

—The U.S. Government operates virtually all commercial enterprises within the zone, denying to Panama the jurisdictional rights which would enable its private enterprise to compete.

—The United States controls virtually all of the deep water port facilities serving Panama.

—The United States holds, unused, large areas of land within the zone.

—The United States pays Panama but \$2 million annually for the immensely valuable rights it enjoys on Panamanian territory.

—The United States operates, on Panamanian territory, a full-fledged government that has no reference to the Government of Panama, which is its host.

—And the United States can do all these things, the treaty states, forever.

To these things the Panamanians object, saying that they deprive their country of dignity, of the ability to develop naturally, and, indeed, of full independence.

One could disagree. One could ask that Panama relax in the tropics and enjoy, perpetually, the enormous direct and indirect benefits which the operation of the canal in its territory by the United States has brought to it. Yet the level of consent would not thereby be raised.

One can more usefully ask: What is the nature of these things to which Panama objects? Close scrutiny indicates, I suggest, that they resemble the appurtenances of power rather than power itself—that it is the manner of the U.S. presence in Panama, not the presence itself, which is at the heart of our problem with that country and, I must add, with the world community.

My impression is that the United States would do well to examine what there is about our presence in the Canal Zone that is essential to our critical interests and what is not, and then proceed to modify the latter so that we may protect the former.

The process will not be easy for either country. On one hand, the physical, legal, and psychological architecture which the United States has erected in this 500 square miles over many years is enormous and very

solid. On the other, Panama's capacity to absorb, to rebuild, to redesign, is limited. But there really is no rational alternative.

New Climate of Accommodation

For more than 10 years we have been engaged with Panama, determined to arrive at a new and modernized relationship which would cause Panamanians to be fully content that the United States remain in Panama—and Americans to be fully content to remain there. Successive American Presidents since Dwight Eisenhower have pressed that negotiation.

If our negotiations have not prospered over so many years, it is not for lack of distinguished and dedicated Panamanians and Americans negotiating. Rather, it is because the times have simply not been right. In any case, what is negotiating past is not negotiating prologue.

When the Secretary of State and I had the pleasure of meeting for the first time with the Foreign Minister of Panama in New York last October, the Secretary suggested that henceforth in this negotiation the United States should not attempt to impose its will on Panama nor Panama attempt to impose its will on the United States.

And I am able to say, after four months of the new negotiation, that the negotiators on both sides have accepted that counsel. Political decisions have been taken to make accommodation a way of negotiating life. We shall not, I think, be easily distracted from it.

The world has already observed that accommodation. Last month the Secretary of State journeyed to Panama to initial with the Panamanian Foreign Minister a set of eight principles.² They are to serve as guidelines for the negotiators in working out the details of a new treaty. Perhaps the Chief of Government of Panama best characterized these

² For text of the joint statement of principles initialed on Feb. 7, see BULLETIN of Feb. 25, 1974, p. 184.

principles when he said they constituted a "philosophy of understanding." Their essence is that:

—Panama will grant the United States the rights and facilities and lands necessary to continue operating and defending the canal.

—The United States will agree to return to Panama jurisdiction over its territory, to recompense Panama fairly for the use of its territory, and to arrange for the participation by Panama, over time, in the canal's operation and defense.

It has also been agreed in the principles that the new treaty shall not be in perpetuity, but rather for a fixed period, and that the parties will provide for any expansion of canal capacity in Panama that may eventually be needed.

Still another form of accommodation will, I trust, be visible shortly. Following my first visit to Panama, I recommended to the President that the United States should not await the successful conclusion of treaty negotiations to begin modernizing its presence in the Canal Zone, to the benefit of both countries. He agreed and is now forwarding to the Congress legislation which would return to Panama two World War II airfields now within the Canal Zone, which Panama could put to very good use for economic development. I am hopeful the Congress will agree that this is only right for the United States to do.

It escapes neither of the two negotiating parties that these accommodations are but a good beginning. A treaty arrangement which

has evolved over 70 years, and evolved too often in acrimony rather than harmony, will not yield readily to the skills of negotiators nor even to the political dictates of heads of government.

Nor does it escape the parties that there is opposition in both their lands. In this country there are those who hold that it is folly for the United States to alter the nature of its presence in the Canal Zone by making any concessions to Panama and that our power must reside there, undiluted, forever. In Panama there are those who hold that it is folly to make a single concession to the United States and that its presence must be eliminated forthwith.

We can acknowledge the profound patriotism of those views. Were the executive authorities of the two countries to share them, however, they would be squarely on a collision course.

The plain fact of the matter is that geography, history, and the economic and political imperatives of our times compel the United States and Panama to have a joint stake in the Panama Canal enterprise. It follows that with respect to that enterprise they should comport themselves as partners and friends—preserving what is essential to each, protecting and making ever more efficient a vital international line of communication and, I suggest to you, creating a model for the world to admire of how a small nation and a large one can work peacefully and profitably together.

I think that is not too grand a design.

President Nixon Honors Foreign Ministers of Latin America and the Caribbean

Following is an exchange of toasts between President Nixon and Foreign Minister Raúl Sapena Pastor of Paraguay at a dinner at the White House on April 17.

Weekly Compilation of Presidential Documents dated April 22

PRESIDENT NIXON

Your Excellencies the Foreign Ministers and the Ambassadors from the Latin Amer-

ican countries and the Caribbean countries: I wish I could address you in the language which most of you understand and speak so well, but I would not presume to do so. Consequently, tonight I will have Mr. [Donald F.] Barnes, who speaks English better than he speaks Spanish and Spanish better than he speaks English, translate for me.

I will simply open this comment with regard to our relations with one of the few Spanish phrases I think I know reasonably well. Mrs. Nixon and I say: *Están ustedes en su casa*.

As you went through the receiving line tonight, my wife and I shared many memories with you. It was 34 years ago that we had our wedding trip in Mexico. Obviously, she was much younger than I was at that time. [Laughter.] And our distinguished Secretary of State followed our example because he just had his honeymoon in Mexico, too, and we welcome Mrs. Nancy Kissinger on her first visit as the wife of the Secretary of State tonight. She is a little liberal, but otherwise she is all right. [Laughter.] Don't interpret the word "liberal" literally, please. [Laughter.]

After that first trip 34 years ago, we returned again to the Caribbean and to Central America for a trip which took us to eight countries in that area in 1941. The other events come tumbling over: the attendance at the inauguration of Ruiz Cortines in Mexico in 1953, a trip to Mexico and all the Central American countries in 1955, and then a trip through all the South American countries in 1958, and then as private citizens returning to Mexico on our 25th wedding anniversary in 1965, and in 1967 a tour which took me to virtually all the countries of South America.

Now, my only regret is that in this travelogue that I have just gone over, I have not had the opportunity, except for Mexico, our great friends and neighbors to the south, to visit the countries of Latin America and the Caribbean. But I believe I have sent our best ambassador there in my stead. Mrs. Nixon's visit to Peru at the time of the earthquake and then her recent visit to Caracas and to Brasilia for the inaugurations, I think, indicated that the one who was closest to my heart could win the hearts of the people of Latin America.

As you can tell, I probably, as a result of this, am the first President of the United States ever to have visited all the nations of Latin America before entering this office.

And while traveling alone is not significant, these travels do indicate, it seems to me, the measure of the affection and esteem which not only my wife and I, but all Americans, continue to have for our neighbors in the Americas.

Let me speak very frankly about the relations between the United States and our friends to the south. During these past 30 years we have heard an enormous amount of rhetoric about the relationships between our countries. There have been almost as many slogans as conferences, and too often, both have been quickly filed away and forgotten.

Now, in the past six months, the United States has proposed a new approach, what we call a new dialogue. It was discussed in New York, again in Bogotá, then in Mexico City, now in Washington. Now, after so many trial runs, we think this one is here to stay. But you could very well ask: Why will our new dialogue be any better than the old ones? Why will the future be any different from the past, when the United States so often seemed to ignore its friends to the south?

Let me answer that very directly. Over the past five years, I have seen that the winds of change are blowing strongly across the entire world today. In fact, initiatives undertaken by the United States have helped those winds along their way.

There is one great lesson that all of us, large and small, whatever our nations may be, must learn. The nations of the world can no longer ignore each other, whether we like it or not. A decision by an oil producer in the Middle East has a direct impact upon the supplies of gasoline and fertilizer in the West. A decision by a wheat grower in the great northern plains of North America can make the difference between full and empty stomachs, not only in the south of the world but also in the east and west.

Independence, a proud concept, has given a way to interdependence. The past has given a way to a new way of life. And the critical question now is whether we return to the past—it is too late for that—but how we shape the future.

Now, there are some that argue that every nation must now fend for itself in a narrow struggle for survival, setting man against man, nation against nation, bloc against bloc. That, in my opinion, would lead to the eventual collapse of Western civilization as we have known it.

We propose instead that we meet the reality of interdependence by following a different path—a higher road of cooperation and of collaboration. It will be more strenuous; it will require more patience; it may even be more expensive in the short run. But eventually we believe it will lead to a better life for all of our people in every nation.

Now, this, in essence, is the meaning of the new dialogue we are calling for. It is more than a slogan; it is more than just more talk; it signifies a new attitude, a new desire to join with you in seeking out that high road of cooperation and growth for all of the nations in the Americas.

And going now from words to actions, let me be more concrete about what you may expect from the United States in this new endeavor.

Speaking personally, and speaking also about the world in which we live, the greatest gift I hope to leave to my countrymen and to the world is a legacy of peace. It is our desire for peace that has been the foundation for our new relationships with the Soviet Union and the People's Republic of China and which shapes our relationships with other nations.

And our relationships with Latin America are a central pillar in the structure of peace we are trying to build for the whole world. And it would be our hope that we could work more closely with you in maintaining peace beyond our hemisphere and that we could continue to work with you in keeping the peace in our hemisphere.

On the political side, you can expect that the United States will not seek to impose its political preferences on your countries. That is your decision. We will not intervene in the domestic affairs of others in this hemisphere.

And finally, and of keen interest tonight, we have a mutual interest in economic

growth and prosperity for all the nations in this hemisphere. There is just as much at stake for the United States as for the nations of Latin America and the Caribbean, and I reaffirm my pledge to work directly with you in the areas of greatest concern. Let me enumerate them.

We will continue to seek trade legislation which will permit generalized trade preferences, a concept that I have supported for years.

We will seek cooperative solutions to our energy problems, and we shall share our resources and our research with you.

We will seek better ways to pool our knowledge of science and technology.

We will seek to maintain our level of aid.

We will seek to consult more closely with you on international trade and monetary affairs.

And we will continue to encourage the growth of private capital in ways that are mutually acceptable.

We recognize that each government in this hemisphere has the sovereign right to determine the rules for investors in its country.

But speaking from experience, we also believe that private investment is the richest potential source of the technology, the capital, the organizational skills, that the developing world needs.

For example, the amount of private capital that flows to Latin America today is over twice as much as the amount of public capital. We must recognize that many of the nations which enjoyed the fastest rates of economic expansion have had the benefit of intensive infusions of private capital as well as public.

This, then, is a summary of the new dialogue—peace, political freedom, economic growth. The road ahead will not be easy. It has never been traveled before, and it is only dimly perceived. The pessimists predict we will lose our way because, they say, our civilization is entering a new age of darkness.

Let us prove to them, all of us, what we know in our hearts: We are indeed entering a new age, but what we see is not a setting

but a rising sun, a new dawn for the Americas.

I have often been asked, after my trips to Peking and to Moscow, to Europe, to Southeast Asia, whether this means a downgrading of our interest in our friends in the American hemisphere.

Let me assure you tonight, nothing could be further from the truth, because the new initiatives we have undertaken in these past five years are essential if we are to have world peace. If we have world peace, all of the people in the Americas will benefit. And if we have world war, all of the peoples in the Americas will suffer.

And that is why I say tonight, let us join together in these initiatives to seek to build a new structure of peace, not only for ourselves but the whole world. And whatever success we have in this direction will benefit us all.

And now tonight in proposing a toast, I cannot propose it to any individual because all are of equal rank, but I remember that when I visited my friend Galo Plaza [Secretary General, Organization of American States] at his farm he used a wonderful expression that I think is the proper expression I should use in proposing the toast tonight.

This man, that I have just made an all-American football player 30 years after he played football at the University of California, which will put him in the Hall of Fame—[laughter]—spoke very feelingly about California, the state in which he got his higher education, and his own country.

And he said what we must all understand is that despite our differences in background, despite our differences in language, despite our differences in culture, and despite our difference in political ideology, we are all one family, we are all proud members of the American family.

So, it is in that spirit that I propose the toast: *La familia Americana*.

And now to our very special guests, if you will be seated again, it was very difficult to select the individual from this distinguished group who would respond to the toast. We

did not flip coins, so we went to seniority. That does not mean that seniority means senility, but one thing I learned and Mrs. Nixon learned in our travels through the countries to the south is that while there are very many, and most speak the same language, each has its own character, each is quite different, and each is very proud of its own background, and that diversity must never change.

And so we call upon not the largest country here, we call upon one that is one of the smaller countries, but it is a country we remember well, not that it is not and should not be known for other things. I refer to that nation where the lovely ladies do the bottle dance.

Our distinguished guest, the Foreign Minister of Paraguay.

FOREIGN MINISTER SAPENA¹

Your Excellency Richard Nixon, President of the United States of America, Your Excellency Mrs. Nixon, Your Excellencies ladies and gentlemen: The Ministers of Foreign Affairs of the nations of Latin America and the Caribbean have conferred upon me the extraordinary honor of replying to your words. Aware of this great responsibility, I assume this mandate, shielded by the magnitude of what I represent.

The history of inter-American relations will record as a very fortunate initiative of yours, Your Excellency President Richard Nixon, to have instructed the Secretary of State, Dr. Henry A. Kissinger, to invite the Ministers of Foreign Affairs and representatives of the countries of Latin America and of the Caribbean that were attending the 28th period of regular sessions of the General Assembly of the United Nations to a meeting which was held on October 5, 1973, and to there suggest the initiation of a new dialogue to deal with matters of interest for the American continent.

¹ Foreign Minister Sapena spoke in Spanish.

It is true that as close as we were and as united by common bonds and interests in the destiny of the continent and of the world, however, we lived at a distance in the consideration and the treatment of those things which are basic and vital to our civilization.

And for one part there was a United States of America, the leading world power, which had achieved the highest levels of standards of living for its people while at the same time having to be concerned and to take care of problems and situations scattered throughout the globe, situations of every order and nature, at every distance, and of the most varied degrees of seriousness, and on the other hand, all of the nations of Latin America and the Caribbean with different degrees of development, deprived to larger or lesser degree of the financial and technological means necessary to increase their economic, social, educational, cultural, scientific, health, and technological conditions.

The idea of this new dialogue was immediately taken up by all of the American nations and the distinguished Foreign Minister of Colombia, Alfredo Vázquez Carrizosa, on behalf of his government issued an invitation to the meeting of Bogotá held in November of 1973, where there was an exhaustive debate before establishment of the items on which the usefulness of a dialogue was established.

Thus came about the Conference of Tlatelolco held in February of 1974, where under the skillful and enlightened leadership of the Foreign Minister of Mexico, Don Emilio Rabasa, and this time with the presence of the Secretary of State of the United States of America, the dynamic and clearly successful international negotiator, Dr. Henry A. Kissinger, there was an advanced consensus achieved on the solutions to the subjects brought up at Bogotá.

Among the positive results of Tlatelolco, there are two that are very important but that were not even included in the agenda. The first is having converted this new dialogue offered in October of 1973 into a continuous process of consultation. The second, which is the birth of what we have come

to call the spirit of Tlatelolco, which is a new state of feeling among all of the nations of the Americas who commit themselves to work with faith and will in a coordinated and joint action in order to achieve the harmonious development of all the nations.

Development in all its aspects has to be the basic theme of the process of consultation that we have established. It has been said that the new name for peace is development. In reality, there is so much overlapping between both terms that just as we cannot have development without peace, we also cannot conceive of peace without development.

Mr. President, this splendid setting that you are offering to the Foreign Ministers of the nations of Latin America and the Caribbean undoubtedly is not the propitious time to refer to generalized preferred tariffs, to financial assistance, to the transference of technology, to monetary reform, to tariff and nontariff barriers, to the net transfer of real resources, and to many other items which will appear in the agendas in this continued process of consultation until they are definitely resolved.

But if what separates us is not geographic distance, but rather the differences in the degree of development, necessarily we must agree that our main fundamental concern should concentrate and give priority to the structure of international trade and the monetary system.

And so the present and unfair terms of trade dealing with our raw materials vis-a-vis manufactured products, a trade that takes place not only with the United States of America but with the entire industrialized world, this is what generates the differences in development that create artificial distances and obstacles of all kinds in the relations between our peoples.

I have the conviction that the day that our nations of Latin America and the Caribbean receive fair and equitable prices for their labor and their products there will be a reduction in the clamor for financial loans and technology will be just another product that we can purchase and pay for and not

assistance or a favor that we want to receive.

In this task, the nations of Latin America and of the Caribbean expect to continue counting on the firm cooperation of the U.S. Government, a cooperation that we have seen already in the dialogue and in the consultations with Secretary of State Kissinger.

Mr. President, even though the meeting of Foreign Ministers that we are holding here in Washington is in appearance unrelated to the fourth period of sessions of the General Assembly of the Organization of American States, which will begin on April 19 in Atlanta, although this first meeting is informal and noninstitutionalized and the second one will be formal and will follow treaties and instruments that are in effect, it is obvious that we cannot separate one from another and even more obvious that the subject of the restructuring of the inter-American system will appear on both agendas.

I have the honor to express to you, Mr. President, that the nations of Latin America and of the Caribbean harbor the hope that as a result of the restructuring of the inter-American system that more dynamic instruments may come into being that will permit a better and faster achievement of development of all nations, that will embody all of the rights, assurances, and protection deserved by persons and states, that will stimulate what Secretary of State Kissinger has called a friendship based on equality and respect for the dignity of each one and a new inter-American system, in short, that will be able to be imbued with and which we will decide to translate into this symbol of faith which we have come to call the spirit of Tlatelolco.

Your Excellency President Richard Nixon, I interpret the sentiments of all my colleagues, the Ministers of Foreign Affairs, in expressing to you the deepest appreciation and esteem with which we have followed your admirable and tenacious efforts in favor of a world peace and for the reduction of international tensions.

In thanking you on behalf of all the Ministers of Foreign Affairs of the nations of

Latin America and of the Caribbean for the many and very fine attentions which we have been receiving from your government, I would like to express our best wishes for the ever-increasing greatness and prosperity of the United States of America, for the personal good fortune of yourself and of Mrs. Nixon, and to the fact that the happiness of all of our peoples be achieved by means of a global development which will make possible dignified international relations based on respect and equality. To your health, Mr. President.

PRESIDENT NIXON

To all of our distinguished guests: We realize that you have come a long way, most of you, and that tomorrow you will be going to Atlanta, and I would simply like to bring this historic occasion—historic at least for us who are honored to be your host—to a conclusion with these words.

This house is not an old house when you compare it with the great houses of Europe, of Asia, of the Mideast, even of Latin America. It was planned by George Washington, and every President since Washington has lived here.

And I think it is fair to say that every President of the United States has had a dream about his own country and about the world. Some have been more successful in interpreting that dream than others. But all have tried because they know that that dream represents what the American people, the people of this country, of the United States, feel in their hearts.

It was summarized perhaps best by Thomas Jefferson when at the time of the signing of the Declaration of Independence he said, we act not just for ourselves but for the whole human race.

Now, to some contemporary observers at that time and some at this time, that would seem in retrospect to have been a very arrogant statement. But speaking for all of the people of the United States of America, let me say to you that I know our people; I know how they feel.

We are strong now; whereas compared with at the beginning, we were very weak. We are rich now; when compared with at the very beginning, we were very poor. But it is our great desire to share whatever we have in terms of development with all the peoples of the world and particularly with our closest friends and neighbors. And to use whatever our strength is, and whatever our wealth is, not only to build a world of peace, peace in the sense of absence of war, but peace in terms of progress and development for all people wherever they may be.

That was the dream of those who founded this country. That was the dream of those who founded your countries. We are all part—as old as we are—we are all part of a new world, and together we can build a new world for all people who live on this earth.

And in this room that has seen the great leaders of the world pass through it over 175 years, it is well to conclude by saying that the hopes of all the people of the world—not just the Americas but all the people of the world—for peace, for progress, for opportunity, lie with our solidarity, with our unity, and with our vision. And may the historians one day record that we, the inheritors of the new world, helped to build not only for ourselves, but for the whole world, a structure of peace and progress for all.

And it is in that spirit that I respond to the very eloquent remarks of the Foreign Minister from Paraguay.

And with those words, Mrs. Nixon and I will now, according to protocol, leave the room. We understand that refreshments are still available, and for those who like to, even dancing. And for those who haven't airplane reservations for Atlanta, we can provide a bus. [Laughter.]

Latin American and Caribbean Foreign Ministers Meet at Washington

Twenty-five Western Hemisphere Foreign Ministers met at Washington April 17-18. Following are opening remarks made by Jack B. Kubisch, Assistant Secretary for Inter-American Affairs, at a news conference on April 18 at the conclusion of the meeting, together with the text of a communique approved by the meeting of Foreign Ministers that day.

REMARKS BY ASSISTANT SECRETARY KUBISCH

Ladies and gentlemen: I understand you do have a copy of the communique that was approved by the Foreign Ministers this afternoon. I would just like to say a few words about this meeting that has taken place here in Washington yesterday and today, discuss a few of the highlights and the main points covered in the communique, and make an

announcement or two, following which I would be glad to take your questions.

First, as you know, this meeting here in Washington, which began yesterday and took place among the 25 Foreign Ministers, including Secretary of State Kissinger, was really the second phase of the new dialogue and the new fresh approach to multilateral diplomacy in this hemisphere that began with Secretary Kissinger's invitation to the Foreign Ministers to a new dialogue last October shortly after he became Secretary of State. They accepted his invitation to this new dialogue. They established an agenda. They met with him just eight weeks ago in Mexico City for their first consideration of the topics on that agenda, which was followed by the Declaration of Tlatelolco, the suburb of Mexico City where the conference took place.

It was decided as that conference was concluded in Mexico City that it would be worthwhile for them to meet again soon, to continue their discussions in a frank and cordial and open manner, to address problems of great interest to all of them.

It was decided, since of the 25, 23 would be coming to the United States in any case in April to attend the annual General Assembly of the Organization of American States, Secretary Kissinger would have them come here and they would have these meetings.

They continued to address the agenda items that were agreed upon before—those are set forth in the communique. And as you will note from the communique, the Ministers reaffirmed the atmosphere and constructive spirit which characterized these discussions.

The meetings were private. There will not be, by me at least, any identification of who said what at the meetings. There was complete freedom for all Foreign Ministers to speak on any topic as they saw fit and to make any observations they wanted to make. They presented their views on some very important questions in the economic, trade, commercial, financial fields, and other aspects of inter-American relationships. Secretary Kissinger responded stating the U.S. policy. He expressed the intention and desire of the United States to cooperate effectively with the countries of Latin America in an effort to revitalize our relationships in this region.

They considered a number of specific topics, which are summarized in the communique, and it was decided that they would meet again. They considered just when the next meeting should take place and decided that since the Foreign Ministers would be returning to the United States this fall for a meeting of the General Assembly of the United Nations, Secretary Kissinger extended an invitation to them to meet with him in New York for a luncheon of the type they had last October when they were present in New York.

They agreed that it was not possible in the short time available to them really to analyze in depth and reach important decisions

on some of the very complex issues that they were addressing, and therefore they decided to set up several working groups and study groups and preparatory groups to prepare for their next meeting, and those are summarized in the communique as well. They specifically wished to have a working group study the question of multinational corporations and to develop recommendations as to principles applicable to the operations of those companies.

There also was considerable interest in the whole question of science and the transfer of technology, and they decided to set up a working group also of governmental representatives to study this subject and to make recommendations to them.

And finally, they concluded that it would be desirable for them to have their next meeting, to continue this in this framework, in Buenos Aires in March 1975 and to make the preparations between now and then for that meeting.

Most of the Foreign Ministers, not all—the Foreign Ministers of Guyana and Bahamas, two of the 25 who were present in Washington, are not members of the Organization of American States—but the other 23, including Secretary Kissinger, are proceeding now to Atlanta—Secretary Kissinger will go tomorrow—which will be the site this year of the annual General Assembly of the Organization of American States. And they will continue there their formal discussions and consideration of some of these topics.

I would just say that Secretary Kissinger, I believe, was particularly gratified at the manner in which he and his colleagues were able to meet here in Washington and to continue in the open, candid, and useful kinds of exchanges that they first had in Mexico just eight weeks ago. From his point of view, and I think from the standpoint of the other Ministers as well, although of course they will speak for themselves, it was a meeting of great value for all concerned. And they do want to continue.

I know there are some questions on your minds on matters pertaining to the agenda

and to the communique, and I will be glad to address those in just a moment.

There has been considerable interest on one other subject that I would like to make a statement on before we proceed to the questions.

As you know, there have been pending before the Treasury Department of the United States applications by certain North American companies for licenses having to do with trade and export sales from Argentina to Cuba. And the statement that I would like to read to you is as follows. I should say at the outset that this subject was not discussed as such in these meetings that took place in the Foreign Ministers meetings yesterday and today. The statement is as follows:

"The Department of State announced today that the Argentine subsidiaries of American companies had been advised that licenses will be issued for the export of goods from Argentina as required by that country. The issuance of these licenses is an exception to the United States regulations concerning foreign assets controls, which will continue to be maintained."

TEXT OF COMMUNIQUE

Press release 149 dated April 18

1. Accepting the invitation of the United States Secretary of State, the Foreign Ministers of Latin America met April 17-18 in Washington to resume the dialogue begun at the Conference of Tlatelolco in Mexico eight weeks ago. Attending this meeting were the Foreign Ministers of Argentina, the Bahamas, Barbados, Bolivia, Brazil, Chile, Colombia, Costa Rica, the Dominican Republic, Ecuador, El Salvador, Guyana, Haiti, Honduras, Jamaica, Mexico, Nicaragua, Panama, Paraguay, Peru, Trinidad and Tobago, the United States of America, Uruguay and Venezuela, and the representative of the Foreign Minister of Guatemala.

2. The meeting of Foreign Ministers continued in the atmosphere of cordiality and openness which characterized the Conference of Tlatelolco. The Foreign Ministers reiterated their conviction that these meetings contribute to greater inter-American cooperation and solidarity. The topics discussed were: Structure of International Trade and the Monetary System; Cooperation for Development; Transna-

tional Enterprises; Solution of the Question of the Panama Canal; Coercive Measures of an Economic Nature; and Transfers of Technology.

3. The Foreign Ministers of the Latin American countries presented their views and positions on the several topics covered by the agenda. The Secretary of State of the United States responded, stating United States policy on the respective subjects and expressing the intention and desire of the United States to cooperate effectively in the integral development of the Latin American countries.

4. On the subject of trade, the Foreign Ministers of Latin America attached special importance to the standstill commitment made by the United States in Caracas in February 1970 and reaffirmed by Secretary Kissinger at Tlatelolco, and to the urgency of eliminating restrictions on access to the United States market for products of special interest to Latin America. They stressed that, in order to improve trade relations and promote new flows of trade from Latin America to the United States, as a minimum, no new import restrictions should be applied and existing import restrictions should not be expanded.

5. The Secretary of State recognized the importance of the United States market for the economies of Latin America. In the new spirit growing out of the Conference of Tlatelolco, he expressed his support of Latin America's aspirations in the trade field. In particular, he stressed the intention of his Government to refrain to the extent possible from establishing new trade restrictions. He reiterated the interest of his Government in achieving enactment of the proposed Trade Reform Act which would authorize generalized preferences, including in them the products of interest to Latin America, and in further liberalizing the access of Latin American products to the United States market. Similarly, he reaffirmed the commitments of his Government under resolution REM 1/70,¹ and especially stated his agreement to hold consultations with Latin America on the inclusion in the GSP [Generalized System of Preferences] of products of special interest for the area before making final decisions. Secretary Kissinger also expressed his Government's intention to support the effective participation of Latin America in reform of the international monetary system.

6. The Secretary of State of the United States considered favorably the views held by Latin America in the matter of Multilateral Trade Negotiations as regards nonreciprocity, differentiated and most favored treatment of the Generalized System of Preferences toward the developing countries and indicated his agreement to hold consultations with a view to the harmonization of positions on this subject.

¹ Adopted at the Eighth Special Meeting of the Inter-American Economic and Social Council at Caracas in February 1970.

The Foreign Ministers of the Latin American countries noted with satisfaction the fact that the Special Representative of the President of the United States for Trade Negotiations is initiating extensive bilateral consultations with the countries of Latin America to promote the achievement of these objectives.

7. The Foreign Ministers emphasized the importance of hemispheric cooperation in the field of economic development and the establishment of an international system of collective economic security for development. They stressed the importance of increasing the volume of real resource transfers to Latin America. The Ministers of Foreign Affairs recognize the importance of the policy of export diversification for the developing countries of the region and believe that this policy should be supported as an essential aspect of the progress of Latin America.

8. The Foreign Ministers stressed the need to provide preferential attention to the less developed countries of the region, especially the land-locked countries and those of insufficient internal market. They expressed their conviction concerning the importance of concessionary loans for the financing of enterprises and projects that are fundamental to the economic and social development process in those countries. They furthermore agreed on the usefulness of multilateral financial mechanisms to provide help in cases of emergency with which they are unable to cope by themselves.

9. The Foreign Ministers discussed the problem of economic coercion and the desirability of their elimination from relations among the countries of the Americas which would contribute in a positive manner to a more authentic spirit of cooperation. The Foreign Ministers of Latin America also expressed concern over proposals that would tend to restrict the access of products of developing countries to the United States market.

10. The Foreign Ministers of Latin America reiterated in its entirety the Declaration adopted in Bogotá at the "Conference of Chancellors of Latin America for Continental Cooperation" as regards the solution of the Panama Canal question and reaffirmed it without change during the course of the new dialogue begun at the Conference of Tlatelolco.

The Foreign Ministers reiterated their confidence that the bilateral negotiations presently in progress between the governments of Panama and the United States would continue in a positive tone and conclude as soon as possible with satisfactory results in conformity with the spirit of the new dialogue.

11. The Foreign Ministers decided to establish a Working Group, consisting of governmental representatives from all of the participating states, with the mandate to prepare for submission to the consideration of the next meeting, a document that would contain principles to be applicable to transnational enterprises. The Working Group will meet at least two months prior to the date on which the Conference of Buenos Aires will convene. In the preparation of the document, the Working Group should bear in mind the Report that the United Nations Organization has prepared on the subject, as well as those that are emanating from other international forums.

12. The Foreign Ministers, recognizing the importance of technology in social and economic development, agreed to convene a Working Group of Governmental representatives to study the possibility of creating a Committee on Science and the Transfer of Technology, that would have as its objective matching scientific capability with practical needs, and overcoming obstacles to the flow and use of technology in the industrialization process. For this purpose, and at the earliest possible moment, the members of that Working Group will be designated and requested to submit their report within a period of not more than six months. Without prejudice to the foregoing, the United States and Latin America will continue supporting and encouraging the existing technological development programs, especially the OAS Inter-American Committee on Science and Technology. Their efforts must be coordinated in order to avoid duplication of programs.

13. In approving this communique, the Foreign Ministers reaffirmed the value and promise of the new dialogue in inter-American relations. They believe that their meeting just concluded in Washington has given additional impulse to achievement of progress on matters of common concern.

14. The Foreign Ministers agreed to meet again in Buenos Aires in March 1975.

Secretary Kissinger Outlines Good-Partner Policy Before the OAS General Assembly

The fourth regular General Assembly of the Organization of American States (OAS), hosted by the United States, opened at At-

lanta, Ga., on April 19. Following are statements made before the Assembly on April 19 and 20 by Secretary Kissinger, who was chairman of the U.S. delegation.

STATEMENT OF APRIL 19

Press release 150 dated April 19

This meeting is the first General Assembly of the OAS to be held in the United States outside Washington. It is no accident that we are meeting in the southern part of our country, a region renowned for its warmth, its spaciousness, and its hospitality.

On behalf of all my colleagues I want to thank Governor [Jimmy] Carter and Mayor [Maynard] Jackson and all the people of Atlanta for the warmth of their reception to me and all of my colleagues. The arrangements could not have been done more beautifully and more warmly.

To our friends from Latin America and the Caribbean, I offer the welcome of President Nixon and of the people of the United States.

As we meet here outside the governmental atmosphere of Washington, the Americas can broaden their understanding of each other and of each other's people.

Governor Carter and those of you who have not attended our meetings previously, you will hear a great deal at these meetings about something called the spirit of Tlatelolco, and it is important that we say a few words about this.

Last year some of my friends, the Foreign Ministers from Latin America, suggested that there had been too many proclamations and too few policies, that the peoples of the Western Hemisphere needed a new approach to their relationship. Picking up this idea, very insistently urged upon me by the distinguished Foreign Minister from Mexico, I invited the Foreign Ministers from Latin America who were at the General Assembly in New York to a lunch. I proposed to them a new dialogue among equals. This led the distinguished Foreign Minister of Colombia to call a meeting in Bogotá which outlined an agenda for common action. And this in turn led to a meeting in Mexico at the Foreign Ministry, located in Tlatelolco—a part of Mexico City—in which the nations assembled here and two others that are not

part of the OAS dedicated themselves to a new dialogue among equals.

This dialogue has been continued this week in Washington, and we can say with confidence that we are making progress in understanding, progress in dedication, and above all, progress in concrete programs that will realize the aspirations of the Americas. In our meeting in Atlanta we can discuss the institutions that can give effect to these aspirations, and we can discuss the elements of our common progress.

At Tlatelolco all our countries agreed to dedicate ourselves to new horizons of understanding and cooperation. We saw that we had reached a time of unprecedented opportunity for achieving the goals of justice, peace, and human dignity which have for so long been the essential promise of the New World. In the spring of Atlanta let us take new, confident steps toward these new horizons.

I also have the great honor of reading to you a message from President Nixon:

"On behalf of the people of the United States I send greetings to the Foreign Ministers of the Americas on the occasion of the annual General Assembly of the Organization of American States.

"The Organization of American States has long been a symbol and expression of our Hemispheric cooperation and partnership, and it is indeed a profound pleasure and honor for the United States to host this distinguished gathering. It is my sincere hope that this meeting will result in further contributions to the improving atmosphere of relations in the Americas."

RICHARD NIXON.

STATEMENT OF APRIL 20

Office of Media Services release; as delivered

As this General Assembly of the Organization of American States convenes, a special session of the General Assembly of the United Nations is underway in New York.

This is more than a coincidence. In this continent as in the world, our nations face

together a broad agenda of interdependence. Instantaneous communications, global economics, and weapons of vast destructiveness have thrust mankind into a proximity which transforms world community from a slogan into a necessity. Our problems are unprecedented in type and scale. But our purpose is age-old: to realize man's eternal aspiration for a life of peace, well-being, dignity, and justice.

The challenge before the Americas is to define our place in this global quest. What should be this hemisphere's purposes in the modern world? How can the distinctive and special bonds that have united us, and that are reflected in this organization, foster cooperation among the nations assembled here and among all of the nations of the world?

Montaigne once wrote:

The archer must first know what he is aiming at and then set his hand, his bow, his strength, his arrow and his movements for that goal. Our plans go astray because they have no direction.

The Americas have identified their target: to make our mutual dependence define a program for effective cooperation.

We have come a long way together in the past six months. When we began our dialogue in New York last October, many feared that we might repeat the familiar cycle of new slogans followed by renewed neglect. We asked of each other: Could we make our diversity a source of strength, drawing on the richness of our material and spiritual heritage? Could we define together a concrete and realistic role for the United States to support the development efforts of our Latin American neighbors? Could the nations of the hemisphere fashion a vision of the world as it is so that we could move together toward the achievement of common goals while retaining individual dignity and uniqueness?

In Bogotá last November, the nations of Latin America took the initiative in providing an answer and proposed an agenda for action. In Mexico City in February, we came together again and launched a new process of collaboration based on this agenda and inspired by a new attitude—the spirit of Tlate-

lolco. This week in Washington, we reaffirmed our mutual commitment and moved toward concrete achievements.

What is the spirit of Tlatelolco that has given such impetus to our current efforts?

On one level, it is the enduring recognition that our nations are joined by unique and special bonds—of geography, tradition, self-interest, and common values. For all our differences, the nations of the Americas share a common origin, a history of mutual support, and a common devotion to national independence, social progress, and human dignity. For centuries we have seen ourselves as a beacon to the world, offering mankind the hope of leaving behind its eternal tragedies and achieving its enduring dreams. For decades we have been linked in an inter-American system that has been a vehicle for joint action. But on a deeper level, the spirit of Tlatelolco defines something new and vital, of importance not only in the hemisphere but across the oceans. For most of our shared history, the United States alone determined the pattern and set the pace of our cooperation. We were often tempted to do for others what we thought was best for them. That attitude no longer shapes our relationships.

New Dialogue a Necessity For All

We in the United States have come to recognize that a revolution has taken place in Latin America. Industrialization and modern communications have transformed economic and social life. A new generation is molding strengthened institutions. A sense of regional and national identity has acquired new force. The commitment to modernization has become fundamental. Brazil's gross national product approaches that of Japan less than two decades ago. The countries of the Andean Group have begun a major collaborative effort to hasten development. Argentina and Mexico are industrializing rapidly. And the newly independent countries of the English-speaking Caribbean have brought different perspectives and traditions, a fresh vitality, and if I may say so, a new charm to hemispheric relations.

The United States, too, has changed enormously in the last decade. We have learned that peace cannot be achieved by our efforts alone and that development is far more than simply an economic problem. Through years of anguish and trial, we have found that the United States cannot remake the world and that neither peace nor development is achievable unless it engages the effort and the commitment of other nations.

This is why our new dialogue is not a concession by the United States, but a necessity for us all. We convene as equals, on the basis of mutual respect—each recognizing that our special relationship can be preserved only if we transform it to meet the new conditions of our time and the new aspirations of our peoples.

In the 19th century, the United States declared what those outside the hemisphere should not do within it. In the 1930's, the United States proclaimed what we would no longer do within it—the policy of the Good Neighbor. In 1974 in Mexico City, in Washington, and now in Atlanta, we of the Americas jointly proclaim our cooperative actions—the policy of the Good Partner.

Our new dialogue has already been marked by substantial progress:

—We have committed ourselves to a cooperative development effort and to the creation of a system of collective economic security.

—We have agreed to devote special attention to the needs of the poorest countries of the hemisphere.

—We have agreed to consult in order to develop common positions, so far as possible, in major international negotiations, especially on economic issues.

—We have established a working group to develop principles for the conduct of transnational enterprises.

—We have set up a Working Group on Science and the Transfer of Technology to strengthen our cooperation in the process of industrialization.

—We have decided on multilateral financial institutions to deal with those natural

disasters and economic crises that our countries cannot deal with alone.

—Above all, we agreed in the Declaration of Tlatelolco that “interdependence has become a physical and moral imperative, and that a new, vigorous spirit of inter-American solidarity is therefore essential.”

For its part, the United States knows that if the answers to the great dialogue between the developed and the developing countries cannot be found in the Western Hemisphere they may not be found at all. We seek a hemisphere lifted by progress, not torn by divisions. We are committed to shaping our action to accelerate Latin America's efforts to fulfill the aspirations of its peoples.

We will do our utmost to expand Latin American access to U.S. markets, to maintain our assistance levels, and to consult on political and economic issues of common concern. We have moved to resolve old disputes with Peru, Panama, and Mexico that have blocked progress along our common road.

Together, we must now ask ourselves: What are our ultimate goals? We in the Americas have always believed that our efforts and our achievements had relevance beyond our shores. Thus it is clear that our special relationship cannot mean the formation of an exclusive bloc. The world has already seen enough of pressure groups, exclusive spheres, and discriminatory arrangements.

A bloc implies a rigidity that would deny our different perspectives and constrain our reach in different directions. Some of us have global responsibilities; some of us feel affinities with the Third World; developing ties with many regions attract us all. We seek not a common front against others but, rather, a common effort with others toward the global cooperation which is dictated by political and economic realities.

A healthy special relationship is not a bloc. Working together, the Western Hemisphere can lead the world toward solutions to those basic problems of the contemporary period that are now being discussed in New York. Rejecting autarky, respecting diversity, but

in a spirit of solidarity, we in the Americas can both promote our common objectives and strengthen the fabric of global cooperation.

The Inter-American Agenda

In this context of our wider purposes, let me outline for your consideration some principles and tasks to guide our common efforts.

Inter-American solidarity must be rooted in a free association of independent peoples. The spirit of dialogue, of give-and-take, that has so enriched our meetings in Mexico and Washington must be perpetuated. For its part, the United States pledges that it will not seek to impose its political preferences and that it will not intervene in the domestic affairs of its Western Hemisphere neighbors.

Effective collaboration requires continuing and close consultation. The United States understands that its global policies and actions can have a major impact upon the other nations of this hemisphere. Therefore we have pledged ourselves to a constant and intimate process of consultation.

We look forward to periodic meetings of America's Foreign Ministers to discuss issues of mutual concern in the Americas and in the world. We will consult closely in the global monetary and trade talks and in other international negotiations. We do not expect an identity of views. We do believe that better comprehension and sensitivity to one another's positions will benefit us all.

Our relationship must assure progress and a decent life for all our peoples. The ultimate test of our relations will be to translate our aspirations into concrete programs, especially in the decisive field of development.

Earlier this week, before the special session of the United Nations, I listed six principles which economic reality and our common humanity dictate should be the guiding principles for international action to spur development:

—We need to expand the supply of energy at an equitable price.

—We need to free the world from the cycle of raw material shortages and surpluses.

—We need to achieve a balance between food production and food demand.

—We need to extend special consideration to the poorest nations.

—We need to accelerate the transfer of science and technology from developed to developing nations.

—We need to preserve and enlarge a global trade, monetary, and investment system which will sustain industrial civilization and stimulate its growth.

This hemisphere has a vital stake in the world community's response to these challenges. Some of these problems, such as the inventory of raw material resources in relation to needs, are best carried out on a global basis. But on many of the items of this agenda the nations of this hemisphere can provide leadership and inspiration and advance the welfare of their peoples through joint actions.

In the field of *energy*, the hemisphere uniquely encompasses both producers and consumers. The United States is ready to collaborate with its hemisphere partners in a major way both bilaterally and multilaterally.

The Working Group on Science and the Transfer of Technology established by the Foreign Ministers two days ago in Washington can be charged with setting up programs for sharing information on energy conservation and for pooling our efforts to expand available supplies, to develop alternative sources of conventional fuels, and to encourage the discovery of new and renewable energy sources. The Latin American Energy Organization and the United Nations Economic Commission for Latin America provide additional mechanisms for cooperation.

The United States is prepared to link its technology with the resources and capital of the hemisphere's oil producers to help them expand their production and diversify their economies.

The Western Hemisphere has a special role to play in overcoming the *world food shortage*. This continent, even as it is scarred by malnutrition and hunger, has a vast agricul-

tural potential. President Nixon is asking the Congress to raise our assistance to food production programs in the Americas by 50 percent. We have, as well, lifted our own domestic production restrictions.

The shortage of fertilizer and the steep rise in its price are a problem of particular urgency. The United States will give high priority to linking our technological skills with the raw material and capital of oil-producing countries to encourage the development of new fertilizer capacity.

In a collective effort, I propose that we cooperate in a program to increase food production in this hemisphere substantially by the end of this decade. This program should encompass research, the application of science and technology, and the intensified application of foreign and domestic resources:

—As an initial step, we should ask the Inter-American Economic and Social Council to help focus our efforts to increase production and productivity. The Working Group on Science and the Transfer of Technology should explore new ways to increase agricultural productivity, especially in the continent's vast tropical zones.

—A comprehensive hemispheric agricultural survey would be an important contribution to the success of the World Food Conference.

—Food processing is another high-priority field for cooperation and innovation.

Only this week, the Foreign Ministers of the Americas pledged to give special attention to the problems of the *least developed* among us. To this end, the Inter-American Development Bank should adapt its lending policies to ease the shock of rising energy prices on the poorest nations in the hemisphere. We welcome the decision of Venezuela to assist the Bank in this task, including concessional lending assistance to those who require it most.

The United States, as the hemisphere's richest nation, has a particular obligation. We will urge our Congress to maintain our assistance levels to the hemisphere. It is an expression of our special relationship that

U.S. bilateral and multilateral aid to the hemisphere is larger, on a per capita basis, than to any other region of the globe. In accordance with the recommendations of the recent Washington Conference, we are now urgently examining whether Latin America's share can be further increased.

The *transfer of science and technology* may be an even more important bottleneck in the development effort than capital. The United States, as a technologically advanced nation, recognizes a special responsibility in this regard. We believe that normally private investment is the most efficient vehicle for the transfer of these resources, but governments can facilitate the transfer of advanced technology to stimulate balanced development.

The Working Group on Science and the Transfer of Technology can seek to overcome obstacles to the flow and use of productive technology. In addition to those I have already mentioned relating to energy and agriculture, its tasks should encompass:

—Improving the dissemination of information on available technologies, including managerial and engineering skills;

—Spurring the search for new technologies in such areas as marine sciences and labor-intensive industry; and

—Identifying how to adapt technology most effectively to different national circumstances and industries.

In addition to these projects, all of which require improved cooperation among governments, current OAS programs aimed at strengthening university and basic research and training institutions in Latin America should continue to receive the wholehearted support of this Assembly.

The Americas are in a position to participate effectively and to make an important contribution to the reform of the international systems that govern *trade, monetary, and investment* relations. The United States will support such efforts.

Trade is critical in the development process. The United States is strongly committed to a system of generalized tariff preferences,

and once this legislation is enacted, we will consult closely with our partners in this hemisphere on how it can be made most beneficial to your needs. Despite the uncertainties arising from the energy crisis, we will do our utmost to avoid new restrictions on Latin America's access to our markets.

The United States recognizes that trade within this hemisphere depends significantly on global patterns. Trade expansion worldwide is one of our longstanding objectives. Mutual support in the forthcoming multilateral trade negotiations can help us overcome many bilateral trade problems within the hemisphere.

In the spirit of Tlatelolco, the United States is prepared to adjust its position on specific issues in these negotiations to take account of Latin American objectives. As a first step, the President's Special Trade Representative, Ambassador Eberle, departs today to begin bilateral consultations with many of your governments. Similar efforts are planned through organs of the OAS and in Geneva.

Private investment is crucial to development. At times, it has also been a source of friction. At the Washington Foreign Ministers Conference, we agreed to join with you in a study commission which would prepare guidelines applicable to the conduct of transnational corporations. We cannot afford to let our political relations and our economic cooperation be distorted by commercial quarrels.

A modern inter-American system requires that the Treaty of Rio and the OAS be adjusted to new conditions. The inter-American system is the oldest major association of nation-states. It has pioneered the concept of international organization and collective security. It has been in the forefront of the development of international law. It has championed the principles of self-determination and nonintervention. It has functioned productively for more than 70 years because it has been adaptable. Today, as we contemplate past experience and future needs, we see that further modification is necessary.

First, development is impossible without security. The Rio Treaty has helped keep this hemisphere largely free of turmoil and conflict. We should modernize it, in keeping with our times, but we should preserve its essentials.

Second, we need to reform the OAS so that it becomes a more effective instrument for hemispheric cooperation. It is overly rigid in its structures, unnecessarily formal in its procedures, and insufficiently broad in its membership. To remedy these weaknesses:

—All major OAS meetings, including the General Assembly, should be made less formal.

—The Permanent Council should be recognized as the central executive body of the OAS.

—OAS membership should be open to all the nations who have attended the recent Foreign Ministers conferences.

—The OAS should be restructured to become a more effective instrument for our economic consultations.

One of our principal tasks should be to create institutions to implement the decisions of the new dialogue.

Broadening the Dialogue

Our dialogue will remain formal if confined to diplomats or officials. It must involve our peoples, catching their imagination and liberating their abilities. The efforts on which we are embarked require all the human and intellectual resources of our continent.

To this end, the United States will see to it that its cultural and educational exchange programs make a more important contribution to cooperation as well as to mutual understanding. We will:

—Increase our emphasis on professional exchanges designed to link comparable institutions in the United States and Latin America;

—Encourage seminars and joint research on such topics as urbanization, protection of the environment, and other problems common to all our countries; and

—Stimulate awareness of the extraordinary cultural richness of the Americas by promoting tourism, exhibitions, and other activities to expand our awareness of each other and our appreciation of our common humanity.

Distinguished Ministers and friends, delegates, Mr. Secretary General: The warmth of the welcome you have received here testifies to the friendship of the American people for our neighbors to the south. The ultimate hemispheric solidarity comes from the heart, not from the mind. It is rooted in history and inspired by common traditions.

As our Mexican colleague said at Tlatelolco, we of the Americas have advanced from political speeches to political dialogue and now to political consultation. This must be the design for our new purpose, for great

challenges lie before us. We hear the demand of our peoples for justice and dignity; we know their yearning for security and progress; we cannot give them less, for it is their birthright.

In 1900 José Enrique Rodó wrote his classic "Ariel." He viewed the two Americas at the turn of the century as in fundamental opposition. Yet he foresaw that another kind of relationship could eventually emerge. He wrote:

To the extent that we can already distinguish a higher form of cooperation as the basis of a distant future, we can see that it will come not as a result of unilateral formulas, but through the reciprocal influence and skillful harmonization of those attributes which give our different peoples their glory.

Let us here choose such a future now, and not in the distance. Let us realize the glory of our peoples by working together for a better life for our children. In so doing, we shall realize the final glory and common destiny of the New World.

DEPARTMENT OF STATE PUBLICATION 8770

Inter American Series 107

Released June 1974

Office of Media Services
Bureau of Public Affairs

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





MINNESOTA HISTORICAL SOCIETY

Copyright in the Walter F. Mondale Papers belongs to the Minnesota Historical Society and its content may not be copied without the copyright holder's express written permission. Users may print, download, link to, or email content, however, for individual use.

To request permission for commercial or educational use, please contact the Minnesota Historical Society.



www.mnhs.org