - Gaullism, 19, 49
 - Iraq, relations with, 23
 - Military forces, growth in, 36
 - North-South relations, 79
 - Nuclear weapons development, 36
 - Quadrupartite Agreement on Berlin (1972), 7
 - United States, relations with, 23, 30, 46
 - U.S.-European relations, 23
 - Vietnam War, 78
 - Watergate crisis, 78
 - Weapons sales to Saudi Arabia, 52
- France, Boyd, 50
- Frank, Charles, 82
- Frankel, Max, 83
- Fraser, Donald M., 49, 59
- Free trade, 32
- Frelinghuysen, Peter H.B., 33
- Frenzel, William E., 52
- Friedersdorf, Max L., 33, 50
- Fulbright, J. William, 16, 22
-
- Gammon, Samuel R., 38
- Gart, Murray, 42
- Gaullism, 19, 49
- General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade (GATT), 32
- Generalized System of Preferences (GSP), 82
- Geneva Conference (1973) (*see also* Arab oil embargo; Middle East; Yom Kippur War (1973)):
- Convening of, 22
 - Ford-Kissinger talks on, 48
 - Nixon-Kissinger talks on, 25
 - Palestinian role in, 36
 - Soviet policy toward, 36
- Gergen, David R., 20
- German unification, 29
- Germany, Democratic Republic of, 7, 13, 62
- Germany, Federal Republic of:
- Agreement on the Prevention of Nuclear War (1973), 23
 - Ford's visit to, 62
 - GDR agreement with, 62
 - Military forces, growth in, 36
 - North-South relations, 79
 - Nuclear weapons as forbidden to, 13
 - Quadrupartite Agreement on Berlin (1972), 7, 62

Germany, Federal Republic
of—*Continued*

- Solzhenitsyn's exile to, 35
 - United States, relations with, 30
 - U.S. as seen in, 46
 - Vietnam War, 2
- Geyelin, Philip, 30
- Gibbons, Sam M., 49
- Gierek, Edward, 62
- Gilliam, Jerry, 75
- Giscard d'Estaing, Valéry, 36, 80, 83
- Gladstone, William, 78
- Golan Heights, 19, 30
- Gold standard, 5
- Goldman, Patricia, 52
- Gompert, David C., 52, 58
- Gonzales Amendment (1972), 28
- Goodpaster, Gen. Andrew J., 2
- Grain stockpiling, 34, 60, 79
- Graubard, Stephen, 70
- Graybeal, Sidney, 26
- Great Britain:
- Agreement on the Prevention of Nuclear War (1973), 23
 - Arab-Israeli dispute, 22
 - Common law, 80
 - EC membership for, 54
 - MBFR, 23
 - North-South relations, 79
 - Quadrupartite Agreement on Berlin (1972), 7
 - United States, relations with, 23, 24, 30
 - U.S. differences over NATO with, 23
 - Vietnam war, 2
 - Weapons sales to Saudi Arabia, 52
- Grechko, Andrei, 36
- Greece:
- Cyprus dispute, 55
 - MBFR talks, 23
 - Turkey, relations with, 4, 81
 - United States, relations with, 60
- Green, Marshall, 4
- Green Revolution, 32
- Greenfield, Meg, 30
- Greenspan, Alan, 50
- Gridiron Club, 83
- Griffin, Robert P., 33
- Gromyko, Andrei A.:
- As Middle East hard-liner, 48
 - Helsinki Summit, 61
 - Jackson-Vanik Amendment, 19
 - Kissinger's meetings with, 34
 - Middle East diplomacy of, 30

- Gromyko, Andrei A.—*Continued*
 Nixon's talks with, 33
 Grunwald, Henry, 42
 Guatemala, 82
 "Guns vs. butter" issue, 11
 Gwertzman, Bernard, 61, 84
- Habib, Philip C., 49, 54
 Haig, Brig. Gen. Alexander M., Jr., 20, 25, 33, 40
 Haldeman, H.R., 1, 8, 42
 Hall, William, 4
 Hammer, Armand, 36
 Hardin, Clifford M., 26
 Harkin Amendment, 82
 Harlow, Bryce N., 20, 26
 Harmel, Pierre, 80
 Harmel Report (Dec. 1967), 80
 Harriman, W. Averell, 53
 Harrington, Michael J., 49
 Hartmann, Robert T., 20, 40, 50, 75
 Harwood, Richard, 30
 Hatfield, Mark O., 52
 Hawaii, 65
 Heath, Edward, 23, 30
 Hegemony:
 Chinese view of, 4
 Communist, 46
 European charges of U.S. desire for, 15, 23, 36
 By the United States in Latin America, 18
 U.S. view of, 65, 72
 Vietnamese, 54
 Helsinki Agreements (1975), 69, 83
 Helsinki Summit (1975), 61, 62
 Hersh, Seymour, 49
 Herter, Christian A., 70
 Hickenlooper Amendment (1961), 28
 Hirohito, Emperor, 60, 65
 Ho Chi Minh, 54
 Holdridge, John H., 7
 Holton, A. Linwood, 33, 49
 Horton, Frank J., 52
 House of Representatives, U.S.:
 Appropriations Committee, 40, 76
 Ford's speeches before, 41, 51
 Future Foreign Policy Research and Development Subcommittee (International Relations Committee), 72
 Nixon impeachment, 25
 Paris Peace Accords (1973), relations with White House regarding, 1
- House of Representatives,
 U.S.—*Continued*
 Pike Committee, 67
 Ways and Means Committee, 19
 Howe, Jonathan, 13
 Huang Zhen, 29
Hughes Glomar Explorer mission, 40
 Human Rights, 49, 59, 60, 77, 81, 82, 83
 Humanism, 80
 Humphrey, Hubert H., Jr., 25, 34, 59, 75
 Humphrey-Scott delegation to Moscow, 61
 Hungary, 23, 68, 73
 Hunger, 32, 34, 51, 62, 81
 Hunt, Terence, 70
 Hussein I, ibn Talal, King of Jordan, 30, 34, 35, 38, 53
 Hyland, William G., 26, 54, 61
- Idealism, 35, 46
 Ikle, Frederick C., 26, 39
 Impeachment, 25, 30
 Incidents at Sea Agreement (1972), 35
 Independence, 79
 India:
 As nuclear power, 34
 Bangladesh, relations with, 17
 NPT, 54
 Pakistan, relations with, 17
 People's Republic of China, relations with, 10
 Seen as Soviet satellite, 3, 10
 U.S. economic assistance to, 33
 Indian Ocean, 22, 54
 Indian subcontinent, 17
 Indo-Pakistani War of 1971, 15, 42
 Indonesia:
 U.N. role in, 17
 United States, relations with, 2, 55, 65
 Vietnam defeat, effect on, 54, 55
 Inflation, 20, 32, 48
 Ingersoll, Robert S., 38, 40, 49, 52
 Inouye, Daniel K., 33
 Intellectuals, 46
 Intelligence, 53, 55, 67, 83
 Inter-American Development Bank (IDB), 82
 Inter-American dispute resolution, 28
 Inter-American trade, 28, 82
 Inter-American Treaty of Reciprocal Assistance (Rio Treaty) (1947), 28, 82
 Interdependence:
 As benefit for everyone, 46

Interdependence—*Continued*

- As real U.S. belief, 46
- Challenges of, 32
- Peace and, 28, 32
- Social organization as needed for, 57
- U.S. support for, 41, 58

International Bank of Reconstruction and Development (IBRD), 32

- Expropriation of U.S. property, 28
- LDC dependence on, 79
- Nairobi Conference (Sept. 1973), 20
- Nixon speech (1972), 8
- Transportation in Southern Africa, 77
- U.S. interests and, 34

International Council of Scientific

- Unions, 32

International Court of Justice, 77

International Development Association (IDA), 32

International Energy Agency, 55, 60, 84

International Food Review Group, 47

International Fund for Agricultural Development (IFAD), 79

International Institute for Strategic Studies, 80

International Law of Europe and America in Theory and Practice (Calvo), 28

International Monetary Fund (IMF), 32

- Expropriation of U.S. property, 28
- LDC dependence on, 79
- Nairobi Conference (Sept. 1973), 20
- Nixon speech (1972), 8

International Resources Bank (IRB), 79

International trade, 5

Iran, 52, 81, 83

Iraq, 22, 23, 83

Iron, 82

Isolationism:

- Historical, 59
- In Congress, 13
- In Europe, 2
- Kissinger on, 16
- Nixon on, 2, 9, 12, 13, 35

Israel:

- Arab demands on, 22
- Arab oil embargo and U.S. relations with, 40
- Disengagement agreements:
 - With Egypt (Jan. 1974), 25, 35, 84
 - With Egypt (Sept. 1975), 63
 - With Syria (May 1974), 30, 34, 35
- Egypt, relations with, 25, 35, 52, 53, 55, 84
- Elections (1973), 22, 25

Israel—*Continued*

- Entebbe raid (July 1976), 81
- Influence in U.S. politics of, 11
- Jordan, relations with, 53
- Military strength of, 15
- Morality as basis for U.S. relations with, 78
- Nuclear weapons development, 22
- October 1973 War, 19, 20, 22, 24, 25, 31, 35
- Physical security vs. legitimacy of, 84
- Syria, relations with, 30, 34, 35
- United States, relations with, 40
- U.S. economic and military assistance to, 20, 22, 33, 40, 78, 83
- U.S. resolve and security of, 78
- Withdrawal from occupied territories by, 23, 25, 33

Italy:

- MBFR talks, 23
- Political situation, 36
- Renaissance in, 80
- Unification of, 29

Jackson, Henry M., 31, 42

- As hawk, 26
- Carter differences with, 81
- Détente, 61
- Jackson-Vanik Amendment introduced by, 19, 23
- MFN possible compromise on, 30
- Soviet view of, 48

Jackson-Vanik Amendment (*see also* Most Favored Nation (MFN) status):

- Approval of, 31
- As tradeoff for trade bill, 52
- Détente as affected by, 19
- As harmful to Presidential authority, 51, 53
- Introduction of, 19, 23
- Negative effects of, 55, 66, 68
- SALT talks as affected by, 30
- Soviet view of, 19, 20, 50

Jamaica Agreement (Jan. 1976), 80

Janney, Stuart S., 81

Japan:

- Anti-Americanism in, 29
- Arab-Israeli dispute, 22
- Arab oil embargo, 22, 23
- As non-military power, 12
- European Union, relations with, 23
- International importance of, 8
- Latin America, relations with, 82

- Japan—*Continued*
 Nationalism in, 29
 North-South relations, 79
 NPT, 54
 Nuclear weapons development, 13
 People's Republic of China, relations with, 3, 10
 as seen by Kissinger, 15, 48
 Self-reliance in, 80
 Soviet axis with, possible, 54
 Soviet trade with, 36, 55, 84
 United States, relations with:
 Ford's visit (Nov. 1974), 48, 51, 55, 60, 65
 Improvement in, 42, 58, 60, 65
 In the early Cold War era, 9
 Security issues, 2
 Trade talks, 8
 U.S.-European competition for, 23, 25
 U.S. security guarantee for, 13, 55, 56
 Japan Society, 60
 Javits, Jacob, 61
 Jaworski, Leon, 42
 Jenkins, Albert LeS., 7
 Jerusalem, 22
 Jewish emigration from the Soviet Union, 20, 30, 31, 36, 49, 52, 55, 61, 66, 81, 83
 Jews, American, 22, 23, 33, 66
 Jiang Qing, 3
 Jobert, Michel, 23, 30
 John XXIII, Pope, 19
 Johnson, James P., 52
 Johnson, Lyndon B., 12, 49, 54, 66
 Johnson, U. Alexis, 4, 26
 Joint Chiefs of Staff (JCS):
 Kissinger's trip to Moscow (Mar. 1974), 29
 Nixon's meetings with, 2, 25, 38
 Jordan:
 Crisis of 1970, 2, 15, 20, 29
 Israel, relations with, 53
 Kissinger-Hussein talks, 34, 35
 U.S. economic assistance to, 33
 Jorden, William J., 13
 Judd, Walter, 26

 Kadar, Janos, 68
 Kalb, Bernard, 25
 Kant, Emmanuel, 17
 Katzir, Ephraim, 35
 Kaul, T.N., 52
 Kaunda, Kenneth, 77, 84
 Kellogg-Briand Pact (1928), 56
 Kennan, George F., 56
 Kennedy, Edward M., 25
 Kennedy, John F., 12, 83
 Assassination of, 49
 Cooperation, 45
 Last speech of, 78
 Peace as necessity, 59
 Soviet-U.S. relations, 48
 Vietnam War, 54
 Kennedy, Col. Richard T., 38, 40
 Kennedy, Robert F., 49
 Kenya, 77, 83
 Kiep, Walther L., 23
 Kissinger, Henry A., 68
 Agreement on the Prevention of Nuclear War (1973), 14, 23
 Angola, 64, 67
 Anti-Americanism, 13, 29
 Appointment as Secretary of State of, 16
 Arab oil embargo, 22, 25, 27, 33
 Arms race, 46
 As historian, 46
 As lame duck, 70
 Birth control, 32
 Brezhnev visit (June 1973), 3, 14
 British-U.S. relations, 24
 Carter's relationship with, 83
 Colson's view of, 52
 Communism's weaknesses, 46
 Congressional-White House relations, 1
 CSCE, 62
 Cyprus, 34, 44, 50, 81
 Defense budget, 4, 25
 Détente, 22, 25, 29, 30, 31, 58, 64, 70, 80
 Difficulties in foreign policy implementation, 53
 Economic assistance program, U.S., 33
 Economic development, 32, 60, 80
 Election campaign (1976), 75, 81, 83
 Energy conservation and development, 32
 Energy crisis, 24, 27, 44, 84
 Energy policy, 52
 Europe as seen by, 30
 European-U.S. relations, 23, 24, 25, 29, 36, 80
 Food scarcity, 44, 46, 47
 Foreign policy assessment of Ford's first year in office, 60
 Foreign policy issues for 1975, 50

- Kissinger, Henry A.—*Continued*
 Geneva Conference (1973), 25, 48
 Gromyko meetings with, 34
 Hussein talks with, 34, 35
 Inter-American trade, 28
 Interdependence, 28, 32, 46, 58
 International cooperation, 17
 Isolationism, 16
 Israeli security and U.S. resolve, 78
 Jackson-Vanik Amendment, 19, 23, 52, 53
 Japan as seen by, 15, 48
 Latin America, 13, 63, 82
 Looking to the future by, 46
 Meetings:
 Cabinet, 20, 40, 50
 Congressional Wednesday Group meetings, 52
 Helsinki Summit, 61
 Latin American Foreign Ministers luncheon (Sept. 1975), 63
 North Atlantic Council, 22
 NSC, 26, 40
 With past and present foreign policy key people, 23, 53
 Reston interviews, 46, 84
 Senate Finance Committee, 31
 Senate Foreign Relations Committee, 45, 77
 With Senators and State Department officials (June 1975), 60
 Special Actions Group, 38
 With *Time* magazine editorial board, 42, 48
 With the *Washington Post*, 30
 With bipartisan Congressional leaders, 22, 33, 49
 With Colby and Moorer, 25, 30
 With Ford and Scowcroft, 83
 With Mao Zedong, 3, 29
 With National Conference of Editorial Writers, 83
 With *New York Times*, 46
 With Nixon, 25
 With reporters, 25
 With Scowcroft, 15
 With Zhou En-lai, 3
 Memoranda:
 To Ford, 53
 To Nixon, 3
 Middle East, 33, 46, 53, 63, 84
 Monetary reform, 8, 28, 32
 Morality in foreign policy, 70
- Kissinger, Henry A.—*Continued*
 Nixon's annual review of foreign policy, 9
 Nixon's relationship with, 25, 30, 52
 Nixon's resignation, 42
 Nixon's views on, 52
 Nonintervention, 28
 North-South relations, 71, 79, 80
 NSC system, 39
 Nuclear war, 84
 October 1973 War, 20, 22
 Paris Peace Accords (1973) signed by, 1
 Peace through strength, 43, 78
 People's Republic of China, 3, 15, 84
 Permanent interests of the United States, 71
 Political leadership, need for, 46
 Presidential transition, 38, 39, 40, 42
 Quality of life, 17
 Retrospective look at legacy of, 84
 Rockefeller nomination, 48
 SALT I treaty, 25, 84
 Saudi Arabia's role in oil embargo, 52
 Schlesinger's Overseas Press Club speech as critiqued by Scowcroft, 56
 Schlesinger's relationship with, 30
 Science and technology, 17, 28, 32
 Sino-Soviet dispute, 46, 84
 Southern Africa, 74, 77
 Speeches:
 American Legion (Aug. 1974), 43
 American Society of Newspaper Editors (Apr. 1975), 58
 Boston World Affairs Council (Mar. 1976), 71
 Conference of Tlatelolco (Mar. 1974), 28, 82
 Eagleburger critique of, 70
 Economic Club of Detroit (Nov. 1975), 64
 International Institute for Strategic Studies (London, June 1976), 80
 Japan Society (June 1975), 60
 Laramie (Feb. 1975), 70
 Los Angeles World Affairs Council, 52, 58
 Lusaka (Apr. 1976), 77, 84
 Moral Purposes and Policy Choices (Pacem in Terris Conference), 19, 49

- Kissinger, Henry A.—*Continued*
 Speeches—*Continued*
 National Urban League (Aug. 1976), 77
 Pilgrim Society, 23, 24, 27, 46
 Saint Louis (May 1975), 58
 San Francisco (Feb. 1975), 70
 UNCTAD IV conference (Nairobi, May 1976), 77, 78, 79
 UNGA (Sept. 1973), 17, 19, 28, 32, 34, 47
 UNGA (Apr. 1974), 32
 UNGA (Sept. 1974), 44
 UNGA 7th Special Session (Sept. 1975), 63, 79
 University of Wisconsin Institute of World Affairs (July 1975), 59
 Upper Midwest Council (July 1975), 59
 World Food Conference (Nov. 1974), 47
 The "Year of Europe," 8, 23, 24, 30, 36, 46
 Status in Washington of, 70
 Strategic Arms Limitation Talks, 29, 36, 42, 71
 Trade Reform Bill (1973), 31
 Unilateral disarmament, 29
 U.S. military assistance policy, 52
 U.S. policy toward the Soviet Union, 72
 Vietnam War, defeat in, 54, 55, 58
 Visits:
 Africa (Apr.–May 1976), 77, 78
 Bonn (Mar. 1974), 30
 Brussels (Dec. 1973), 22
 Brussels (Mar. 1974), 30
 California (Apr. 1975), 54
 Europe (July 1974), 36
 Geneva (Apr. 1974), 34
 Helsinki (July 1975), 61
 Israel (Sept. 1975), 63
 Latin America (Feb. 1976), 82
 Latin America (June 1976), 82
 Middle East (Nov. 1973), 22
 Middle East (May 1974), 34, 35
 Moscow (Mar. 1974), 29, 30
 People's Republic of China (July 1971), 3, 84
 People's Republic of China (June 1972), 3
 People's Republic of China (Feb. 1973), 3
- Kissinger, Henry A.—*Continued*
 Visits—*Continued*
 Paris (May 1973), 11
 Korea, Democratic People's Republic of (DPRK):
 ROK, relations with, 17
 U.N. membership for, 17
 U.S. security guarantee for ROK, 54
 Korea, Republic of (ROK):
 DPRK, relations with, 17
 Ford's visit (Nov. 1974), 48, 51, 55, 60, 65
 Human rights in, 49, 60, 81, 83
 U.N. membership for, 17
 U.S. economic assistance to, 49
 U.S. security guarantee for, 54, 56, 65
 Korean War, 2, 4, 35, 54
 Kornienko, Georgi M., 61
 Korologos, Thomas, 33
 Kosygin, Alexei N., 20
 Koven, Ronald, 30
 Kubisch, Jack B., 18
 Kubitschek de Oliveira, Juscelino, 26
 Kudirka, Simas, 49
- Laird, Melvin R., 20, 26, 61
 Land, Edwin H., 15
 Laos, 26
 Ceasefire and negotiated settlement in, 41
 DRV failure to withdraw from, 6, 11
 Paris Peace Accords (1973), 1, 6, 7
 Latin America:
 Agenda for the Americas, 28
 Anti-Americanism in, 11, 13
 Bogotá foreign ministers meeting (Nov. 1973), 28
 European Community, relations with, 82
 Hemispheric dialogue, 60, 63
 Human rights in, 82
 Importance to U.S. in U.N. of, 13
 Japan, relations with, 82
 Kissinger's meeting with Foreign Ministers of, 63
 MFM Working Groups, 63
 New Dialogue meetings, 63, 82
 Nixon Doctrine's effect on, 9
 People's Republic of China, relations with, 82
 Regionalism in, 18
 Soviet Union, relations with, 82
 Trade, 28

Latin America—*Continued*

- United States, relations with, 2, 28, 55, 60, 63, 82
- U.S. economic and military aid to, 28, 63
- U.S. foreign policy role in, 82
- U.S. hegemony in, 18
- U.S. policy in, 18, 26
- Latin American Economic System (SELA), 82
- Law of the Sea Conference, 28
- Le Duc Tho, 1, 25, 84
- Leadership, 46
- League of Families, 12
- Leaks, 12
- Leatherman, Mildred, 70
- Leber, Georg, 23
- Lee Kuan Yew, 52
- Lend-lease, 20
- Lescaze, Lee, 30
- Less-Developed Countries (LDCs), 60, 74, 79, 81, 84
- Lewis, Samuel W., 70, 82
- Liberia, 77
- Libya, 22, 23
- Liebman, 61
- Lin Piao, 3
- Lincoln, Abraham, 55
- Linkage concept, 20, 84
- Lodal, Jan M., 26
- Lodge, Henry Cabot, II, 13
- Lone Rangerism, 81
- Lord, Winston, 54, 58, 60, 63, 70, 72, 74, 82
- Los Angeles Times*, 69, 75
- Los Angeles World Affairs Council, 52, 58
- Love, John A., 20
- Lowenstein, James G., 68
- Luns, Joseph, 23
- Lusaka Manifesto, 77
- Lynn, James T., 11, 20, 50
- Macaulay, Thomas, 28
- Mack, Vice Adm. William P., 35
- Macmillan, Harold, 23
- Macomber, William, 4
- Maginot line, 29
- Mahon, George, 33
- Makarios, Archbishop, 52, 81
- Malaysia, 54, 65
- Malek, Frederic V., 20
- Manchuria, 15
- Manifesto on Southern Africa, 77
- Mansfield, Michael J.:
 - Latin America, 26
- MBFR, 25
- White House meeting with bipartisan Congressional leadership, 22, 33, 36
- Mao Zedong:
 - Ford's talks with, 65
 - Kissinger's talks with, 3, 29
 - Succession issues, 10
- Marcona, 82
- Marder, Murray, 30, 75
- Marsh, John O., Jr., 40, 50
- Marshall Plan, 32, 46, 48, 54, 80
- Mayaguez* incident, 60
- McClellan, John L., 22
- McCloskey, Robert J., 4, 52
- McCloy, John J., 23, 53
- McFall, John J., 33, 35
- McKnight, Lt. Col. George G., 6
- McNamara, Robert S., 53
- Meany, George, 61
- Meir, Golda
 - "Meet the Press," 64
- Meir, Golda, 23, 25
- Mexico, 28, 63, 82
- Meyer, Armin H., 4
- MFN Working Groups, 63
- Middle East (*see also* Arab oil embargo;
 - Geneva Conference (1973); Yom Kippur War (1973)):
 - Arab-Israeli disengagement agreements, 25, 30, 34, 35, 63, 84
 - As danger spot, 13
 - As U.S. election issue, 81
 - Ceasefire in, 17
 - European fears about possible events in, 23
 - Nuclear weapons use in, 23
 - Progress of negotiations on, 34, 35, 50, 71
 - Prospects for settlement in, 46, 84
 - Soviet diplomacy in, 30
 - U.S. foreign assistance program, 33
 - U.S. objectives in, 22
 - U.S. role in, 17, 41, 44, 53, 60, 84
 - U.S.-Soviet talks on, 36, 48
- Miki Takeo, 60
- Military assistance policies, 52
- Missiles:
 - ABMs, 36, 62, 69, 81
 - Cruise, 76
 - Poseidon, 36

- Missiles—*Continued*
 Trident, 42, 76
 Mitchell, John N., 40
 Mondale, Walter, 26, 59
 Monetary reform, 5, 8, 27, 28, 32, 80
 Montgomery Ward's, 84
 Moore, George C., 4
 Moorer, Adm. Thomas H., 25, 29, 30
 Morality in foreign policy (*see also*
 Foreign policy, U.S.; Pragmatism in
 foreign policy):
 As Presidential election issue, 83
 Democratic solidarity and, 80
 Foundations of, 59
 Israeli security and, 78
 Kissinger's failure to place emphasis
 on, 70
 Pragmatism vs., 19, 35, 66, 70
 U.S. choices in use of, 59
 And the U.S. historical experience, 46
 Morgan, Dan, 30
 Morton, Rogers C.B., 11, 20, 39, 50
 Moscow Summit (May 1972), 7, 36
 Most Favored Nation (MFN) status (*see*
 also Jackson-Vanik Amendment):
 Compromise on, possible, 30
 Détente and, 19, 29, 60
 Jewish emigration as affected by, 36
 For Soviet Union, 11
 Moynihan, Daniel P., 63
 Mozambique, 77
 Multilateral trade negotiations, 80
 Multiple independently targetable
 re-entry vehicles (MIRVs), 36
 Munich Pact (1938), 71
 Mutual and Balanced Force Reductions
 (MBFR):
 British position, 23
 European position, 23, 36
 Likelihood for, 25, 60, 80, 84
 Reconsideration of, 54
 Scheduling of talks for, 2, 17
 Start of, 62
 U.S.-European consultation on, 24
 U.S. position, 8, 12, 45
 Nairobi Conference (Sept. 1973), 20
 Namibia, 77, 84
 Nassau Agreement (1962), 23
 National cohesion, 46
 National Conference of Editorial
 Writers, 83
 National Council of Churches, 49
 National liberation, 80
 National Security Council:
 Food scarcity, 47
 Maintenance of NSC system, 38, 39
 Meetings:
 Jan. 24, 1974, 26
 Aug. 10, 1974, 38, 40
 Strategic Arms Limitation Talks, 26
 National Security Decision Memoranda:
 NSDM 1, 39
 NSDM 2, 39
 NSDM 242, 40
 NSDM 265, 39
 National security policy, U.S., 8, 9
 National Security Study Memorandum
 241, 77
 National Urban League, 77
 National War Labor Board, 84
 Nationalism, 29, 68
 Natural resources, 32
 Navy, U.S., 35
 Navy League of the United States, 57
 Nazism, 59
 Negativism, 48, 60
 Nelson, Vice-Adm. Horatio, 35
 Neocolonialism, 79
 Nessen, Ronald, 50, 69
 Netherlands, 23
 New Dialogue meetings, 63, 82
 New Economic Policy (1971), 5
 New Hampshire Presidential Primary
 (1976), 69
New York Times, 30, 46, 49, 69, 83, 84
 New Zealand, 55, 65
 Newsom, David D., 4
 Ngo Dinh Diem, 83
 Nguyen Van Thieu, 25, 57
 Nigeria, 55
 Nitze, Paul H., 26
 Nixon, Julie, 26
 Nixon, Richard M. (*see also* Watergate
 crisis):
 Agreement on the Prevention of
 Nuclear War (1973), 14, 23
 Anti-war demonstrations, 12
 Arab oil embargo, 21, 27
 Brezhnev's relationship with, 22, 29
 Brezhnev's talks in Moscow with, 35,
 36
 Brezhnev's visit (June 1973), 10, 11,
 12, 14, 30, 36
 Bruce's talks with, 10
 Congressional-White House relations,
 1

Nixon, Richard M.—*Continued*

Defense budget, 4, 6
Détente, 25, 31
Diplomatic secrecy, 12
Domino theory, 2
Economic assistance program, U.S.,
 33, 34
Economic development, 32
Energy conservation, 21, 27
Energy crisis, 27
European unity, 8
European-U.S. relations, 2, 25
First International Economic Report
 (1973), 5
Geneva Conference (1973), 25
Gromyko talks with, 33
Hussein talks with, 35
Impeachment of, 25, 30
Inter-American trade, 28
Isolationism, 2, 9, 12, 13, 35
Israel's influence in U.S. politics, 11
Jackson-Vanik Amendment, 20
On Kissinger, 52
Kissinger appointed as Secretary of
 State by, 16
Kissinger's relationship with, 25, 30,
 52
Kissinger's U.N. speech (Sept. 1973),
 17
Latin America, 2
Meetings:
 Cabinet, 11, 20, 34
 Council of the Americas, 13
 Executive Club of Chicago, 31
 JCS, 2, 25, 38
 NSC, 26
 With Bipartisan Congressional
 leaders, 22, 33, 36
 With Rogers, 4
 With Schlesinger, 25
Memoranda:
 From Kissinger, 3
 From Scowcroft, 2
 From Ziegler, 4
 To Haldeman, 1
Messages:
 To Congress, 5
 Third Annual Report on U.S.
 Foreign Policy, 9
 Fourth Annual Report on U.S.
 Foreign Policy, 9
Middle East, 35
Monetary reform, 5, 27
NATO, 2

Nixon, Richard M.—*Continued*

October 1973 War, 20, 22, 25, 35
Paris Peace Accords (1973), 1, 26
Peacekeeping, 33
People's Republic of China:
 Military strength of, 26
 Succession issue, 3, 10
 United States, relations with:
 Establishment of, 7, 12
 Nixon's approach to, 2, 9
 Vietnam War and, 3
POW receptions, 12
Republic of China, 26
Resignation of, 36, 37, 42, 49
Rogers resignation, 16
SALT I treaty, 26
Schmidt talks with, 36
Soviet Union:
 MFN for, 11
 Solzhenitsyn's deportation's effect
 on, 35
 United States, relations with, 2, 9
 Agreement on the Prevention of
 Nuclear War, signed by, 14
 Moscow Summit (May 1972), 7,
 36
Speeches:
 IMF/IBRD (1972), 8
 On defense budget, 6
 Second Inaugural Address, 7
 State of the Union (1973), 5
 State of the Union (1974), 25, 26
 UNGA (1969), 32
 USNA graduation (1974), 35
 Withdrawal of U.S. forces from
 Vietnam, 6
Strategic Arms Limitation Talks, 26
Taping of conversations of, 42
Trade Reform Bill (1973), effect on
 détente of, 31
Unilateral disarmament, 27
U.S. alliances, 2
U.S. foreign policy approach of, 9
Vietnam War, 3, 6, 54, 66
Visits:
 Asia (July 1969), 9
 France (May 1973), 11
 Middle East (June 1974), 35
 Moscow (June 1974), 29, 30, 35, 36
 Moscow (May 1972), 7, 36
 People's Republic of China (Feb.
 1972), 3, 17
 Poland (May-June 1972), 80
 Romania (Aug. 1969), 80, 83

- Nixon, Richard M.—*Continued*
 Visits—*Continued*
 Yugoslavia (Sept.–Oct. 1970), 80
 War Powers Resolution (1973), 51
 Nixon Doctrine, 9, 35, 54
 Noel, Cleo A., Jr., 4
 Non-aligned nations, 17, 71
 Nonintervention, 28
 Norodom Sihanouk, Prince, 15, 54
 North Atlantic Council (NAC), 22, 24, 36, 60, 80
 North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO):
 As essential for global stability, 80
 British-U.S. differences over, 23
 Budget cutting for forces in, 2
 Communist governments in member states of, 71, 73, 83
 Declaration on Atlantic Relations, 36, 80
 Flexible response, 8
 Foreign Ministers meeting (Oslo, May 1976), 80
 Founding of, 4
 Harmel Report (Dec. 1967), 80
 People's Republic of China's position, 10, 29
 Portuguese exclusion from, 54
 Spanish membership for, 54
 Strategy for use of nuclear weapons, 8
 Turkish role in, 55
 Twenty-fifth Heads of Government Meeting (Brussels, June 1974), 36
 U.S. commitment to, 56
 U.S. prestige as declining in, 53
 North-South relations, 71, 79, 80, 81, 82
 Novak, Robert, 73
 Nuclear deterrent strategy, 40, 80
 Nuclear Non-proliferation Treaty (NPT), 54
 Nuclear power, 24, 45, 81
 Nuclear proliferation, 44, 54, 57, 60, 81
 Nuclear test ban, 45
 Nuclear understanding initiative, 3
 Nuclear war:
 Agreement on the Prevention of, 14, 23
 Détente for prevention of, 22, 31
 Fears of, 84
 U.S. position, 44
 Nuclear weapons:
 French development of, 36
 Indian development of, 34
 Nuclear weapons—*Continued*
 Israeli development of, 22
 Japanese development of, 13
 Military superiority and, 84
 NATO disagreements on strategy for use of, 8
 Nuclear Non-proliferation Treaty (NPT), 54
 Peaceful use of, 36
 People's Republic of China development of, 36
 Possession of forbidden to Germany, 13
 Use in the Middle East of, 23
 Oberdorfer, Don, 49, 83
 Ocean exploration and exploitation, 9, 17, 24, 55
 October 1973 War (*see also* Arab oil embargo; Geneva Conference (1973); Middle East):
 Energy crisis and, 24
 Outcome for Israel of, 20, 25
 Soviet role in, 20, 22, 31
 Start of, 19
 U.S. actions during, 22, 35
 U.S. perspectives on, 20
 Office of Management and Budget (OMB), 47
 Ogle, George, 49
 Oil:
 Arab embargo of:
 African position, 22, 23
 Congressional response to, 55
 Energy conservation as affected by, 21, 23, 27
 European/Japanese approach to, 22, 23
 Israeli-U.S. relations and, 40
 Lifting of, 25, 33
 Saudi role in, 40, 52
 Soviet position, 30
 U.S. response to, 21
 As U.S. election issue, 81, 83
 Expansion of supply of, need for, 32
 Rhodesia embargo of, 77
 Sharing of, 46
 U.S. policy on, 52
 Venezuelan nationalization of, 82
 O'Neill, Thomas P., 22, 33, 49
 Operation Condor, 82
 Operation Eagle Pull, 55
 Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development (OECD):
 Economic growth among nations of, 80

- Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development (OECD)—*Continued*
 - Energy Committee, 23
 - Executive Committee, 79
 - High Level Oil Committee, 27
 - North-South relations, 79
 - Summit (Paris, June 1976), 79
- Organization of African Unity (OAU), 23, 66, 67
- Organization of American States (OAS):
 - Meeting, Atlanta (Apr. 1974), 30
 - Meeting, Santiago (June 1976), 82
 - Reorganization of, 28
 - Sanctions against Cuba, 82
 - U.S. foreign assistance program, 33
 - U.S. treaty commitments to, 56
- Organization of Petroleum Exporting Countries (OPEC), 21, 27, 52, 60, 81, 84
- Otto, Allan W., 68
- Overcommitment, military, 71
- Overpopulation, 9
- Overseas Press Club, 56

- Pacific Doctrine, 65
- Packwood, Robert W., 52
- Pakistan, 17, 52
- Palestine, 22, 36, 52
- Palestine Liberation Organization (PLO), 53
- Pan Americanism, 18
- Panama Canal treaty negotiations, 28, 60, 63, 75, 82, 84
- Paraguay, 82
- Paris Peace Accords (1973):
 - Article 20, 11
 - As major foreign policy achievement, 7, 26
 - Cambodia as affected by, 1, 6
 - DRV failure to observe, 6, 11, 25, 55, 56
 - First anniversary of, 19
 - Ford's re-affirmation of, 40, 41
 - Laos as affected by, 1, 6, 7
 - Negotiations for, 23
 - Signing of, 1
- Park Chung Hee, 60
- Parker, Daniel, 33, 39
- Parker, David N., 20
- Passman, Otto E., 33
- Pastore, John O., 36

- Pauly, Lt. Gen. John, 38
- Peace:
 - As foundation of U.S. foreign policy, 17, 71
 - As moral objective, 35, 80
 - As necessity, 59
 - Coexistence as necessary for, 19
 - Interdependence and, 28, 32
 - Lack of alternative to, 45, 80
 - Requirements for achievement of, 9
 - Through strength, 12, 43, 78
 - The United States at, 78
- Peaceful change of borders, 83
- Peaceful nuclear explosions (PNE), 36
- Peacekeeping, 17, 33
- Pearl Harbor, 65
- Pedersen, Richard F., 4
- Pentagon Papers, 12, 30
- Perle, Richard, 83
- Permanent interests of the United States, 71
- Peru:
 - Andean Pact membership of, 63
 - Cuban weapons training for, 49
 - Food security, 26
 - Kissinger's visit (Feb. 1976), 82
 - United States, relations with, 28
 - Weapons purchases by, 49, 52, 82
- Peterson, Donald K., 74
- Peterson, Peter G., 53
- Philippines, 13, 54, 56, 65
- Pierpoint, Robert, 24
- Pike Committee, 67
- Pilgrim Society, 23, 24, 27, 46
- Pinochet, Augusto, 49
- Pitt, William, 35
- Poland, 62, 68, 73, 80, 83
- Political parties:
 - Baathist (Iraq/Syria), 22
 - Christian Democratic Union (CDU) (FRG), 23
 - Communist, 71, 73, 83
 - Democratic (U.S.), 61, 81
 - National Front for the Liberation of Angola (FNLA), 64
 - National Union for the Total Independence of Angola (UNITA), 64
 - Popular Front for the Liberation of Angola (MPLA), 64, 67, 81
 - Republican (U.S.), 61, 81
 - Socialist Party (SPD) (FRG), 23
- Pollution, 9
- Pompidou, Georges, 11, 23, 30

- Popper, David H., 49
 Population control, 81
 Population growth, 17
 Porter, William J., 4
 Portugal, 53, 54, 60
 Poverty, 32, 44
 Pragmatism in foreign policy (*see also*
 Foreign policy, U.S.; Morality in
 foreign policy):
 Moral force and, 19, 35, 66, 70
 Rebellion against, 46
Present at the Creation (Acheson), 16, 24
 Presidential transition, 37, 38, 39, 40, 41,
 42
 President's Foreign Intelligence
 Advisory Board (PFIAB), 15
 Price, Raymond K., Jr., 20
 Prisoners of War (POWs), 1, 6, 12, 29
 Project Independence, 21
 Proletarian internationalism, 80
 Protectionism, 80
 Puerto Rico, 64, 82
 Puerto Rico summit (June 1976), 80

 Quadripartite Agreement on Berlin
 (1972), 7, 8, 62, 71, 80
 Quality of life, 17

 Rabasa Mishkin, Emilio Óscar, 49, 82
 Rabat Arab League summit (1974), 53
 Rabin, Yitzhak, 35, 83
 Racial discrimination, 77
 Radhakrishnan, Sarvapalli, 32
 Radiation, 70
 Rahal, Abdellatif, 32
 Rambouillet economic summit (Nov.
 1975), 80, 84
 Rand Corporation, 42
 Raw materials, 32, 51
 Ray, Dixie Lee, 39
Reader's Digest, 61
 Reagan, Ronald W., 69, 75
 Reconnaissance missions, 38
 Reformation, 80
 Refugees, 77, 81
 Regionalism, 63
 Reich, Kenneth, 75
 Renaissance, 80
 Renewable energy, 32
 Reston, James, 23, 30, 46, 70, 84
 Rhodes, John J., 33
 Rhodesia, 49, 74, 77, 84
 Ribicoff, Abraham A., 30, 61
 Richardson, Elliot L., 2, 11, 20
 Richardson, John, Jr., 4
 Richardson, William B., 52
 Rio Treaty (1947), 28, 82
 Risner, Col. Robinson, 6
 Robinson, Charles W., 77, 79
 Rockefeller, David, 13, 23, 53
 Rockefeller, Nelson A., 48
 Rodman, Peter W., 25, 61
 Roe, Robert A., 49
 Rogers, William D., 63
 Rogers, William P.:
 Council of the Americas meeting, 13
 Demonstrations against, 11
 Nixon's meetings with, 4
 People's Republic of China's
 succession issue, 3
 President's annual review of foreign
 policy, 9
 Reports on U.S. Foreign Policy, 7
 Resignation of, 16, 30
 Visit to Latin America (May 1973), 11
 Romania, 10, 68, 73
 As U.S. election issue, 83
 Ford's and Nixon's visits to, 80, 83
 MBFR talks, 23
 Roosevelt, Franklin D., 41, 59, 78
 Rosenfeld, Steve, 30
 Rowny, Lt. Gen. Edward, 26
 Rumsfeld, Donald H., 40, 50, 75
 Ruppe, Philip E., 52
 Rush, Kenneth W., 4, 26, 34
 Rusk, Dean, 23, 53
 Ryan, Gen. John D., 26, 29

 Sadat, Anwar el-, 22, 33, 34, 35, 49, 53,
 60
 St. Clair, James D., 42
 Saudi Arabia, 53
 Oil embargo role of, 40, 52
 United States, relations with, 81
 Weapons sales to, 52, 83
 Saukham Khoy, 55
 Saunders, Harold H., 53
 Sawhill, John C., 39
 Saxbe, William B., 39
 Scali, John A., 20, 50
 Schechter, Jerrold, 42
 Scheel, Walter, 23, 30, 62
 Schlesinger, James R.:
 Détente, 75
 Foreign policy issues for 1975, 50
 Kissinger's relationship with, 30

- Schlesinger, James R.—*Continued*
Kissinger's trip to Moscow (Mar. 1974), 29
Meetings:
 Cabinet, 40
 NSC, 26, 40
 With Nixon, 25
NSC system, 39
Overseas Press Club speech, 56
People's Republic of China visit by, 83
Presidential transition, 38, 40
Strategic Arms Limitation Talks, 29
U.S. military aid to Israel, 40
Vietnam War, 56
Schmidt, Helmut:
 Ford talks with, 62
 Nixon's talks with, 36
 Political role of, 23
 Vietnam War, 2
Schneebeli, Herman, 52
Schubert, Richard, 20
Schweiker, Richard F., 52
Science, 17, 28, 32
Scott, Hugh D., Jr., 4, 22, 35
Scott, Stanley, 20
Scowcroft, Maj. Gen. Brent A., 60
 Council of the Americas meeting, 13
 Election campaign (1976), 75, 83
 Foreign policy issues for 1975, 50
 Kissinger's trip to Moscow (Mar. 1974), 29
 Meetings:
 Cabinet, 11, 20
 Helsinki Summit, 61
 Special Actions Group, 38
 With bipartisan Congressional leadership, 33
 With Ford and Kissinger, 83
 With Kissinger, 15
 Memorandum to Nixon, 2
 Nixon's relationship with Kissinger, 25
 NSC meetings, 26, 40
 Presidential transition, 40
 Rockefeller nomination, 48
 Schlesinger's Overseas Press Club speech as critiqued by, 56
 Soviet use of radiation at U.S. Embassy Moscow, 70
 U.S. alliances, 2
Scranton, William W., 53
Secrecy, 12, 81, 83
Security, 59, 80
Seever, Gary, 20
Seidman, L. William, 39, 50
Selective Service System (SSS), 12
Self-determination, 62
 In Africa, 67, 74, 77
 In Eastern Europe, 80
 In Vietnamese Republic, 1, 6
Senate, U.S.:
 Church Committee, 67
 Détente, 70
 Finance Committee, 31
 Foreign Relations Committee, 16, 33, 45, 53, 55, 77
 African Affairs Subcommittee, 67
 Human rights, 49
 Humphrey-Scott delegation to Moscow, 61
 Paris Peace Accords (1973), relations with White House regarding, 1
 U.S. evacuation from Cambodia, 55
Senegal, 77
Shanghai Communiqué, 3, 17, 41, 55, 65, 72, 83, 84
Shriver, Garnet E., 33
Shultz, George P., 20, 27, 53
Shuttle diplomacy, 84
Sidey, Hugh, 42
Sihanouk, Prince Norodom, 15, 54
Silberman, Lawrence H., 50
Simon, William E., 11, 27, 39, 50
Simons, Howard, 30
Sinai Peninsula, 19, 22, 53
Sinai II, 63
Singapore, 54, 55, 65
Single Integrated Operation Plan (or Procedure) (SIOP), 38
Sino-Soviet dispute (*see also* China, People's Republic of; Soviet Union):
 U.S. approach to, 46, 54, 72, 84
 U.S.-PRC relations, effect on, 3
 U.S. support for PRC, 10
Sisco, Joseph J., 4, 38, 52, 53
Smith, Hedrick, 84
Smith, Ian D., 74, 84
Smith, Jane Farwell, 76
Smith, Mary Louise, 50
Social justice, 81
Social organization, 57
Solzhenitsyn, Aleksandr, 35, 61
Somalia, 49
Sonnenfeldt, Helmut, 68
 European-U.S. relations, 23
 Helsinki Summit, 61

Sonnenfeldt, Helmut—*Continued*
 NSC meetings, 26
 U.S. policy toward Soviet Union and Eastern Europe, 68, 73
 Vietnam War, 54
 Sonnenfeldt Doctrine, 68, 73, 83
 "The Sources of Soviet Conduct" (Kennan), 56
 South Africa, Republic of, 67, 77
 South West Africa (Namibia), 77
 South Yemen, 22
 Southeast Asia, 54
 Southeast Asia Treaty Organization (SEATO), 54
 Southern Africa, 74, 77, 81
 Sovereignty, 28
 Soviet Union (*see also* Sino-Soviet dispute):
 Angolan role of, 64, 66, 67, 72
 Apollo-Soyuz Test Project, 59, 61, 62
 Arab-Israeli dispute, 22
 Arab oil embargo, 30
 As U.S. election issue, 75, 81
 Attack on People's Republic of China by, possible, 15
 Communist Party Congress (25th, 1976), 73
 CSCE, 36
 Cuba, 29
 Détente, 20, 64, 68
 Egypt, relations with, 22, 33
 European trade with, 36, 55, 84
 Geneva Conference (1973), 36
 Human rights issues, 83
 India seen as satellite of, 3, 10
 Iran as threatened by, 83
 Jackson as seen by, 48
 Japanese axis with, possible, 54
 Japanese trade with, 36, 55, 84
 Jewish emigration from, 20, 30, 31, 36, 49, 52, 55, 61, 66, 81, 83
 Latin America, relations with, 82
 Middle East diplomacy of, 30
 Military strength of, 68, 80
 Minority group nationalism in, 68
 Most-favored nation status for, 11
 Nuclear understanding initiative of, 3
 October 1973 War, 20, 22, 31
 People's Republic of China alliance with, possible, 26
 People's Republic of China-U.S. relations, 3, 72
 Quadripartite Agreement on Berlin (1972), 7

Soviet Union—*Continued*
 Southern African role of, 74
 Strategic Arms Limitation Talks, 48
 Succession issues, 10
 United States, relations with:
 Chill in, 30
 CIA paper on, 38
 Cuba as issue in, 29
 During the early Cold War era, 9
 Energy conservation and development exchange, 36
 Establishment of, 59
 Ford's re-affirmation of, 41
 Hughes Glomar Explorer mission, 40
 Humphrey-Scott delegation to Moscow, 61
 Idealism and pragmatism in, 35
 Incidents at Sea Agreement (1972), 35
 Jackson-Vanik Amendment's effect on, 19, 20, 50
 Linkage concept, 20, 84
 Moscow Summit (May 1972), 7, 36
 Nixon's approach to, 2, 9
 People's Republic of China-U.S. relations as affected by, 3, 72
 Solzhenitsyn's deportation's effect on, 35
 Soviet use of radiation at U.S. Embassy Moscow, 70
 Trade, 36
 Trade Agreement (1972), 55
 U.S. leverage in, 52
 U.S. perspectives on, 17
 U.S. principles for, 59, 71
 Vladivostok Agreement (Nov. 1974), 48, 50, 51, 55, 57, 61, 62, 76
 World War II era in, 49
 U.S. policy toward, 68, 72, 73
 U.S. wheat sales to, 20, 29, 30, 36, 46, 67, 68, 72, 83
 Vietnam War role of, 29, 36
 Weapons sales to Peru, 49, 52, 82
 Soybeans, 34
 Space exploration, 9
 Spain, 36, 54
 Spanish-American War, 56, 59
 Sparkman, John J., 33
 Special Actions Group, 38
 Special Commission for Latin American Coordination (CECLA), 18
 Spivak, Lawrence, 64
 Springsteen, George S., Jr., 23

- Stalin, Josif, 26
Steelman, Alan W., 52
Stein, Herbert, 39
Stennis, John C., 33
Stevenson, Adlai E., 71
Stockpiling of food, 34, 60, 79
Stoessel, Walter J., Jr., 4, 23, 61
Strategic Air Command (SAC), 38
Strategic Arms Limitation Talks:
 ABMs, 36, 69
 Agreement on principles for SALT II negotiations, 1
 As U.S. election issue, 81
 European position, 23
 Failure to complete, 84
 Jackson-Vanik Amendment, effect on, 30
 Likelihood of, 54, 60
 MIRVs, 36
 Necessity of, 67, 80
 Need for breakthrough on, 25
 Negotiation for, 71
 NSC discussion of, 26
 Phases of, 30
 Reagan's view of, 69
 Resumption of, 29, 36
 SALT I agreement, 12, 13, 25, 26, 35, 84
 Soviet desire for, 48
 U.S.-European consultation on, 24
 U.S. objectives for, 42, 45, 72
Strategic balance, 8, 9
Strategic superiority, 42
Sudan, 4, 30
Suez Canal, 29, 33
Suharto, 2
Sukhodrev, Viktor M., 61
Supreme Court, U.S., 42
Syria:
 Disengagement agreement with Israel (May 1974), 30, 34, 35
 Egypt, relations with, 52
 Geneva Conference (Dec. 1973), 22
 Israel, relations with, 30, 34, 35
 October 1973 War, 19, 25
 U.S. economic assistance to, 33
Sistema Economico Latinoamericano (SELA), 82

Taiwan. *See* China, Republic of.
Tanaka Kakuei, 2, 23
Tanzania, 10, 77
Tarr, Curtis W., 4
Tax cuts, 34

Technology, 17, 28, 32, 82
Technology Test Bed (TTB), 36
Teller, Edward, 15
Teng Hsiao-ping. *See* Deng Xiaoping.
Terrorism, 4, 9, 22, 81
Texas Presidential Primary (1976), 81
Thailand, 2, 29, 54, 65
Third Pacem in Terris Conference, 19, 49
Thucydides, 71
Thurmond, J. Strom, 33
Time, 42, 48
Timmons, William E., 33, 36
Tito, Josip Broz, 68, 73
Tlatelolco Conference (Mar. 1974), 28, 33, 63, 82
Toth, Robert, 25
"Town Meetings" on foreign policy issues, 70
Trade:
 East-West, 19, 36, 55, 80, 84
 Free, 32
 Inter-American, 28, 82
 Japanese-Soviet, 36, 55, 84
 U.S.-Japanese, 8
Trade Act (1974), 5, 19, 31, 50, 52, 55, 61
Trade Reform Bill (1973), 8, 19, 31
Transportation, 77
Treasury, U.S. Department of, 47
Treaty of Constantinople (1888), 33
Treaty of Moscow (1970), 8
Trend, Burke, 23
Trudeau, Pierre Elliott, 2
Truman, Harry S., 44, 50, 54, 55, 83
Truman Doctrine, 4
Tulane University, 57
Tunisia, 30
Tunney, John, 64, 66
Turkey:
 Cyprus dispute, 55
 Greece, relations with, 4, 81
 MBFR talks, 23
 NATO role of, 55
 United States, relations with, 60
 U.S. military and economic assistance to, 49, 51, 52, 66
 Vietnam War, 2, 4
Tyranny of the majority, 44

Underground nuclear test ban treaty, 45
Unemployment, 32
Unilateral disarmament, 27, 29, 54
United Arab Emirates (UAE), 30

- United Kingdom. *See* Great Britain.
- United Nations (U.N.):
- Carter speech on Nuclear Energy and World Order, 81
 - Committee on Trade and Development, 28
 - Congo role for, 17
 - Cyprus role for, 17
 - Division on Resources, 32
 - Indian subcontinent role for, 17
 - Indonesia role for, 17
 - Korean membership issue, 17
 - Latin America's importance to U.S. in, 13
 - Weaknesses of, 71
- United Nations Charter, 32, 44, 77
- United Nations Committee on Trade and Development (UNCTAD), 77, 78, 80, 81, 82
- United Nations Disengagement Observer Force (UNDOF), 48
- United Nations General Assembly (UNGA):
- 6th Special Session, 32
 - 7th Special Session, 60, 63, 66, 71, 74, 79
 - 28th Session, 24
- Ford speech (Sept. 1974), 44
- Kissinger's speeches before:
- (Sept. 1973), 17, 19, 28, 32, 34, 47
 - (Apr. 1974), 32
 - (Sept. 1974), 44
 - (Sept. 1975), 63, 79
- Nixon speech (1969), 32
- Resolutions:
- 2145 (XXI), 77
 - 3201 (S-VI), 32
 - 3202 (S-VI), 32
 - 3281 (XXIX), 82
- U.S. foreign assistance program, 33
- United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees, 77
- United Nations Security Council (UNSC):
- Peacekeeping role of, 17
 - Resolution 232, 77
 - Resolution 242, 20, 22
 - Resolution 253, 77
 - Resolution 338, 22
 - Resolution 339, 22
 - Resolution 385, 77
- United Press International (UPI), 83
- Universal Declaration of Human Rights, 77
- University of Wisconsin Institute of World Affairs, 59
- Upper Midwest Council, 59
- Uranium enrichment, 24
- Uruguay, 82
- Valenti, Jack, 83
- Vance, Cyrus, 23, 53
- Vanik, Charles, 19, 20, 31
- Vatican City, 83
- Vavilov, Andrei, 61
- Veliotes, Nicholas A., 74
- Venezuela, 55, 63, 82
- Verification Panel, 26, 30
- Vest, George, 30, 70
- Veterans of Foreign Wars (VFW), 43
- Vichinskiy, Andrey, 30
- Vietnam, Democratic Republic of:
- Failure to withdraw from Cambodia and Laos, 6, 11
 - Hegemony over Cambodia by, 54
 - Paris Peace Accords (1973) signed by, 1
 - Post-Paris Accords attacks by, 6, 11, 25, 55, 56
 - U.S. bombing of, 6
- Vietnam, Republic of:
- Fall to Communists of, 54, 55
 - Military situation in, 30
 - Paris Peace Accords (1973), 1
 - Peacekeeping in, 33
 - Self-determination for, 1, 6
 - Survival of, 11
 - United States, relations with, 2
 - U.S. economic assistance to, 33, 55
 - U.S. military assistance to, 52, 55
- Vietnam War
- Vietnam peace settlement. *See* Paris Peace Accords (1973).
- Vietnam War:
- Allied opposition to, 2
 - As U.S. election issue, 83
 - Bombing of DRV, 6
 - British position, 2
 - CIA paper on, 38
 - DOD perspective on, 56
 - Evacuation of U.S. citizens, 57
 - French view of, 78
 - GFR position, 2
 - Lessons of, 71
 - Mining of Haiphong Harbor, 6, 20, 48
 - Need for peace, 9
 - People's Republic of China role in, 29

- Vietnam War—*Continued*
People's Republic of China-U.S.
relations and, 3, 26
POWs, 1, 6, 12, 29
Public opinion on ending of, 13
Reconciliation in the post-war era, 56,
57
Repatriation of KIA/MIA troops, 65
Soviet role in, 29
State-DOD differences in thinking
about, 56
Turkish position, 2, 4
United States as affected by, 9, 35, 84
U.S. defeat in, 54, 55, 58, 60
U.S.-LDC relations as affected by, 84
U.S. military intervention in
Cambodia, 6, 26
U.S.-Soviet talks on (1972), 36
Value to U.S. of, 12
White House-Congress relations over,
66
Withdrawal of U.S. forces, 6
Vietnamization, 6
Virtue in foreign policy. *See* Morality in
foreign policy.
Vladivostok Agreement (Nov. 1974), 48,
50, 51, 55, 57, 61, 62, 76
- Wagner, Jerry, 23
Waldheim, Kurt, 22, 44
Wall Street Journal, 69, 81
Warner, John W., 35
Warren, Gerald L., 33
Washington Energy Conference (Feb.
1974), 27, 30, 32, 35
Washington Post, 30, 31, 49, 75, 83
Washington Special Actions Group
(WSAG), 38
Washington Star, 70
Watergate crisis (*see also* Nixon, Richard
M.):
As challenge for Nixon
administration, 11
French view of, 78
Negativism as a result of, 48, 60
Nixon's resignation resulting from,
36, 42, 49
U.S. foreign policy as affected by, 15,
38, 46
"Year of Europe" as doomed by, 8,
46
Wealth redistribution, 81
- Wehner, Herbert, 23
Weinberger, Caspar W., 20, 50
West Bank, 53
Western cohesion, 46
Western Hemisphere community, 28, 46
Weyand, Gen. Frederick C., 55
Wheat, 20, 26, 29, 30, 34, 36, 46, 67, 68,
72, 83
Whip Inflation Now (WIN) program, 48
White House Conference on Domestic
and Economic Affairs, 55
Wilson, Harold, 36
Wilson, Woodrow, 59
Wiretapping, 16
Woods, R.E., 58
World economic order, 78, 84
World Federalists, 49
World Food Conference:
As U.S. election issue, 83
Bilateral vs. multilateral aid, 34
Kissinger speech at, 46, 47
Scheduling of, 35
U.S. position, 28
U.S. program as outlined at, 49, 55,
60, 71
U.S. proposal for holding of, 17, 32,
44, 46
World Meteorological Organization
(WMO), 32
World Population Conference, 28, 32
World War I, 12, 71, 80, 84
World War II, 12, 46, 49, 51, 59, 65, 80,
84
Wright, W. Marshall, 4
- "Year of Europe," 8, 23, 24, 30, 36, 46
Yugoslavia, 68, 73, 80, 83
- Zablocki, Clement, 33, 73
Zaire, 67, 77, 83
Zambia, 67, 77
Zhou Enlai:
Kissinger's talks with, 3
Succession issues, 10
U.S.-People's Republic of China
relations, 7
Visit to the United States, possible, 25
Ziegler, Ronald L., 4, 20, 42
Zimbabwe, 77
Zimmerman, Warren, 68
Zumwalt, Adm. Elmo R., Jr., 26, 29, 36,
42