PRESS
DEPARTMENT OF STATE

No. 72
April 15, 1985

WELCOMING REMARKS
BY
THE HONORABLE GEORGE P. SHULTZ
SECRETARY OF STATE
BEFORE THE
CONFERENCE ON RELIGIOUS LIBERTY
LOY HENDERSON AUDITORIUM
MONDAY, APRIL 15, 1985, 9:00 A.M.

SECRETARY SHULTZ: I consider it a great privilege to have an opportunity to take a part in this important conference populated as it is by such a distinguished group, and dedicated as it is to a topic of such central importance.

In the early years of the twentieth century, fashionable opinion probably would have dismissed the idea that the latter decades of this century would be a time of religious revival. The conventional wisdom of the time was that this modern age of reason and science could hold little room for something as supposedly "irrational" as religious faith. The mere fact that we are today holding a conference on religious liberty says something very important about the relevance of religion to the great issues of our time.

We see here in America, and throughout the world, that religion remains a powerful force. It inspires men and women of all races and nationalities; religious institutions hold the allegiance of hundreds of millions on every continent, even where these institutions are under attack by the state, even where those who dare express their religious faith risk persecution, ostracism, or even death.

We will have to leave to future historians the full explanation of this resurgence of faith in the modern age. Perhaps the social dislocations of an era of progress have strained people's inner resources which traditional values have traditionally buttressed.

Whatever the cause, the new vitality of religion represents a clear rejection of the "modern" notion that reason and science hold all the solutions to the problems of earthly existence, or that they can adequately fulfill mankind's spiritual needs. We may also be witnessing a rejection of another related modern idea -- that all the answers to these human problems and needs somehow lie with the state.

The resiliency of the Catholic Church in Poland, for instance, and the efforts of Jews, Christians, and many other groups to retain their religious identity in the Soviet Union, are clear evidence that communism's attempt to supplant religion with its own utopian ideology has failed. No matter what hardships they may endure, men and women around the world are today bravely refusing to sacrifice their beliefs to the state.

This resurgence of faith is a welcome development. America's founding fathers well understood the importance of religious faith and values in our own society. They believed that the basic civic virtues, so necessary to a free, democratic society, could not be imbued in men and women by government. Government was meant to safeguard the rights and freedoms of the individual. But something else was necessary to instill the values and moral principles upon which a free society nevertheless relies. And that something else was religion. Religious values safeguard the dignity and sanctity of the individual. They teach us that we are all part of the brotherhood of mankind. They are a bulwark against the moral relativism, and even nihilism, that has at times threatened the modern world.

And the founders believed that the human spirit was a realm over which the government could not and should not hold sway. As John Locke wrote, "The care of souls cannot belong to the civil magistrate." When the founders called for the separation of church and state, therefore, it was not because they wished to elevate the political over the spiritual. They did not seek to replace religion with the state. On the contrary, what they feared was state control of the spiritual realm, in whatever guise. As Thomas Jefferson put it, "Religion is a matter which lies solely between man and his God .... He owes no account to none other for his faith or his worship, [and] the legislative powers of government reach actions only, and not opinion."The founders wanted to protect the free society they created from the possibility of an intolerant, established church like that which they had fled in England. They were convinced that there had to be an inviolable realm of individual thought and action that is sacred, totally beyond and outside state control.

In short, they understood that a free society required religious liberty. For without religious liberty, what other aspect of individual thought can be spared? Once the border of that sacred realm is crossed, all freedoms inevitably become vulnerable.

What the American founders understood holds true today. Indeed, the close relationship between religious liberty and all other forms of individual freedom should be even more apparent to us in our own time.

In the totalitarian societies of the modern world we see that religion is always among the first targets of repression. Traditional dictatorships have often assaulted the church when they felt threatened by its participation in challenges to their authority. This is hardly excusable, but it is also not systematic. But in totalitarian societies, the notion that a man or a woman can have a greater loyalty to God than to the state is anathema. At the core of communist ideology is the idea that the rulers must arrogate to themselves the attributes of omnipotence and omniscience that religious believers ascribe to God alone. The utopia that all the major religions reserve for the next life was to be made here on earth.

The "truth" had already been revealed, and it was the sole province of the state. In service to this awful myth, totalitarian rulers seek to impose the complete control of the state over <u>all</u> areas of life. And what they cannot control, they try to destroy.

We know, of course, that religious intolerance and repression are not limited to the communist totalitarian societies. Iran today, for example, has viciously suppressed religious minorities in a manner far exceeding in brutality any of the previous excesses of the Shah. Members of the Bahai faith have been killed, imprisoned, and persecuted, in violation not only of the universal principle of freedom to worship, but, ironically, also of the Islamic tradition of religious tolerance. Khomeini's rule is a blight on the history of Islam.

The myth in Khomeini's Iran is different from that of the communists in the Soviet Union, but the result is the same. The state knows the truth, and all who dissent are to be vanquished. The brutalities of Khomeini's regime against the Bahai show what happens to individual liberty when the state tries to control the thoughts and beliefs of its citizens, when it obliterates the distinction between the secular, political realm and the spiritual realm. We must never forget this important lesson.

In the late eighteenth century, the American founders had a vision: they wanted to create a free society where all men and women could worship as they please, openly, without fear of threats to their lives and livelihoods.

Today, two hundred years later, we, too, have a vision: we want to see the hopes and dreams of those yearning for freedom throughout the world become reality. We must recognize, as the founding fathers did, that a central part of that freedom we seek to promote is freedom of religion. One cannot exist without the other. We must support, in whatever way we can, those around the world who seek only to worship God without fear of persecution, and who struggle against the state's efforts to control their thoughts and beliefs. Whether it is to be the rights of Jews in the Soviet Union to live as Jews, the rights of Bahais in Iran to live as Bahais, the rights of Buddhists in Vietnam to live as Buddhists, we must lend our support, moral and otherwise, to this most basic of human needs.

All religions call upon us to recognize and respect the essential dignity, equality, and fraternity of all men and women. We are all equal in God's eyes; therefore, we owe it to ourselves, to the world, and to God to protect and promote religious liberty everywhere.

Thank you.

(Applause)

(Remarks concluded at 9:15 a.m.)

PRESS
DEPARTMENT OF STATE

No. 73
April 16, 1985

AS PREPARED FOR DELIVERY

SOUTHERN AFRICA:

TOWARD AN AMERICAN CONSENSUS

ADDRESS BY
THE HONORABLE GEORGE P. SHULTZ
SECRETARY OF STATE
BEFORE THE
NATIONAL PRESS CLUB
Washington, DC
April 16, 1985

For further information contact:

Much has been said in recent years about the need to rebuild the national consensus in foreign policy -- the consensus that assures continuity and purpose in our diplomacy. I share that view.

Consensus does not just happen spontaneously. It must be nurtured, like a garden; it grows from knowledge and experience. Consensus should be a positive force: We need to decide what we are for and know what means are available to achieve our goals; consensus cannot be simply a negative catalogue of what we are against. And we will achieve neither consensus nor results if our public discourse is simply emotional, or divorced from facts and from a realistic understanding of the problems at hand.

Today, I want to speak about an area of the world that has become a focus of interest and debate; and where both our policies and the regional realities are too often misunderstood or even distorted. I am talking about southern Africa.

A great human drama is unfolding in southern Africa, as new nations struggle for stability and progress and as South Africa itself confronts the necessity of internal change. This drama has crucial implications for the United States. The region's future touches on our most basic moral convictions as well as our interests and our global responsibilities for security and peace.

On such an issue above all, a national consensus is imperative. On a question of such overwhelming moral, practical, and strategic significance, our national policy must be coherent, considered, and effective. We simply cannot afford to let southern Africa become a divisive domestic issue -- tearing our country apart, rendering our actions haphazard and impotent, and contributing to the ugliest and most violent outcome.

Equally important -- and I believe this deeply -- the elements of such a consensus exist, based on our principles, our goals, and our capabilities. Few Americans today would contest that we want to help the people of South Africa -- black and white -- build a just society; and we want to promote peace, freedom, and progress throughout southern Africa. Few Americans would contest that change is inevitable. The question now being debated is: How best can we help South Africans manage that change? What is the most effective way to promote a just and peaceful outcome?

Today I will outline the analysis and the facts that underlie our strategy. I do so with confidence that Americans overwhelmingly support the goals of racial justice, progress, and peaceful change, and are realistic enough to judge for themselves what policies work and don't work.

Southern African Realities

In 1981, the new Reagan Administration found in southern Africa a region marked:

-- by growing racial tension in South Africa;

-- by escalating cross-border violence;

-- by Soviet and Cuban intervention in the region;

-- by stalled negotiations for the independence of Namibia, a territory illegally ruled by South Africa; and

-- by governments that were willing, indeed eager, to see the United States undertake an effective and forceful diplomatic role.

To play such a role, we had to take into account hard realities.

The first reality is that South Africa's denial of political rights to the country's majority -- apartheid -- is not only morally indefensible; it is in the long run unsustainable.

South Africa's blacks are making their voices heard, saying that they are no longer willing to live under a system that denies them fair political participation; both demography and economics are on the side of those challenging the old order. The key psychological breakthrough will come when everyone in South Africa recognizes that change is coming; then the question shifts from "whether" to "how." An upheaval of bloodshed and destruction would be a monstrous tragedy for all South Africans of all races.

Second, South Africa is not a small island. It is a regional powerhouse endowed with vast mineral resources and real economic might. It is the hub of the entire area's economy and infrastructure. The bordering states -- Mozambique, Zimbabwe, Botswana, Lesotho, Swaziland, Namibia -- and even countries farther away such as Zambia and Zaire, are heavily dependent upon South Africa's ports, industries, railway networks, and financial institutions. At the same time, South Africa needs -- but to a lesser degree -- the markets, the labor, the transport systems of its neighbors. Any policy which ignores this symbiotic relationship is out of touch with reality. A scenario of upheaval in South Africa will spell disaster for its neighbors.

But for much of the past decade, this interdependence has been strained by hostility and armed conflict. This is the third reality: Southern Africa has been a region of conflict, with warfare or armed dissidence of one form or another in South Africa, Zimbabwe, Mozambique, Namibia, Lesotho, and Angola. A senseless cycle of cross-border violence increased in ferocity as guerrillas operating from the black states thrust into South Africa, while South Africa turned on its neighbors with its military might and destabilizing efforts.

The violence has provided new opportunities for our global adversaries. And this is a fourth reality. Today there are about 30,000 Cuban troops in Angola, along with Soviet and East European advisers. Soviet aid in the region has been almost exclusively military. Our adversaries have no constructive stake in the region, seeing rather in instability their best chance to expand their influence. When the Soviets and Cubans intervene in a part of the world far from their borders, we had better pay attention. Such intervention threatens African independence, as well as the global balance. The peoples of Africa deserve better than the bankruptcy -- economic, political, and moral -- of the Soviet model. More and more Africans have come to look to the United States and the West for help in addressing the twin challenges of regional peace and economic survival.

This leads to a fifth reality -- the importance of the American role. Of course there are limits to what we can do directly. Our influence over issues and players is not the determining factor in their actions. Nevertheless, we are not without potential to affect events. While the Soviets can fan conflicts and supply the implements of war to pursue them, they cannot produce solutions. That peacemaking role can only be played by a power that has a working relationship and influence with all the parties, including, of course, South Africa.

I have devoted some time to describing the broad regional realities because the regional context is all-important. Its many dimensions are interrelated. The external environment has a direct bearing on the situation within South Africa; a white government that no longer sees itself as besieged from outside its borders will be better able to take the steps it must to reform its own society. Conversely, internal upheavals in South Africa can spill over and complicate the regional diplomacy. An end to cross-border violence is essential if the surrounding black states are to be able to devote their energies to economic development or to offer less tempting opportunities to Soviet adventurism.

From the outset, the Reagan Administration undertook to help influence the process of change:

-- to accelerate the peaceful evolution in South Africa away from apartheid; and

-- to diminish the violence and instability that threaten lives and livelihoods throughout the region.

The complexities are daunting. But the United States has confronted an unsatisfactory situation, worked at the problem with care and determination, and achieved a good measure of progress. There have been ups and downs, obstacles and setbacks. But through painstaking diplomacy, we have reached the point where the agenda we proposed is accepted by all participants; where we, not the Soviet Union, have a major say in helping shape the region's political future. There is now less cross-border violence than there has been in eleven years. There has been more reform in South Africa in the past four years than in the previous thirty.

The gains are fragile. Nonetheless, a process of change is clearly under way -- offering hope to Africa's peoples if we continue to show responsibility and dedication in helping them manage that process.

South Africa

Let me start with the central issue of domestic reform in South Africa. In pursuing that goal, we have been guided by two important facts.

First, South Africa is not a closed, totalitarian society in which the government controls all aspects of life, all means of communication, all avenues of thought. While the white minority dominates the system, there is in that system a significant degree of openness of political activity and expression -- a generally free press, an independent judiciary, vigorous debate within the governing party and in parliament, and vocal critics of all viewpoints. There is nothing comparable in the Soviet Union. This degree of openness reflects the fact that white South Africa is not immune to the moral influence of the West; indeed the white community's desire to be viewed as part of the Western world, and its growing recognition of the need for change, are among the grounds for hope for peaceful change. How many governments in the world would permit ABC's Nightline program to set up shop for a week, probe and dissect the country's ills, film heated debates between government leaders and their most ardent critics, and then show those programs to its people?

Second, we chose to focus on getting results. We cannot have it both ways: We cannot have influence with people if we treat them as moral lepers, especially when they are themselves beginning to address the agenda of change. South Africa's neighbors recognize this. We must too.

By the same token, this has not kept us from speaking out -- to South Africans of all races and to the American people. We have conveyed the message to the South African Government that a more constructive relationship with the United States is possible, provided that it demonstrates a sustained commitment to significant reform toward a more just society:

-- We have consistently called for an end to apartheid;

-- We have spoken out forcefully for press freedom and against repressive measures such as forced removals, arbitrary detentions, and bannings;

-- We have called for political dialogue between blacks and whites and for an end to Nelson Mandela's long imprisonment;

-- With our support, U.S. businesses have become a positive force for change in South Africa by adopting the Sullivan Code of fair labor employment practices and by providing educational, housing and other benefits worth more than $100 million to their black employees over the past few years; and

-- We have developed nearly $30 million in assistance programs to train leaders in the black community to help them work more effectively for change in their own society.

The truth is that South Africa is changing. For the most part, the transformation is being brought about by reality -- by the growing realization that a modern industrial society simply cannot be governed by a pre-industrial political philosophy of racial segregation.

The old illusion that South Africa's blacks could live permanently or enjoy citizenship rights only in designated tribal homelands -- so that in the end there would no longer be any "South African blacks" -- is being abandoned. Blacks are no longer prohibited from acquiring property rights in the supposedly "white" urban areas. The right of blacks to organize trade unions has been recognized, and black unions are now a powerful factor on South Africa's industrial relations scene; fully 50 percent of trade unionists in South Africa are black. Central business districts are being opened to black businessmen, and cities like Durban and Cape Town are desegregating their public facilities.

Faced with the obvious injustice of forced removals of settled black communities, and with the obvious inability to stop the influx of blacks into the cities, the government has suspended such removals and is shifting to what it calls an "orderly urbanization" policy.

The government has now acknowledged that it must consult with representative blacks about political participation outside the tribal homelands and at the national level; mere local self-government is understood to be inadequate. Just this week, the government accepted a special commission's report that calls for the abolition of laws banning interracial marriage and sexual relations -- one of the most important symbols of apartheid.

If we recognize that white opinion holds vital keys to change, then we must also recognize that change must originate in shifts in white politics. In this regard, in the past three years, the white government has crossed a historical divide: It has been willing to accept major defections from its own ranks in order to begin to offer a better political, economic, and social deal to the nation's black majority.

These changes are not enough. South Africa is not now a just society.

Serious inequities continue: repression, detentions without trial, and the prospect of treason trials for some black leaders. The issues of common citizenship for all, and of black political rights, have been raised but not yet concretely addressed by the government. The hated pass laws and influx control continue, though the government appears to be rethinking its actions on this front. Much more must be done. Change has just begun, but it has begun. Our job is to continue to encourage it.

The recent domestic violence is clearly a setback. All Americans are saddened and dismayed at the almost daily reports of violent encounters that have caused nearly 300 deaths among black South Africans over the past nine months. The United States has consistently, repeatedly, and publicly deplored this bloodshed and the police tactics that only produce killings and add fuel to the unrest.

There is no excuse for official violence against peaceful demonstrators. Any government has a duty to maintain law and order. Nevertheless, that cannot be done simply on the basis of force; law and order also means due process, and adequate channels for airing and resolving grievances.

But just as we recognize the right of peaceable assembly, so, too, if we are to be taken seriously, must we reject the right of any to take the law into their own hands. That is a formula for anarchy. We applaud the courage of those black leaders who press for non-violent change, confronted on one side by a surging mass of black bitterness and on the other by a long-unresponsive political system. We welcome the words of Bishop Desmond Tutu, Nobel Peace laureate, who urged a crowd of blacks at a funeral the other day: "Don't undermine our wonderful cause. Let us not use the methods that are used against us by our enemies. When we finally achieve our goal of freedom, we must be able to look back with pride at how we got there."

There are responsibilities here for all South Africans, and most particularly for those in authority. We hope the government will move quickly and concretely to restore confidence in its reform commitments; we urge it to take up the dialogue with black leaders about the road to a just society. We urge all South Africans to take advantage of openings for peace.

Regional Security

Peace within South Africa, as I said, is directly linked to the question of regional peace. A society that feels immensely threatened by outside forces is less likely to loosen the controls at home. Nor can black states normalize their relations with their South African neighbor so long as there is no convincing movement away from apartheid.

The United States has worked hard, and successfully, to maintain the confidence of the parties and to facilitate negotiated solutions:

-- We helped bring South Africa and Mozambique together in the Nkomati Accord of March 1984, ending government-supported cross-border violence and promoting economic cooperation. This accord faces serious challenges, but both sides are committed to making it work.

-- We helped Angola and South Africa agree on a plan for the withdrawal of South African forces from Angola and control of SWAPO and Cuban troops in southern Angola. The war between South Africa and Angola is over; there has in fact been peace for the last 14 months.

The few South African troops left in Angola as part of a joint monitoring commission will be withdrawn this week as the final step of disengagement. The problems of Angola and Namibia are far from solved, but this marks important progress.

-- Our diplomacy, in concert with key Western allies, has brought Namibia closer to independence than ever before. Agreement on a timetable for Cuban troop withdrawal from Angola is the one issue remaining in the overall settlement package. Let there be no mistake about it: U.N. Security Council Resolution 435 remains the only internationally acceptable basis for a solution.

-- The United States has helped bring about understandings between Lesotho and Botswana, on the one hand, and South Africa on the other, averting potential conflicts.

-- And we helped move Mozambique away from heavy dependence on the Soviet camp and closer to true nonalignment. We demonstrated to Mozambique that its best interests are served by closer cooperation with the West, and by rejection of confrontation with South Africa. The trend of our relations with Mozambique is positive and needs further encouragement.

All of these steps have lessened the danger of warfare. But the situation remains fragile; it requires the continued pragmatism, realism, and dedication of the parties involved. New opportunities have been created; they should be seized.

America's Responsibility

Southern Africa is thus, clearly and unmistakably, in a process of transformation. The only question is how this change will come about. The idea that our policy is simply reinforcing the status quo is an utter misconception -- a display of ignorance of what is going on. We are engaged as a force for peace and for constructive change throughtout southern Africa. This is the only responsible course, and we will not be deflected from it.

Some believe that the United States should have nothing to do with Marxist regimes such as Angola or Mozambique, leaving them to cope with their predictable economic failures or throwing in our lot with their armed opponents. Such a notion ignores the realities on the ground in southern Africa as well as significant distinctions between those two countries.

In Angola, when the Portuguese granted independence, a number of black liberation movements competed for power.

A Marxist party took over the country in 1975 backed and sustained by the massive Soviet/Cuban intervention. UNITA, an important indigenous nationalist movement, was denied a share of power. The U.S. Congress passed the Tunney and Clark amendments barring any U.S. support for those Angolans opposing the Soviet/Cuban intervention -- as if to grant the Marxist regime immunity against its own people; the Brezhnev Doctrine -- which declares that Communist revolutions are irreversible -- was, in effect, enacted into American law. Since 1975, UNITA has waged a determined armed struggle in the countryside against the MPLA government's monopoly of power; it has steadily grown in strength and territorial control.

We do not believe that Angola's agony -- still continuing ten years after independence -- can be resolved militarily. In our contacts with both the MPLA government and UNITA, we sense little optimism about military solutions. Our diplomacy, therefore, has sought constructive alternatives to open-ended warfare and suffering. By focusing on the related <u>international</u> questions of Namibian independence and Cuban troop withdrawal from Angola, we have taken important steps forward. The principle of a regional settlement involving these two issues -- Namibia and Angola -- is now accepted; the next step is to agree on specifics.

If we succeed, Africa's last colony will achieve statehood, and foreign intervention and foreign forces will be removed from the Angolan equation. This can set the stage for all Angolans to work out their own future and achieve reconciliation at home.

In Mozambique, we make a different calculation based on different facts. Mozambique and South Africa have moved toward coexistence based on their own national interests. This prospect, which we encouraged, offered an opening for improved relations with Western nations and Western help for Mozambique's shattered economy. We have seized these openings. By competing, we have strengthened a trend favorable to our interests. In these circumstances, our European allies, South Africa, and Mozambique's other neighbors have thrown their weight behind that country's turn toward moderation. We have done the same.

There are also those who believe we should cut our ties with the government of South Africa because of its racial policies. This is just as mistaken as the idea that we should refuse to deal with Angola and Mozambique because of their Marxist inclinations. We cannot bury our heads in the sand. We do not enhance our ability to influence change in the region by eliminating ourselves as an actor.

Some propose that we try to cut South Africa off, to run it out of the Western world through boycotts, embargoes, and sanctions. They argue that even if such actions do not bring about change, our position will "put us on the side of right." I reject that view. It leads us down the road to ineffectual actions that are more likely to strengthen resistance to change than strengthen the forces of reform. It ignores the harm that such an approach will inflict precisely on the black majority whom the advocates of boycotts, embargoes, and sanctions purportedly want to help.

Opinion polls in South Africa by reputable organizations reveal that the overwhelming majority of black factory workers are opposed to disinvestment by American firms. An economy that even now needs to create 250,000 new jobs for young blacks each year, and that will have twice as many of them entering the job market by the turn of the century, needs more job opportunities, not fewer.

I do not understand why it is good for American investors to create jobs for black workers in Zimbabwe or Zaire, but not in South Africa. And I suspect the tens of thousands who have flocked to the squatters' camp at Crossroads outside Cape Town in a desperate search for work would not understand either.

Nor would the more than one million Africans from the surrounding nations who have moved into South Africa in search of employment.

I do not accept the argument that it is in our interests to help a black middle class develop in Guinea or Gabon, but not in South Africa.

I do not agree with those who argue that American companies should promote the social and educational advancement of their black workers in Sierra Leone or Senegal, but not in South Africa.

Now, I am quite aware that some of the proposals now before the Congress are not, strictly speaking, disinvestment bills. Instead they are couched in terms of conditional bans on "new investment," or new loans, unless certain political changes are made within a year or two. Other proposals would make the voluntary Sullivan Code mandatory and severely penalize firms that do not comply adequately. Well-intentioned as these proposals may be, let us not kid ourselves about their likely effect. Given the additional risks and uncertainties which such legislation would create, many U.S. firms are apt to conclude that their continued presence in South Africa is simply no longer worth the candle. The result will be reduced American influence.

U.S. firms, private U.S. groups and foundations, as well as the U.S. Government, have played an important role in influencing the changes we have seen. That is because they were there.

The only course consistent with American values is to engage ourselves as a force for constructive, peaceful change. It is not our business to cheer on, from the sidelines, the forces of polarization that could erupt in a race war; it is not our job to exacerbate hardship, which could lead to the same result.

At the same time, a clear bipartisan American voice that rejects apartheid as an unjust, anachronistic, and untenable system is another essential building block of a successful policy. And here I return to my opening theme of consensus. As long as Americans speak with contrary and confusing voices, our influence will be less than it could be.

What, then, can we as Americans agree on?

First, we can all agree that southern Africa is an important part of the world that demands our attention.

Second, we can all agree that the pace of change, of reform and development in each of the countries of the region, depends on regional peace and stability. Continued conflict only helps perpetuate racism and poverty.

Third, we can agree that apartheid must go. It is a system contrary to all that we stand for as a nation.

Fourth, we can agree that we are more interested in promoting real progress than in posturing, debating points, or grandiose schemes that are likely to prove ineffectual.

Fifth, we can agree that in southern Africa, as in every other part of the world, the engine of economic and social advancement is the productive private sector and its links to the global economy.

And, finally, we should agree that America's role must always be on the side of those seeking peaceful change. We should agree that we do not support violence, but that we do support -- and will support aggressively -- those who have committed themselves to promote change and justice.

These are the elements for a broad consensus that will allow America to speak with one voice.

We must recognize the importance of what has been taking place in South Africa in recent years, and we must reinforce that process creatively. Only by engaging ourselves can we hope to do so. We will not be the main actors in this human drama; that role must be played by the region's people -- black and white Africans. But we must not stand by and throw American matches on the emotional tinder of the region.

Our morality and our interests coincide. America's values and America's global responsibilities both compel us to stay engaged, to work actively for justice and decency and reconciliation. We should be indignant at injustice and bloodshed -- but indignation alone is not a strategy. The morality of a nation's policy must be judged not only by the noble goals it invokes but by the results and consequences of its actions.

If all Americans work together, this nation can be a major force for good. Thus we serve our highest ideals.

PRESS
DEPARTMENT OF STATE

No. 73A
April 17, 1985

Q&A SESSION
THE HONORABLE GEORGE P. SHULTZ
SECRETARY OF STATE
BEFORE THE
NATIONAL PRESS CLUB
WASHINGTON, D.C.
TUESDAY, APRIL 16, 1985, 1:45 P.M.

PRESIDENT DAVID HESS: (Knight-Ridder) Thank you, Mr. Secretary. We now have a number of questions. Obviously, we're not going to have a chance to get them all in.

Concentrating on the situation in South Africa, the questioner says that U.S. constructive engagement policy does not seem to be doing the job very well.

Is there an alternative? Can you foresee a change in U.S. policy in the near future?

SECRETARY SHULTZ: I just made an address answering that question. (Laughter)

I think constructive engagement is the right policy, and I think we have been seeing some results of it. To say that the situation is unsatisfactory is not to say that there hasn't been any result, and I tried to list in my talk some of those results. So I believe that the policy course we are on is the right course; the right course for the United States and the right course for those with whom we are seeking to work in southern Africa.

QUESTION: Mr. Secretary, while the Pretoria government announced yesterday total withdrawal from Angola, it has also

begun preparing for an internal solution to Namibia. That is not the international settlement that your Administration is committed to.

Do you still believe South Africa is committed to a Namibian settlement in terms of U.N. Resolution 435?

SECRETARY SHULTZ: Well, that is the only way to resolve the problem. Any regime that is put in place there, other than the regime that flows from implementation of the U.N. resolution simply has no standing. The South Africans have told us they agree with that, and I expect to hold them to that commitment.

QUESTION: There are 5,000 more Cuban troops in Angola now than in 1981, according to the questioner. Violence in South Africa itself is greater. How, then, can you claim "progress" as a result of the constructive engagement policy?

SECRETARY SHULTZ: Well, again, I tried to list the progress in my talk, and also to say that the situation is fragile and there are many unsatisfactory aspects to it.

The recent violence, as I said, is a setback, and we have deplored it. But that doesn't mean we shouldn't keep struggling to get people involved in constructive change nor should we cease trying to get foreign forces out of Angola. South African forces, which we think we have gotten out of Angola, or they have taken them out, and Cuban forces -- Soviet-sponsored forces -- which ought to come out, and let the Angolans then work out the solution to their problems themselves.

QUESTION: Mr. Shultz, you spoke of "fair participation" in South African politics. Would the United States support one-man/one-vote elections in South Africa? If so, when?

SECRETARY SHULTZ: One-man/one-vote is a good formula. It has a great variety of combinations and permutations, as a glance at our own Constitutional history shows. I guess we did always have one-man/one-vote but not necessarily one-woman/one-vote, for example. So I think there are lots of possible variations on the theme. And as a general proposition, of course, that is what you're working for, is to let each person who is a citizen of a country have an equal voice in the government, a chance to form it, and, of course, equal opportunity. In the end, to have education, to have job opportunities, to have housing opportunities, to

have freedom of religion, and so on.

QUESTION: Mr. Secretary, you seem to suggest that South Africa's white rulers will reform their own system without sustained pressure from abroad. Do you really believe that can happen, and what incentives would the South African white rulers have to do it?

SECRETARY SHULTZ: Well, I didn't say that. I said that I thought that the white majority in South Africa want very much to be part of the Western world and set of values, and their perception of that has an impact on them.

At the same time, I believe we must recognize that the real powerful forces that will bring change are the forces that operate within the region. And insofar as South Africa is concerned, within South Africa.

It is the evolving role of the blacks. It is the better education they have; it is their better ability to hold jobs of a more demanding character, partly as a result of the training and help they have received in American firms. It is the increasing white consciousness of the fact that the policies of racial segregation don't fit a modern industrial society, where you have to bring in people to work, and they have to work together. And if they're going to work somewhere, they have to live somewhere near there. If they're going to work effectively, they have to have access to education, and so on and so on and so on. It's all of these internal pressures that, I think, are the real pressures that are going to bring about the change.

But we can help. We can help by, on the one hand, expressing our views strongly. And, as I said, moral indignation is appropriate, but it's not enough. We have to be engaged; we have to recognize the problems. The problems are difficult, and try to help people work them out.

QUESTION: Many proponents of sanctions view them as more valuable in the form of a threat than as an accomplished fact. What's wrong in brandishing this threat?

SECRETARY SHULTZ: No threat is worth brandishing if, in its fact, it isn't effective.

You made a joke about my Marine Corps training. And one of the first things I was told, when I was a private in boot camp, when I was given rifle, was, "Never point that rifle at somebody unless you're willing to pull the trigger." An empty threat is not worth anything. So we have to be very

careful with what we decide that we're going to do. And if we do things that are ineffectual, or worse, then we don't accomplish anything except to make ourselves look a little silly.

There are things we can do that will have an effect, and we're trying to develop them, work at them, apply them, and apply them for purposes that I've outlined here, and which -- at least, it seems to me as I listed them -- are purposes behind which all Americans can rally.

QUESTION: Mr. Secretary, what is the U.S. view of South Africa's efforts to obtain a nuclear weapon capability; and how might such an acquisition affect the international balance in southern Africa, or, indeed, in the world?

SECRETARY SHULTZ: We are absolutely opposed to the acquisition of nuclear weapons by any state beyond the five that now acknowledge possession of them. There are some states that are thought to have a nuclear weapons capability or be in the process of developing it. We work actively against that in every way that we can.

I might say that this concern is a reason why it is to our advantage to have some involvement with the South African program of peaceful uses of nuclear power, and to have South Africa involved in the IAEA so that its facilities are open to inspection. That is the way, in South Africa and in other countries, we try to control the spread of nuclear weapons.

I might say, parenthetically, that back in the fall of 1982, in the first meeting that I had with Foreign Minister Gromyko -- at least as Secretary of State -- we identified nuclear non-proliferation as a subject in which we had, at least, considerably parallel interests. And since that time we have been working, through a series of meetings, on that subject, and I think fairly constructively.

It's also the case, if you look back 20 years or so at the literature on nuclear non-proliferation, you would see that people freely predicted in those days that by this time there would be 15/20/25 countries with nuclear weapons. That is not the case today.

Instead, we have a regime that is widely subscribed to. There are more countries subscribing to the IAEA than any other such treaty, and, on the whole, nuclear non-proliferation has been a goal that has more or less been achieved. We have to keep working at it everywhere,

including in South Africa.

And, again, I might say that, if anything, it's an argument for constructive engagement; not from walking away, and not anybody knowing what's going on.

QUESTION: Senator Kennedy of Massachusetts said at a hearing on South Africa today that South African blacks have now become radicalized and lost hope in the United States because of the constructive engagement policy. Your comment?

SECRETARY SHULTZ: Well, I think he's wrong about that.

(Laughter)

QUESTION: A follow-up to the question on nuclear weapons. Do you believe South Africa now has a nuclear weapon, or has the ability to produce one on short notice?

SECRETARY SHULTZ: So far as I know, the answer is no.

QUESTION: Turning to another subject, how can you logically deplore violence in South Africa and encourage it in Nicaragua?

SECRETARY SHULTZ: In Nicaragua, what we encourage is national reconciliation and a peaceful process by which government is selected and the country runs itself. And the President's peace proposal was exactly that. It said to the government of Nicaragua: Here is your opposition. They propose to lay down their arms, have a ceasefire, and engage in a process of national dialogue, not for power-sharing but for producing a process through which government will be selected. The President supports that in his plan, and, I might say, he lifts that right out of the Contadora 21 objectives, to which the Nicaraguans said they agreed; he lifts that out of the undertakings they made to the OAS -- which presumably they said they agreed to -- and, for that matter, out of the acta which is seriously defective in many ways but which the Nicaraguans said they would sign.

So, I think, if they mean what they say, they ought to take up the President's peace plan and act on it.

(Applause).

I see there's some sensible people in the room.

(Laughter).

QUESTION: Another question on Nicaragua. If the United States can deal with Marxist governments in Angola and Mozambique, why can't it deal with the Marxist government in Nicaragua?

SECRETARY SHULTZ: Well, I just described one way in which we called upon them to deal with themselves. As far as dealing with them -- you're looking at a veteran of a trip to Managua -- to try to engage them in a conversation, we sponsored as a result of that a whole series of meetings -- I think eight or so -- in Manzanillo, Mexico with Ambassador Shlaudeman. The fact is that the talks didn't get anywhere, and the Nicaraguans, in the end, started trying to use them to undermine the Contadora process which we explicitly undertook them to support. So we haven't failed to engage them in a conversation, but we have not been able to draw them into a fruitful conversation.

QUESTION: And a message from the Middle East here. A story published yesterday in Kuwait says that Mr. Reagan has already formulated a major initiative that he conveyed to Israel and Jordan in which the United States will begin concrete negotiations over the Palestinian problem within the next six months. True or false? And, if true, can you elaborate?

SECRETARY SHULTZ: Yes, you can read all about it in the President's speech that he made on September 1, 1982. He made a proposal; he stands by that proposal. It's a very careful and well thought-out proposal for the positions that the United States will take when the appropriate parties sit down in direct negotiations.

That proposal, interestingly, has had a great deal of staying power even though it has not been possible to bring about those negotiations. But it has been a source of continuing interest to me, and encouragement to me, that when we have discussions of this subject with our friends in both Israel and in the Arab world about this subject, the President's initiative is unfailingly mentioned -- mostly but not always -- favorably.

QUESTION: Turning to another area of Africa. The new Sudanese leader said yesterday he looks for better relations with the Soviets. How do you assess that?

SECRETARY SHULTZ: It's a little difficult to assess the situation in the Sudan right now. There is a new government there, and we have had conversations with them as have our

friends, and we've had the opportunity to compare notes. We would like to see the establishment of stability in the Sudan and work with the Sudan. That's about what I can say on the subject.

QUESTION: Mr. Secretary, will the Reagan Administration support giving military aid to non-communist rebels in Cambodia? Why, or why not?

SECRETARY SHULTZ: As far as helping the people of Cambodia is concerned, of course, we have been helping them, and we'll continue to help them. We haven't been engaged in the provision of so-called lethal aid, but we have provided a great deal of security assistance to Thailand, which is threatened on its border by Vietnam. We have given tremendous amounts of humanitarian aid to those people fleeing communism from Vietnam, Cambodia and Laos. I think there's some 500,000 who have resettled into the United States, and a similar number in other countries, which gives you some idea of what people think of the Vietnamese regime that is involved there.

Insofar as other forms of assistance are concerned, we work closely with our friends in the ASEAN countries, and essentially support their efforts.

MR. HESS: Before going to the last question, Mr. Secretary, I would like to give you a Certificate of Appreciation from the Press Club and a windbreaker (Laughter) to wear on your next visit to Namibia. (Laughter)

The last question: Do you believe that President Reagan's two-wreaths policy in West Germany will keep everyone happy in the United States, Europe and Israel? (Laughter)

SECRETARY SHULTZ: Anybody that thought he could keep everyone happy in all of those countries would be deluding himself.

But I think the President's objectives, in his visit to Germany after the Bonn Summit is completed, are objectives that we should examine, and when we do I think we'll find that they will gather broad support.

His objective is to say, "Here we are, on this Fortieth Anniversary, and we know that it's the anniversary of a military victory. We know that during that war an awful lot of people were killed. And insofar as Jews residing in Germany were concerned, they were subjected to an ultimate horror for which there's no excuse. It's almost impossible to imagine it, but we shouldn't forget it."

But, also, what the President has intended to do is to say that we should think of this time -- this last forty years and the time ahead of us -- as a time when a new beginning was made. A beginning in Germany -- at least, in the Federal Republic of Germany -- of a democratic form of government; of the establishment, very deeply, of a set of values that would not permit that horror to happen again; of a rebuilding, of a dedication to peace, and of a continued dedication to peace and progress and tolerance and openness.

It's that sense of reconciliation that led the President to undertake a State visit to Germany on that occasion. And I think those sentiments are laudable and important to express on an occasion like this which has such deep meaning in Germany.

MR. HESS: Thank you, Secretary of State George Shultz. That concludes today's National Press Club luncheon.

(Conclusion at 2:03 p.m.)

PRESS
DEPARTMENT OF STATE

No. 74
April 17, 1985

INTERVIEW OF
THE HONORABLE GEORGE P. SHULTZ
SECRETARY OF STATE
ON CBS-TV "MORNING NEWS"
Washington, D.C.
April 17, 1985

PHYLLIS GEORGE: These have been busy weeks at the State Department with talk of a Soviet summit, the new proposal for Contra aid, wrangling with Japan over trade, and the latest flap over the President's travel plans in Europe. We've asked Secretary of State George Shultz to help us sort out some of these issues and he's with us on "Morning News" in Washington with correspondent Terrence Smith. Good morning, gentlemen.

MR. SMITH: Good morning, Phyllis. Mr. Secretary, welcome. It's a pleasure to have you here when there are so many issues in the news.

SECRETARY SHULTZ: Thank you.

MR. SMITH: Let me start with one that is in the headlines this morning, which is the whole controversy over the President's trip to Germany. He has been clearly embarrassed by the outrage caused by, first, his plan to go to a German cemetery, and now, his announced plans to go to some sort of Holocaust site during the trip still to be selected. What are the implications for this -- the foreign policy implications -- for a trip that was to be built on a theme of reconciliation?

SECRETARY SHULTZ: The trip will be built on a theme of reconciliation and peace, and in marking the 40th anniversary of VE-Day which is the President's intention. Not to look upon it as the celebration of a big military victory but more as the beginning of an era of peace and reconciliation, the emergence of democracy, in at least the free part of Germany -- that's his intention and that's what he'll do.

MR. SMITH: Let me ask you on the other sort of leading news story this week on Nicaragua. The President and the whole administration have made every argument possible for the aid to the Contras that's presently before Congress and yet the Republican leaders in the House say it's not enough. What's at fault here? Is it the policy? Is it the strategy? What is it?

SECRETARY SHULTZ: The policy is working in Central America. The problem is Nicaragua and Nicaragua's armaments, Nicaragua's stated intention plus its actions in trying to subvert its neighbors, and its unwillingness to do, in fact, what it has promised to do, -- namely, put in place a more democratic and open form of Government. What the President has done is to say to them, in effect, you've agreed in the Contadora process to national reconciliation and democracy. He's pulled that right out of the process and said, agree to it now, upfront, here's the peace plan.

MR. SMITH: You say that the policy is working, Mr. Secretary, but one of the complaints of the critics is that the Contras have been essentially ineffective in the role that they're supposed to carry out.

SECRETARY SHULTZ: Oh, I think they've been very effective and certainly have the attention of the Nicaraguans and they're doing everything they can. They're lobbying the Congress like they're part of the American electorate up here to discourage the Contras, but they won't discourage them because the Contras are not there because of American support. They're there because of the way that Nicaraguan Government is treating its own people. That's what produces this insurgency.

MR. SMITH: Well, if you do lose this fight on the Hill as the Congressional --

SECRETARY SHULTZ: We don't plan to lose it.

MR. SMITH: I understand that. But if you do lose it, as the Republican leaders say there is a risk of, do you still plan to support the Contras in other fashions to keep them going?

SECRETARY SHULTZ: Well, first of all, let me assure you that this Administration will obey the law. Whatever the law is, that's what we will obey. The fact of the matter is that the Contras are produced, as I said, by the way the Government treats them and that isn't going to be changed, no doubt, by a vote in the Congress.

MR. SMITH: So you would expect the Contras and their effort to continue, regardless of the outcome of this --

SECRETARY SHULTZ: In some fashion, but I think the lack of support from here hurts. It's not only the lack of money. It is a test of American willpower. Will we stand up for freedom and democracy in our own Hemisphere?

MR. SMITH: One of the puzzling things in this to people, I think, is the fact -- the request for $14 million. If the problem is as serious as described by you and the Administration, why only $14 million? Is that just a first installment? Is there more--

SECRETARY SHULTZ: Well, you have to remember that this is an amount of money that the Congress appropriated and then fenced off, and it goes for the balance of this fiscal year until the end of September. And so, it's a tiding-over sum, but certainly this doesn't stand for the whole problem. It's a much bigger problem.

MR. SMITH: So it would be, in effect, an installment payment on a larger program?

SECRETARY SHULTZ: Well, we would hope not. We would hope that the Nicaraguan Government would see their way to doing what they promised to do within their own country and join the rest of Central America in an effort to get democracy, the rule of law, and economic development under conditions of stability. That's our program and it's working everywhere else in Central America except Nicaragua.

MR. SMITH: Mr. Secretary, let me ask you about the plans that are evolving for a Summit between the American and Soviet leaders. Have they progressed at all? Do you have a sense now of where it'll be, when it'll be, and what might come out of it?

SECRETARY SHULTZ: There's nothing that's been worked out on the where, when agenda in any detail. But what has happened is that both leaders have agreed with each other that it would be a good idea before long to have a meeting of some kind.

MR. SMITH: A summit? A meeting? A get-together? What's the language now?

SECRETARY SHULTZ: I don't think it makes much difference what language you use, and it depends a little bit on how much real preparation can be put in place as to the degree of formality and ambition of the get-together.

MR. SMITH: On the subject of South Africa and the unrest there, we are seeing in this country, unrest on campuses from Berkeley to Columbia. You spoke yesterday about the policy of so-called "constructive engagement."

SECRETARY SHULTZ: Yes.

MR. SMITH: Is it sustainable in the face of this kind of opposition, both here and in South Africa?

SECRETARY SHULTZ: For the sake of the blacks and the whites in South Africa and for the region of southern Africa, I certainly hope it's sustainable. I can assure you that the President has a policy with respect to that region that is just as full of moral indignation as anybody else's, but we have to remember that moral indignation is not a foreign policy. It doesn't get anything done. We are there, engaged.

MR. SMITH: Isn't there an argument to be made on the other side for a policy of what you could call punitive disengagement of American interests? I mean, that's what they're -- that's the other --

SECRETARY SHULTZ: There has been more change in South Africa in the last four years than in the previous thirty years. There has been less violence recently than in the past period since the Portuguese pulled out of the region. So there have been results, although, --

MR. SMITH: Although more violence in South Africa --

SECRETARY SHULTZ: -- why do we want to just pull out? The violence recently is a setback. We've said so. I hope that that takes a turn for the better. I admire Bishop Tutu's statement in which he called upon his black supporters not to engage in violence, in a Gandhi-like statement.

MR. SMITH: Mr. Secretary, let me ask you a subject that you have spoken on a great deal on the question of terrorism and how this country should deal with it. Recently there were reports that the United States had warned Iran of the consequences of any harm coming to American hostages held in Lebanon. Does this suggest that we are closer to the policy of pre-emptive or preventive action that you have espoused in several speeches?

SECRETARY SHULTZ: I'm not going to comment on any messages we may or may not have sent anywhere, but I think that there is general agreement in -- certainly the President, the Administration, I think broadly the American people support the idea that in the face of terrorism, we shouldn't just hunker down and try to defend ourselves. We've got to be leaning forward in opposition to these people who are trying to disrupt democratic processes.

MR. SMITH: Mr. Secretary, thank you very much.

SECRETARY SHULTZ: Thank you. You sure cover a lot in a hurry. (Laughter)

PRESS
DEPARTMENT OF STATE

No. 75
April 18, 1985

AS PREPARED FOR DELIVERY

REMARKS BY
THE HONORABLE GEORGE P. SHULTZ
SECRETARY OF STATE
BEFORE THE
HOLOCAUST COMMEMORATION
CAPITOL ROTUNDA
Washington, D.C.
April 18, 1985

For further information contact:

As the 40th anniversary of the Allied victory in Europe draws near, we in America remember not only the triumph of our soldiers and the peace-loving nations of the world, but the rescue of the Jewish people from the Nazi evil.

Every year thousands of Americans visit the memorial to the victims of the Holocaust at Yad Vashem. I myself will be going there next month. The images of Jewish suffering at Nazi hands still burn in our memories. We will never forget, and the world must never forget, the inhumanity of which mankind is capable when it disregards the sanctity, the dignity, and the human rights of all men and women. Our nation shared the grief of those who had survived the concentration camps. We mourned for those who had not. And we made one very simple pledge: Never again.

Today we are assembled to pay tribute to the American soldiers who liberated the prisoners of Nazi concentration camps toward the end of the Second World War. Nothing we say here can have much significance compared with the noble and selfless act of those American liberators. When those soldiers walked into the camps and saw the horrors wrought by Nazi fanaticism, they recognized at once the enormity of the evil they had just conquered. And they forced the world to recognize it, as well.

Never has civilization been confronted by such an unmitigated, monstrous evil as Hitler's Nazism. Never have the will and strength of the democracies been so severely challenged. Never has one people been singled out for such grievous suffering at the hands of their fellow human beings.

The rise of Nazism, and most particularly, the ruthless murder of six million Jews, together dealt an almost devastating blow to all our most fundamental hopes for the modern world. Those who prior to the war had maintained their faith in the possibility of human progress, in the idea that with high culture and high civilization would come the end of man's inhumanity to man, those who had envisioned the day when respect for the dignity, the sanctity, and the human rights of every individual on earth would be universal -- all of us who shared these dreams were stunned by the Holocaust. We castigated ourselves for the world's collective failure to stop it sooner. And after the war, after the concentration camps had been liberated and the bodies of the dead had been buried, we all promised ourselves that next time it would be different. Never again would we allow a monstrous evil to go unchallenged. Never again would we appease the aggressor. Never again would we lose sight of the fundamental moral principles upon which our free society depends.

The men who liberated the camps in a sense liberated the world, as well. They put an end to the physical tragedy, though they could not put an end to the spiritual anguish. We will never forget the atrocities committed by Hitler, and we will continue to pursue the criminals who carried out his awful designs. We will bring them to justice no matter how long it takes.

But the Americans who liberated the camps four decades ago also gave us hope. They made it possible for us to look forward, to start again, to begin to restore our faith in the possibility of a better world, even while the memories of the recent horrors lived on. They offered a new chance for all peoples in all nations to join together in defense of humanity. These brave men showed that the evil ever-present in mankind can be confronted and eventually defeated by an even more powerful devotion to justice and the will to sacrifice for a greater good.

We must never forget that lesson.

The principles that the rescuers upheld, and for which many gave their lives, continue to animate heroic idealists of our own day, whose consciences will not permit them to acquiesce in injustice.

It is the principle summed up by one of the spiritual mentors of the American Revolution, Edmund Burke, when he said: "The only thing necessary for the triumph of evil is for good men to do nothing."

When Andrei Sakharov denounces the systematic denial of human rights by Soviet totalitarianism, and exchanges a position of honor and comfort in the Soviet elite for a life of persecution and exile, he honors the example and the memory of those who have fought tyranny and liberated the oppressed. So do the brave individuals administering the funds provided by Alexander Solzhenitsyn to aid the families of Soviet dissidents. And Anatoly Shcharansky's courageous stand against the Soviet police state is a testament to the human will. He not only endures, he prevails through his example to others.

We have seen the spirit of the rescuers in the mothers of Buenos Aires' Plaza de Mayo, who protested the disappearance of their children week after week, year after year -- even after some of their own numbers "disappeared" -- until democracy was reborn in Argentina. And that spirit lives on today in the acts of those courageous South Africans, of all races, who have sacrificed -- sometimes their privilege, sometimes their lives -- to protest and expose the cruelties of apartheid.

Thank God most Americans have never had to face choices like this, but a few of us have. One who did was an American officer who was captured during the Vietnam war and survived an 8-year ordeal in a North Vietnamese POW camp. As Admiral James Stockdale put it:

> From this eight-year experience I distilled one all-purpose idea .... It is a simple idea. An idea as old as the Scriptures, an idea that naturally and spontaneously comes to men under pressure. That idea is, you are your brother's keeper.

The magnitude of these injustices, I repeat, is not the same. They cannot be equated with Nazi genocide, which was unique in the annals of human depravity.

But the principle applies universally: We are our brother's keeper. We must never turn a blind eye to the sufferings inflicted around the world. We must always draw strength and inspiration from the courage and altruism of the rescuers.

And we must never delude ourselves. Mankind's capacity for evil did not die in the bunker with Hitler.

We see evil in the world all around us, in efforts to impose totalitarian authority on unwilling peoples, in efforts to subjugate, suppress, and sometimes vanquish entire races, classes, and religions.

The legacy of the rescuers admonishes us all to stand up and fight back.

The memory of the American liberators will live on forever, as will the memory of the evil they put an end to. We can only be thankful, and proud, that Americans were willing to make the ultimate sacrifice to defend freedom and the rights of mankind. May we always have the courage, and the vision, to meet such challenges. Only then can the better world we all seek become a reality.

PRESS
DEPARTMENT OF STATE

No. 76
April 18, 1985

REMARKS TO THE PRESS
BY
THE HONORABLE GEORGE P. SHULTZ
SECRETARY OF STATE
AFTER HIS BRIEFING OF SENATORS
Capitol Rotunda
April 18, 1985

SECRETARY SHULTZ: We just finished a session with a great many members of the Senate -- I don't know exactly how many were there but a large number from both sides of the aisle -- and we had I thought a very constructive, serious and thoughtful discussion of the issues involved in the coming vote. And from the standpoint of process, I think it is an outstanding example of the democratic process at work. People are considering this seriously, working on it hard; and I feel very heartened because when we do that in this country, we generally come down with the right kind of decision.

QUESTION: Mr. Secretary, are you satisfied with making the entire $14 million humanitarian aid and not military aid of any kind?

SECRETARY SHULTZ: There have been a lot of proposals made over quite a period of time. I don't know how many meetings the President has had with members of Congress, that I've had and others have had -- that suggestion and a great many others have been made. The President put forward a peace proposal which we've been trying to explain. We consider other proposals, but we think that the basic idea of calling upon the various groups in Nicaragua to engage in a process of national reconciliation, as President Duarte in El Salvador has been trying to do, is the right way to go.

QUESTION: Were there any specific proposals mentioned upstairs which you will take back to Mr. Reagan? For example, there's been some talk of having no vote at all on the $14 million next Tuesday, but instead going with some other more general language.

SECRETARY SHULTZ: Well, there've been -- there were a lot of suggestions in the form of questions, I guess you'd say, and I won't try to enumerate them all. But I will take them back to the President, and I think the fact that there are a lot of serious suggestions is a good thing. And I might say, without wanting to ascribe positions to any individual, that I think there is a very broad agreement that Nicaragua and what it's doing is a major security problem for us and for that neighborhood. The only thing that we're debating here is what to do -- not whether to do something -- but what is the right way to bring this to some proper outcome. So now I need to go and make my report. Thank you.

QUESTION: What are the chances that the President's proposal is going to stay in its present form?

SECRETARY SHULTZ: Well, the President has made a very good proposal, and it certainly has caught everyone's attention including, I might say, the people in the region, which after all we need to be looking at very carefully. He's heard a lot of other suggestions, but right now he's sticking with his proposal.

But we're listening, and we've heard a lot today and before, and this process is now at that level of political intensity that you really have a chance to see what people do think.

QUESTION: What about Senator Nunn's proposal last night? Does that interest the President, do you think?

SECRETARY SHULTZ: That's among the many interesting ideas that have been put forward. But the President has put forward something, and it's interesting that he has really set the agenda for this discussion now. And most of the proposals are in terms of if he would vary this, if he would vary that and so on.

* * * * *

PRESS
DEPARTMENT OF STATE

April 18, 1985
No. 77

ANNOUNCEMENT BY
THE HONORABLE GEORGE P. SHULTZ
SECRETARY OF STATE
ON THE RESIGNATION OF DEPUTY SECRETARY KENNETH DAM
AND THE NOMINATION OF JOHN WHITEHEAD
THURSDAY, APRIL 18, 1985, 11:26 A.M.

SECRETARY SHULTZ: About the first thing I did after being asked by the President to be Secretary of State was reach for the phone and call my friend, Ken Dam, and ask him to join me -- he was then Provost at the University of Chicago -- and he said yes. Ken and I have been working together since, well, 1970 at least, when we worked together in the OMB. We worked together in the White House and Treasury. We worked, co-authored a book when we were not in office, and he has joined me here in the State Department. So I suppose that gives some idea of my high estimation of Ken Dam.

So it's with a sense of real loss that I announce that he is resigning from the post of Deputy Secretary of State, to undertake a job of great scope and great interest with the IBM Corporation, one of the great organizations of the world.

Ken Dam is one of the great public servants around in this country. He has always responded to a call to duty. He's had a brilliant career as a scholar. He has been a groundbreaker in his writings in law, in economic policy, particularly international economic policy. He's been a distinguished educator as a professor of law at the University of Chicago and as Provost at the University of Chicago.

He has been involved here at the State Department with everything that we do -- all of our policy considerations -- and has contributed tremendously to them and to the President's efforts; and he has been tireless in his appearances before the Congress, before the press, and in representing our country abroad. And in his speeches he has been eloquent and has even managed to display a slight literary quality to them, as befits a professor.

So he has had a very heavy schedule, and he's done it with great honor. And I want to take this moment, Ken, to say to you and everybody how deeply I admire what you have done and for that matter, I know, will do. You have my admiration, you have my appreciation, you have my deep respect, and you have my best wishes in the important job that you'll do at this great corporation.

Ken will continue to be with us here in the State Department and will man the post until his successor is confirmed.

So, you might ask, who will his successor be?

(Laughter)

Mr. John Whitehead will be nominated as the President's nominee for Deputy Secretary of State. I have known, and know about, John Whitehead for a very long time. He has come down, and I've talked with him several times about the job; and Ken has -- Mike Armacost, Ron Spiers, and others in the Department; Bud McFarlane and others over in the White House. And yesterday we had a lengthy session with the President, who knew him before. And so we're all very pleased that John not only accepts the job, but does so with, I think, enthusiasm and is anxious to get to work on it.

He has been until very recently senior partner and co-chairman of Goldman, Sachs. This is one of the truly great investment banking firms of the world. In his role at Goldman, Sachs, among other things, he has developed the very extensive worldwide, international business of that company. 1e is also now President of the International Rescue Committee, so he's been heavily involved in dealing with the problems of refugees; played a central role in helping to manage the massive refugee problems that have afflicted the international scene in recent years.

He is a member of the Council on Foreign Relations, the Georgetown Center for Strategic and International Studies, and I am told that he is a regular attender of Henry Kissinger "State" dinners in New York.

Is that right?

MR. WHITEHEAD: (Smiles)

SECRETARY SHULTZ: In trying to think out where to look for a successor to Ken Dam, well, you look for individuals, of course, but I must say I cast my eye on the field of investment banking. And having had a little bit of

experience in that area, I noticed that investment bankers have all those characteristics that we need here, and hope to have: You've got to think pretty fast sometimes; you've got to keep cool; you've got to be able to bounce back a little; and solving problems, operating at the strategic level.

I think investment bankers tend to get involved when the big deals come along. I don't think it's any accident that some of the most successful people who've come from the field of business and finance into government have been investment bankers. Of course, Don Regan is a current example; but you reach to Bob Lovett, to Jim Forrestal, to Doug Dillon, to Paul Nitze, and I think there is an affinity there. So I think that we will find that John Whitehead's name will be added to that illustrious list.

We expect a lot from John Whitehead, and I'm sure you'll be hearing a lot from him, and I welcome him to this new post with enthusiasm.

So it is with respect, admiration, and sadness to see my close friend, Ken Dam, leave, but some joy in seeing him going to such a wonderful opportunity.

And a warm welcome to a man of tremendous talent, a real heavyweight in a very competitive and tough field, in John Whitehead.

So thanks very much, John, for joining us. And, Ken, thank you for all your wonderful public service.

Thank you.

* * * * *

PRESS
DEPARTMENT OF STATE

No. 78
April 21, 1985

AS PREPARED FOR DELIVERY

THE UNITED STATES AND ISRAEL:

PARTNERS FOR PEACE AND FREEDOM

ADDRESS BY
THE HONORABLE GEORGE P. SHULTZ
SECRETARY OF STATE
BEFORE THE
ANNUAL POLICY CONFERENCE OF
THE AMERICAN ISRAEL PUBLIC AFFAIRS COMMITTEE
Crystal City, Virginia
April 21, 1985

For further information contact:

We Americans are united by values and ideals that have guided us since the founding of this nation. We seek to preserve and promote freedom -- freedom to vote, freedom to speak, write, think, and worship as one chooses. We believe in tolerance, and religious tolerance in particular. We believe in justice and equality under the law. We are committed to democratic government as the best, if not the only way to protect the rights, well-being, and dignity of all men and women.

We have also understood that to pursue these noble goals, we have to be strong enough to defend our country and our way of life against aggression. And we must have an equally strong commitment to international peace and security. A world of peace offers the best hope for the spread of freedom; and a world of freedom offers the best hope for lasting peace.

In the latter half of this century, both the defense of freedom and the achievement of peace have come to depend on American strength. There can only be peace when potential aggressors know that they cannot hope to achieve their aims through war. In the modern world, that means that America, as the strongest democracy on earth, has a responsibility to stand with those who share our hopes and dreams.

These principles inform every action we take in our foreign policy. Today, I would like to talk about how our ideals, our morality, and our responsibilities in the world apply to our relationship with Israel and to our hopes for peace in the Middle East.

The United States supported the creation of the State of Israel, almost four decades ago, because of moral convictions deeply rooted in the American character. We knew of the centuries of persecution suffered by the Jews, and we had witnessed the horror of the Nazi Holocaust. No decent American could fail to see the justice and necessity of a Jewish state where Jews could live without fear.

But the founding of the State of Israel also had a wider significance. Certainly, America's support for Israel has been a moral response to centuries of persecution. But the birth of Israel also marked the entrance onto the world stage of a new democracy, a new defender of liberty, a new nation committed to human progress and peace. In a world where such nations have always been the exception rather than the rule, the creation of Israel was a historic and blessed event.

When Lincoln spoke at Gettysburg of rededication to the cause of freedom, he was saying that the survival of liberty depended on peoples' faith in liberty. Israel's success as a thriving democracy helps sustain our faith in the democratic way of life not only in America but throughout the world. Today the principles of freedom and democracy are more alive than when Israel was founded. The number of countries around the world that are democratic or on the road to democracy is growing. I believe the example of Israel and the United States has something to do with this heartening trend.

No wonder, then, that the friendship between the American people and the people of Israel has grown so strong over the years. Our original moral commitment to Israel has never wavered, but over the years Americans have also come to recognize the enormous importance of Israel -- as a partner in the pursuit of freedom and democracy, as a people who share our highest ideals, and as a vital strategic ally in an important part of the world. The moral and personal bonds that tie us together have strengthened us both.

America's Commitment to Israel's Security

For all these reasons, the United States has maintained its unwavering support for Israel's security for nearly four decades. Until peace was made with Egypt, Israel was completely surrounded by hostile forces since its birth, and it has had to fight four wars in less than forty years to defend its very existence. We know that the goals we share with the people of Israel -- freedom, and peace -- cannot be achieved unless both America and Israel are strong. That is why we are committed, and always will be committed, to helping Israel protect itself against any combination of potential aggressors. And that is why we must always make clear to the world -- through our material and moral support for Israel, our votes at the United Nations, and our efforts for peace -- that we are a permanent, steadfast, and unshakable ally of the State of Israel.

Every year we provide more security assistance to Israel than to any other nation. We consider that aid to be one of the best investments we could make -- not only for Israel's security, but for ours as well. Even as we developed our own budget and worked with Israel on its economic program, we nonetheless went ahead with a major increase in our security assistance for Israel.

This is a statement of our commitment; it reflects our understanding of who our friends in the world are, who can be counted upon in times of crisis. Americans know that we have no more reliable friend in the world than Israel.

Our common interests afford us an opportunity -- and a necessity -- to work together on many issues.

We face, for example, the common threat posed by the Soviet Union. The American people and the people of Israel both know what is at stake in the struggle against the spread of Soviet power -- not just territory and natural resources, but the very way of life for which both our nations have shed so much blood and made so many sacrifices.

The continuing persecution of Jews and other minorities by the Soviet government is an abomination. And we in America know that a threat to the rights of Jews anywhere is a threat to the rights of all peoples everywhere. In the Soviet Union today, Jews are not free to practice their religion, or to teach Hebrew or Yiddish to their children; they are actively discriminated against throughout the government and society.

In the face of this injustice, hundreds of thousands of Jews seek to leave the Soviet Union. Many want to settle in Israel. But Soviet authorities continue to restrict Jewish emigration, and only a tiny number are allowed to leave. Those who have sought emigration and been denied exit visas often suffer additional persecution; those who stand up for their rights risk prison, or confinement in so-called "psychiatric hospitals." The United States is doing all it can to urge the Soviet Union to set the Jews free. Nothing the Soviets could do would more convince us of their desire to improve relations than to release Anatoly Shcharansky, and others, and grant Soviet Jews their right to emigrate.

In addition to denying human rights at home, the Soviet Union has also consistently sought to undermine the strategic interests of both Israel and the United States. Today they seek to increase their influence in every corner of the globe, including within this hemisphere.

Today we are trying to check Soviet-backed aggression in Central America. Everyone in this audience, and supporters of Israel across the country, know that in the Middle East America is committed to the security of its democratic ally.

We all understand the need to negotiate from strength, not from weakness. We all understand the need for constant vigilance against aggressors heavily armed by the Soviet Union. Those who truly uphold these principles, which are the foundation of Israel's security, will see the vital importance of supporting these same principles elsewhere. The security of so vital a region as Central America is crucial to the global position of the United States. Let there be no illusions: A failure to contain Communist aggression so close to home will only erode the security of all our allies and friends around the world.

In the Middle East today, the Soviet Union and its radical allies continue to block peace and to threaten those who seek it. They exert influence by their ability to intimidate with guns and through the terrorists they sponsor and direct. The United States and Israel can work together to help ensure that such attempts fail.

Strategic cooperation between the United States and Israel has become a formal, institutionalized process. We have established the Joint Political-Military Group to improve cooperation so that we can resist threats to our common interests in the Middle East.

This kind of cooperation has been long overdue. Today it is an important part of our strategic relationship.

The Challenge of Peace

Americans are committed to the security of Israel because we want to ensure that the Jewish nation, and the Jewish people, never again face a threat to their very existence. But our permanent commitment to Israel's security serves another, related goal, as well: the goal of peace.

Military might has prevented defeat on the battlefield, but true security and peace can come only when Israel has gained the acceptance and recognition of its neighbors. That is why, even as we assist Israel's capacity to defend itself, the top priority of our efforts in the Middle East is to promote Arab-Israeli peace through negotiations.

We have learned many important lessons over the years. One of them is that a strong, visible, and permanent American commitment to Israel offers the best hope for peace. The history of the Arab-Israeli conflict shows, without question, that movement in the peace process can only come when there is no doubt of our commitment to Israel.

It can only come when no one in the Arab world or elsewhere has any delusions about the central reality that America's support for Israel can never be weakened. Israel has demonstrated beyond doubt that it will not bend or change its policies in the face of military or terrorist threats. Nor will the policies of the United States ever yield to terror or intimidation. On this principle, the United States and Israel stand together solid as a rock. So others should not miss the point: There are no military options. There are no terrorist options. The only path to progress, justice, and peace in the Middle East is that of direct negotiations.

Negotiations work. We have tangible evidence of this today in the peace treaty between Israel and Egypt. This relationship is the cornerstone of the peace process. We must build upon it. The Egyptian-Israeli relationship itself must grow and be strengthened. And others must learn from the example that Egypt and Israel have set. President Mubarak is committed to peace. Others must join him. We are glad that King Hussein has re-established Jordan's diplomatic relations with Egypt. The process of building peace must continue, and the United States is committed to helping the parties move forward.

In recent months there has been much activity. Many people on both sides are working to further the peace process.

Today, for the first time in years, there are signs of a new realism and a new commitment on the part of key regional actors.

Prime Minister Peres has made clear Israel's desire to negotiate with Jordan without preconditions, and he has expressed his great respect for King Hussein. The King has also called for peace; he has undertaken an effort to organize the Arab side to negotiate peace with Israel on the basis of Security Council Resolution 242. There is also movement in the Palestinian community toward greater realism, and President Mubarak has played a constructive role in promoting negotiations.

Both Arabs and Israelis trust us, and they seek our help. They find reassurance in our participation as they face the risks and challenges of peace. Such an American role is indispensable.

We also know that those Arab nations that are moving toward peace are taking risks. Radical forces in the region use terrorism and threats of war not only against Americans and Israelis, but against responsible Arabs who have worked to bring Egypt back in the Arab fold and who have sought to promote negotiations with Israel.

As King Hussein took steps to move with the Palestinians to the negotiating table, we saw Jordanian diplomats killed; we saw Jordanian Airlines offices bombed. Those who take risks for peace should know that the United States will help them defend themselves. The United States must continue to support those who seek negotiations and peaceful solutions against those who promote violence and oppose peace.

Assistant Secretary of State Richard Murphy is now in the region, on the President's behalf, exploring practical steps that might be taken toward peace. But whatever opportunities may emerge, no one in the region or throughout the world can have the slightest doubt about America's policy: Israel's vital interests will never be compromised; Israel's survival and security will never be put at risk.

At the same time, we have also made clear our concern for the Palestinian people. Lasting peace and security for Israel will require a just settlement for the Palestinians that assures their dignity and legitimate rights. How ironic and tragic it is, therefore, that those who claim to act on behalf of the Palestinians have continued to <u>block</u> negotiations -- the only course that can achieve a just settlement for the Palestinians.

Now is the time for the Arabs to let negotiations proceed. Now is the time for the Arabs to let King Hussein come forward. There is no alternative to direct negotiation; the longer this truth is evaded, the longer the Palestinian people are the victim. Those who chased illusions of "armed struggle," those who engaged in terrorism, those who thought that Soviet support would intimidate the United States and Israel, have only brought death to innocents and prolonged the suffering of the Palestinian people. Such methods have achieved nothing constructive, and never will.

But the way is open for progress -- even early progress -- and we know what that way is. President Reagan's initiative of September 1, 1982 remains the most promising route to a solution. Our policy will continue to be guided by six fundamental principles in the years to come:

-- First, we will continue to seek a lasting peace that respects the legitimate concerns of all the parties.

-- Second, the United States will oppose violent and radical challenges to peace and security. We will oppose governments or terrorist organizations of whatever stripe in their efforts to undermine the State of Israel and our Arab friends in the region.

-- Third, United States policy toward the PLO is unchanged: We will never recognize or negotiate with any group that espouses violent solutions or refuses to accept Resolutions 242 and 338 or recognize Israel's right to exist.

-- Fourth, the only way to achieve a genuine, lasting peace is through direct negotiations between the Arab states and Israel. No other procedures can substitute. No other approach will get anywhere. No further plans or preliminaries are needed. There is one and only one place to negotiate -- at the table, face to face.

-- Fifth, we will support a negotiated settlement by which the Palestinian people can achieve their legitimate rights and just requirements. We will not support the establishment of an independent Palestinian state in the West Bank and Gaza, nor will we support annexation or permanent control by Israel.

-- Sixth, and finally, we will always insist on Israel's right to exist in peace behind secure and recognized borders. As President Reagan said on September 1, 1982, "In the pre-1967 borders, Israel was barely 10 miles wide at its narrowest point.

The bulk of Israel's population lived within artillery range of hostile Arab armies. I am not about to ask Israel to live that way again." The United States stands firmly behind that solemn commitment.

If Israel and the United States continue to work together, we can make progress toward peace.

The Economic Challenge

We know that peace is essential to Israel's security. But there is another important element to that security. The strength of Israel also depends on the strength of its economy. Israel must work to overcome its economic problems. Because of our own deep interest in a strong, healthy, and secure Israel, we will also do our part in ways we can be most helpful.

We in America know what it is like to live through difficult economic times. Only in the past three years have we begun to pull ourselves out of the spiraling stagflation of the late '70s. We also know how hard it is to make the tough political decisions and the sacrifices needed to put an economy on a stable path of growth without inflation.

We know first-hand how tough it is to cut the budget. Yet these tough decisions must be made.

The Israeli economy is a spectacular success story. The Israeli standard of living has risen steadily and remarkably. Israeli goods compete successfully in the major international markets. In fact, in 1984 Israel increased its exports by 12.5 percent, while simultaneously reducing its imports by 2.5 percent. If the United States had done the same, our trade deficit would be more than $80 billion lower than it is today.

Still, the Israeli economy faces real problems. Israel is consuming more than it produces and its economy is beset by a large national debt, untenable budget deficits, structural rigidities, and powerful inflationary forces. There are no quick solutions to these problems -- yet Israelis have proved during the State's early decades that they could pull together to build and maintain a dynamic, growing economy. Israel has all the qualities needed for economic success: an educated, dynamic people; impressive capacities for research and development of new technologies, and outstanding universities. Israel's economic achievements in previous years were a testament to the public spirit, bravery, creativity, and talents of its people. I have no doubt that those same qualities today hold out the promise of future prosperity.

But Israel must pull itself out of its present economic trauma. And the Israeli people must do it themselves; no one can do it for them. Israel will need support as it makes the needed adjustments, and here the United States can and must help. But our help will be of little avail if Israel does not take the necessary steps to cut government spending, improve productivity, open up its economy, and strengthen the mechanisms of economic policy. Israel and its government must make the hard decisions. Prime Minister Peres and Finance Minister Modai have shown courageous leadership; they deserve support, here and in Israel, for this effort.

From 1981 to 1984, the United States has provided almost $9.5 billion dollars in aid to Israel. In 1984, aid to Israel made up more than a quarter of our entire foreign aid program. Yet we must all understand that this aid cannot really help unless Israel makes hard and far-reaching decisions for structural adjustment.

The United States can also help Israel in other ways, over the long term, to achieve the economic success Israel is capable of achieving. Tomorrow, for instance, the United States and Israel will sign the Free Trade Area Agreement. This will guarantee Israel completely open access to the world's largest and most diverse market.

In 1983, the United States imported almost $1.5 billion worth of Israeli products. The Free Trade Area Agreement will strengthen our trade partnership even further.

And we have created a Joint Economic Development Group for a continuing dialogue on the problems of the Israeli economy and on ways that our cooperation can help.

The future belongs to the free, the venturesome, the educated, and the creative. The Israeli people are all of these. Their future is bright.

America's Pledge

In the years to come, Israel and the United States will stand together in defense of our shared values and in support of our common goals. Our two peoples have the same vision of a better world -- a world of peace and freedom, where the dignity of all men and women is respected by all nations. The evils we see all around us today -- terrorism and the states that sponsor it, the persecution of Jews and other minorities in the Soviet Union, the outrages against Israel in the United Nations -- these only strengthen our determination.

Every year thousands of Americans visit Yad Vashem -- the memorial to the victims of the Holocaust. I will go there again next month. The images of Jewish suffering at Nazi hands still burn in our memories. Our pledge at the end of World War II was simple: Never again. And our support for Israel is the lasting embodiment of that pledge.

Our two nations know that eternal vigilance is indeed the price of liberty. The world will be safe for decency only if men and women of decency have the courage to defend what they cherish. Security and strength are the foundation of survival -- and of any serious foreign policy. They are essential not only for the defense of liberty but for any hopes for peace. Those who would threaten peace and freedom must know that the champions of peace and freedom stand strong, and united.

America and Israel have learned this lesson. Together, we will set an example for all free peoples: We will work tirelessly for peace and for a better world.

PRESS
DEPARTMENT OF STATE

No. 78A
April 21, 1985

Q&A SESSION
THE HONORABLE GEORGE P. SHULTZ
SECRETARY OF STATE
BEFORE THE
AMERICAN ISRAEL PUBLIC AFFAIRS COMMITTEE
HYATT REGENCY HOTEL
CRYSTAL CITY, VIRGINIA
SUNDAY, APRIL 21, 1985,

MR. TOM DINE: (Executive Director, AIPAC). Thank you, Mr. Secretary, for such an erudite and supportive speech. I counted 26 applauses. There may have been more.

(Applause).

It's a privilege to hear from you and to have you here. I would also like to say thanks to you for providing so many strong staff. We, at AIPAC, work with your staff on Captiol Hill to pass the foreign aid bill every year, and other policy measures. And, again, we're very appreciative.

Also, joining us on the bema (Laughter) is the Dante Fascell of Israel -- maybe you're the Abba Eban; Chairman of the Knesset, Committee on Defense and Foreign Policy, Abba Eban. (Applause).

There are several people gathering your questions. I'll take the privilege of, since I haven't received any yet -- let's just hold off.

I have one. Could you tell us, sir, what is the status of the interagency study dealing with future sales of sophisticated arms to Jordan, Saudi Arabia, and Iraq?

SECRETARY SHULTZ: This effort, this study is an effort to look at our strategic objectives and needs in the Middle East and, on the basis of that, set out where we think our efforts ought best to be put.

It's, of course, a subject that is constantly under review, but a special effort has been made to look at this carefully; and I would expect sometime before the middle of the year arrives this would have come to some kind of conclusion. That's about where it stands.

QUESTION: Do you think the recent meeting between five Congressmen and Yasser Arafat furthered the cause of peace?

SECRETARY SHULTZ: Well, far be it for me to criticize Members of Congress. We're looking for their votes all the time. (Laughter) But, personally, I don't think it's a good idea.

(Applause).

I'd say, I don't think you're going to catch Congressmen Fascell or Kemp meeting with Yasser Arafat.

(Laughter/Applause).

QUESTION: He saved you, Kemp.

Since the United States will not support either establishment of a Palestinian state on the West Bank and Gaza, nor will it support annexation by Israel, what are your suggestions for the United States to do?

SECRETARY SHULTZ: One of the points that I tried to get across in my talk was that the way to find out what the answer is is to get the people immediately concerned to the bargaining table face-to-face and have them work it out.

(Applause).

In this very deep sense, the process is, in a sense, the substance. I don't mean to say that there isn't tremendously difficult substance to struggle with. But, plans are a dime a dozen; anybody can think up a plan.

The problem is to get a process underway that is undertaken in good faith and good spirit by serious people who

understand the problems, understand their interests, who will represent them strongly, but who are there and will try to work it out; and you don't know quite what will be created when those circumstances arise.

I don't think that President Sadat knew just what would be created when he made his first move, and made his trip to Jerusalem. But he started something -- a process -- in which the people directly involved worked at it. That's what we have to get started.

In the President's September 1 initiative, he made a statement about a variety of positions -- and I mentioned a couple of them in my talk -- that the United States would talk if we are a party to those negotiations, and I think the likelihood is very strong that we would be; people want us to be. But that is all by way of saying: let us have some negotiations. Other people will take other positions. It's not their going-in positions that matter so much; it's the coming-out positions that matter, and that's what we want to try to find -- a negotiating forum where people will really work at the problem of finding peace between Arabs and Israelis.

(Applause).

MR. TOM DINE: This will be the last question. I went through most of the cards, and I think we've covered most of the points.

This is more personal. How is your perception, since coming to Washington in July 1982, as Secretary of State, changed toward the Middle East conflicts? Basically, how have you grown on the job, sir?

(Laughter).

SECRETARY SHULTZ: Of course, everybody likes to say that all the things that I have done were the right things to do. Don't second-guess yourself.

On the other hand, I have spent my life in the belief that living is learning. Certainly, I've learned a lot about the problems of the Middle East -- their difficulty. And I think perhaps the thing that has sunk in the most with me -- although you mentioned my background in mediation and arbitration, and such things -- industrial relations -- so you're very conscious in that field of the importance of attitudes and processes, and so on -- but, I think perhaps the thing that has deepened most greatly in me is the

point that I was just talking about. That it isn't so much trying to sit down and figure out some new plan, because you have to realize that there are very, very smart people out in the Middle East. They've thought about these things a great deal, and nobody is going to sort of think of something that nobody's thought of before.

The problem is to bring about that good-faith negotiation, that process, undertaken by people who do it in an honest way and who are serious people, and who certainly are going to represent their interests strongly --not neglect their interests -- but who also believe that one of their overriding interests is to create a situation of greater stability and peace in their neighborhood.

I appreciate very much the warmth of your welcome here, and the opportunity to work with you and with Tom and others. And, of course, I appreciate very much the great courtesy with which I have always been received in office and out, in the Middle East, and most particularly in Israel. So I look forward to a brief visit come next month, and, in the meantime, I look forward to our continuing association.

Thank you.

(Standing applause).

(Q&A session concluded at 3:25 p.m.)

PRESS
DEPARTMENT OF STATE

No. 79
April 22, 1985

AS PREPARED FOR DELIVERY

THE UNITED STATES AND CENTRAL AMERICA:

A MOMENT OF DECISION

ADDRESS BY
THE HONORABLE GEORGE P. SHULTZ
SECRETARY OF STATE
BEFORE THE
INDIANAPOLIS ECONOMIC CLUB AND
THE ORGANIZING COMMITTEE FOR THE
TENTH INTERNATIONAL PAN AMERICAN GAMES
Indianapolis, Indian
April 22, 1985

For further information contact:

In two years, the United States will host the Tenth Pan American Games here in Indianapolis. I know that when the athletes from 37 nations come to compete, this beautiful city will display America at its best.

The meaning of the Pan American Games goes beyond sports. They offer us a chance to strengthen friendship among all the peoples of the Americas. They remind us of our common heritage -- as founders and creators of the New World -- and of our common destiny -- as peoples united in the pursuit of peace and freedom. There is extraordinary diversity in our Hemisphere, but this diversity is overwhelmed by all that we share in common: a love of liberty, a strong commitment to religious values, a passion for democracy, and a desire for peace.

The United States has an important role to play in helping achieve these noble goals. If we act with wisdom and determination, in a spirit of bipartisanship, we can play that role effectively.

I am especially pleased to be here today in the home state of a true statesman and outstanding political leader, Senator Dick Lugar. He has taken charge of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee and brought it new energy and dynamism. He is working hard to forge strong, bipartisan commitment in Congress to our nation's security and goals around the world.

He is a champion of peace and freedom. We are grateful for his counsel and his strong leadership -- particularly on the issue that I would like to address today: Our policy in Central America.

The Challenge to Democracy and Peace

In Central America today, we confront a fundamental challenge -- a challenge to our national interests and to the freedom and security of our neighbors. Our goals in Central America are clear: We seek peace, security, economic progress, and the growth of freedom and democracy in every country.

In recent years, we have seen tremendous progress. Costa Rica's democracy remains strong and vibrant, despite threats and attempted subversion from Nicaragua, and despite the fact that Costa Rica maintains no standing army. In Honduras and Panama, military rulers have been replaced by civilian governments. In Guatemala, the transition to democracy is moving steadily ahead with presidential elections scheduled next October. The triumph of democracy in El Salvador was reaffirmed last month as more than a million voters went to the polls to choose their legislative and municipal leaders. President Duarte has shown his readiness for dialogue with the armed opposition. Peace in El Salvador is more possible under Duarte's democratic administration than ever before.

In short, the transition to democracy is succeeding everywhere in Central America -- everywhere, that is, except Nicaragua, where a small group of Marxist-Leninists who call themselves "Sandinistas," backed by the Soviet Union and Cuba, are in the process of imposing a brutal tyranny. In Central America, everyone knows that Nicaragua's intransigence is the single most important obstacle to peace and security in the region. And the threat the Sandinistas pose is growing, not receding.

With Soviet and Cuban help, the Sandinistas are still working to consolidate their power and turn Nicaragua into a full-fledged Communist state. Should they achieve this goal, we would face a second Cuba in this hemisphere, this time on the mainland of the Americas -- with all the strategic dangers that this implies. If the history of Cuba is any guide, Nicaragua would then intensify efforts to undermine its neighbors in the name of "revolutionary" principles -- principles that Fidel Castro himself flatly reaffirmed on American television earlier this year.

Needless to say, the first casualty of a Communist consolidation in Nicaragua would be the freedom and hopes for democracy of the Nicaraguan people. The second casualty would be the security of Nicaragua's neighbors, and the security of the entire region.

And the results of our failure to stop the spread of Communism in this hemisphere will be clear for all to see, in the millions of refugees who will escape to freedom from tyranny, just as others have before them, from Eastern Europe and Afghanistan, from Cuba and Indochina. In the past ten years, over a million and half people have fled Indochina alone. Seven hundred and fifty thousand have come here to the United States; thousands more died before they could reach safe haven. Do we want to see this tragedy repeated in this hemisphere?

Such a disaster in Central America is avoidable, if the United States has the will and the wisdom to take prudent steps now. There is an alternative to war and oppression -- a peaceful alternative, based on negotiations toward democracy and internal dialogue among Nicaraguans, all Nicaraguans, armed and unarmed, in and out of the country, in and out of power.

A New Opportunity

On March 1, in San Jose, Costa Rica, the leaders of the Nicaraguan democratic resistance asked the Sandinista regime to begin a dialogue for peace and democracy in their country. They offered a ceasefire; they asked for a dialogue to let the people of Nicaragua decide, finally, after years of dictatorship first under Somoza and then under the Sandinistas, who they want to govern their country, and how.

On March 22, the Bishops of Nicaragua's Roman Catholic Church agreed to mediate.

On April 4, President Reagan made an urgent appeal in the name of peace and on behalf of the American people. He called upon the government and the armed opposition to stop fighting and to begin talks on national reconciliation, the restoration of democracy, and an end to repression and tyranny.

The Sandinistas have so far turned a deaf ear to the calls for dialogue, for peace and democracy. We hope they will reconsider. Without further incentives, however, that seems unlikely. Throughout their six years in power, the Sandinistas have been flexible only when they were convinced they had no choice.

There are those in this country who would look the other way, imagining that this problem will disappear by itself. But hesitation or neglect on our part will only allow the Sandinistas the time they need to consolidate their totalitarian control. The time for us to act is now.

The Congress will vote tomorrow on funds for the Nicaraguan democratic resistance. President Reagan has asked the Congress to release the $14 million already appropriated. If Congress approves, these funds would be used for humanitarian purposes, not for arms or munitions.

We want to give the Sandinistas a chance to consider and accept the offer of peace. If the comandantes do accept the offer of the democratic opposition, the restrictions the President has put on the funds will remain in effect. But if the comandantes continue to reject all peaceful, democratic alternatives, then the United States will be obliged, sooner or later, on both moral and strategic grounds, to support the democratic resistance in Nicaragua with the resources they need to defend themselves.

As Senator Dick Lugar stressed yesterday, we face a challenge far more important than the sum of $14 million. It is the challenge "of whether the United States is prepared to be involved effectively in the region during the coming years." And as the Senator said, we are unlikely to see a change in Nicaraguan policy if we turn our backs on the one force that has demonstrated it can command the attention and the concern of the Nicaraguan regime.

The choice before Congress is grave and cannot be avoided. We are at a pivotal moment that will help determine the future of Central America and directly affect the national security of the United States.

The situation today in Nicaragua is dangerous because both sides are poised to settle in for the long haul: On one side are the nine comandantes entrenched along exactly the same repressive ideological and subversive lines staked out by Fidel Castro in Cuba twenty-five years ago. They face the resistance of the armed and unarmed democratic opposition, growing in popular support, and digging in on the classic model of extended civil war. If the regime rejects dialogue, if it continues to stifle the democratic aspirations of the Nicaraguan people, then the conflict in that war-torn country will continue and worsen.

That is why the opportunity of internal reconciliation through dialogue is so important -- now. And that is why we Americans have a special responsibility to profit by the experience of the past six years in Central America and act, now, to seize that opportunity. We have learned in El Salvador that dialogue within the framework of a democratic and constitutional order offers the best chance to break through the frustrating stalemate of prolonged conflict.

This positive lesson of El Salvador tends to be ignored in the "alternatives" to the President's initiative being proposed in the Congress. Some of these alternatives are potentially constructive, but some are not alternatives at all. Consider, for example, the proposal to provide funds for refugees outside Nicaragua and for monitoring an eventual Contadora treaty.

These are fine goals, but in this situation they are worse than nothing. The President's proposal of April 4 promotes peace by supporting Nicaragua's democrats and providing incentives for the comandantes to enter into a dialogue with them. This alternative does neither. It supports neither dialogue nor enduring peace. If anything, it is a formula for turning freedom fighters into refugees without hope of a democratic outcome. It is a green light for the regime to continue its foreign subversion without ever accepting a Contadora treaty.

The fundamental problem with this so-called "alternative" is that it ducks the central issue of incentives. The Sandinistas will not change their behavior without powerful reasons to do so. We wish this were not true. But six years have taught us that the comandantes listen to others only when they have a reason. That is why the President has asked Congress to provide a reason. A "yes" vote will maintain the pressure on the Communists and provide incentives for change. A "no" vote or a phony alternative would remove the incentive and guarantee a prolonged conflict. Those in Congress who vote "no" must accept their share of the responsibility if this crucial opportunity is lost.

The Democratic Opposition in Nicaragua

The democratic forces in Nicaragua are on the front line in the struggle for security and freedom in Central America.

We must support their courageous efforts for peace and democracy through dialogue.

In 1979 the anti-Somoza organizations pledged to the Organization of American States, and to their own people, to bring freedom to their country after decades of tyranny. Somoza fell, but the comandantes then betrayed these pledges and the hopes of the Nicaraguan people; they purged the non-Communists from their regime and imposed a new and brutal tyranny that has respected no frontiers. They are attempting to force Nicaragua into a totalitarian mold whose pattern is all too familiar. They are suppressing internal dissent, displacing the free labor movement with their own government-controlled unions, censoring the press, persecuting the Church, cooperating with the terrorists of Iran, Libya, and the PLO, and seeking to undermine the governments of their neighbors. This emerging totalitarianism is supported by political, military, and intelligence links to Cuba and the Soviet Union.

This betrayal has forced many Nicaraguans who opposed Somoza back into opposition. And while many resist peacefully, thousands have seen no choice but to take up arms again, to risk everything so that their hopes for freedom and democracy will not once again be denied. Many poor peasants, unwilling to be drafted to defend Communist rule, have fled the country.

The Sandinistas denounce all opponents as mercenaries or as former National Guardsmen loyal to the memory of Somoza. We can expect them to make such charges. What is surprising is that some in this country seem all too willing to accept such charges at face value.

The truth about the democratic resistance is that it is a popular movement led mostly by men who fought in the revolution against Somoza. Its key political leaders either supported or actually served in the new government until it became clear that the comandantes were bent on Communism not freedom, repression not reform, and aggression not peace. Adolfo Calero, the Commander-in-Chief of the democratic armed resistance, is a lifelong opponent of Somoza who tried to cooperate with the Sandinistas in rebuilding Nicaragua after Somoza's fall. Alfonso Robelo founded a political party opposed to Somoza and then served as one of the original five members of the post-Somoza junta. Arturo Cruz was a member of that junta after Robelo left. These men and the thousands who follow them are democrats committed to a struggle against tyranny -- whether of the right or the left.

The ranks of the democratic forces in Nicaragua are swelling day by day. Many thousands of Nicaraguans are risking their lives. Would these men and women be making such great sacrifices if they believed it would lead to a return of tyranny? The answer is no.

The resistance fighters include peasants and farmers, shopkeepers and vendors, teachers and professionals. What unites them to each other, and to the other thousands of Nicaraguans who resist without arms, is disillusionment with Sandinista economic failure, repression, militarism, and subservience to foreign Communist governments. The young people of Nicaragua are sending the message: Draft dodging is one of the biggest problems the regime faces today. Yet at the same time, when the resistance fighters go out on patrol, they come back with more people than they started with -- as volunteers are choosing the side of freedom.

The Challenge to the Sandinistas

As we have said many times, the goals we share with our neighbors in Central America cannot be achieved unless Nicaraguan behavior changes in four fundamental ways:

-- First, Nicaragua must stop playing the role of surrogate for the Soviet Union and Cuba. As long as there are large numbers of Soviet and Cuban security and military personnel in Nicaragua, Central America will be embroiled in the East-West conflict. The Soviet-Cuban-Nicaraguan power play injects that East-West conflict into the Western Hemisphere. Central America is West. The East must get out.

-- Second, Nicaragua must reduce its armed forces, now in excess of 100,000 and heavily armed, to a level comparable to those of its neighbors. The current imbalance in both men and weapons is incompatible with regional stability.

-- Third, Nicaragua must absolutely and definitively stop its support for insurgents and terrorists in the region. All of Nicaragua's neighbors, particularly El Salvador, but also democratic Costa Rica, have felt the brunt of Sandinista efforts to destabilize their governments. No country in Central America will be secure as long as this continues.

-- And fourth, the Sandinistas must live up to their commitments to democratic pluralism made to the OAS in 1979. The internal Nicaraguan opposition, armed and unarmed, represents a genuine political force that is entitled to participate in the political processes of the country. The Government in Managua must provide the political opening that will allow their participation.

In essence, all that we and the Nicaraguan democrats ask is that the Sandinistas live up to the promises they have <u>already</u> made: the promises they made in 1979 to the OAS, the commitments they made when they signed the 21-point Contadora Document of Objectives in September 1983, the principles they purported to accept when they endorsed the Contadora draft of September 1984.

The fact that they now refuse a dialogue can only raise new doubts about their willingness to abide by any commitments. Can the Sandinistas be trusted to abide by what they agree to? If they cannot be trusted -- if their commitments to peace and pluralism are hollow -- what does this imply about the long-term prospects for peace and democracy in Central America? The present peace offer of the democratic opposition is a crucial test of the Sandinistas' willingness to live in peace with their neighbors and their own people. It may well be the last chance for a peaceful solution.

Any treaty, as we all know, requires adequate verification of compliance. This is one of the key issues now in the Contadora negotiations. But the most important assurance of compliance is the internal openness of Nicaragua's political system. Closed societies, and particularly Communist societies, have a long record of disregarding agreements. The record of the Sandinistas is dismal, and everyone in the region knows it.

President Reagan's peace proposal has won support throughout Latin America. President Duarte of El Salvador said he believes "it is the right step at the right time in our quest for peace and democracy in this region." Contadora leaders have emphasized that their Document of Objectives calls for internal dialogue in all countries of Central America, in Nicaragua as well as El Salvador.

President Monge of Costa Rica called the initiative "a proposal for a peaceful solution to one of the great problems of our time." Presidents Suazo of Honduras, Lusinchi of Venezuela, Betancur of Colombia, Alfonsin of Argentina, Barletta of Panama, and Febres Cordero of Ecuador, among others, have made clear their support for the proposed dialogue. From a wide range of political viewpoints, all urge the Sandinista leaders to accept the offer of peace and begin the dialogue.

The Moral Responsibility of the United States

The United States cannot escape its responsibility. Peace and freedom can be achieved in Central America only if we are willing to support those in the region who share these goals.

How can we as a country say to a young Nicaraguan: "Learn to live with oppression; only those of us who already have freedom deserve to pass it on to our children"? How can we say to those Salvadorans who stood so bravely in line to vote: "We may give you some economic and military aid for self-defense, but we will also give a free hand to the Sandinistas to undermine your new democratic institutions"?

We must make every effort to convince the Sandinistas that the path of peaceful democratic change is the only path they can take.

To cut off support now for the democratic resistance in Nicaragua would be to turn our backs on a crucial opportunity for peace in that country. If we do not take the appropriate steps now to pressure the Sandinistas to live up to their past promises, then we may find later, when we can no longer avoid acting, that the stakes will be higher and the costs greater. And that would be a tragic mistake. Today we have a chance to bring about real change in Nicaragua and throughout Central America, and at a low cost. We cannot afford to miss this opportunity.

I agree with those who say that this could be the most important moment in Congress since 1947. Then, the Congress supported President Truman's determination to stand up to the expansion of Soviet imperialism. Tomorrow Congress will choose whether to support the President in his determination to stop Soviet encroachment right here in our hemisphere. If Congress fails this test, the message will go worldwide -- to freedom fighters in Afghanistan, Southeast Asia, Africa, and elsewhere where the spark of freedom still glows. But it is a message that will have its greatest impact right here in the Americas.

We in this country must stand firmly in the defense of our interests and principles, and the rights of peoples to live in freedom. Nicaragua's democrats deserve our support. Their struggle is vital to hemispheric peace. To abandon them would be a shameful betrayal -- a betrayal not only of brave men and women, but of our highest ideals and the national security of the United States.