A NEW NATIONAL PARTNERSHIP
FOR AN ERA OF CHALLENGE


Crisis" by observing that in palmier times it was the custom for

statesmen to "rejoice in that protecting Providence which had pre-

served us through so many dangers and brought us at last into a

secure and prosperous age." But "little did they know",

Churchill wrote, "that the worst perils had still to be encountered,

and the greatest triumphs had yet to be won."

We do not depreciate the achievements of our predecessors

in saying that the first truly "world crisis" is that which we face

now. We know this crisis holds perils for us. But now the time

has come to recognize that there are great triumphs to be won as

well. For this crisis is above all an unprecedented opportunity.
Our age is no exception. We are at the end of three decades of great efforts in foreign policy marked by many successes. But we face today a period uniquely in peril and opportunity. The one generation is the first confronting a challenge truly global in nature. Old international patterns are crumbling; many old steps are no longer relevant. The world has become interdependent in economics, in communications, in human engineering. All the one part of the world can any longer pretend to be secure in isolation. For one America involving, in most affairs, is no longer an act of choice or even of necessity, it is a necessity. When one looks at the industries requiring high technology, it is not hard to see even if one is not an economist, how the future will belong to the countries that are committed to transnational activity.
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We are the other great denominations, better off. Having to adjust to a loss of power and influence, to assailed by the twin problems of recession and inflation, they are even less able to cope.

Bent on nothing can obscure the trinity of the century; that is the enduring fact, the hard lesson drawn from the history of a challenge only from the inadequacy of despair.

Thus the present situation compels us with an incision. Recent upheavals have forced Americans to recognize their ignorance, experience and maturity have dispelled any illusions that we could control events or shape them in the image of our own history.
Blessed by a bountiful environment and an industrious people,

-- We have the world's strongest and most technologically advanced and broadly based economy;

-- We are the world's strongest military power, and have sustained the security of the international system for a generation;

-- We remain the world's only globally influential society in the realm of commerce and communication;

Bear the standard of political freedom, economic and social progress, and humanitarian concern; as we have for 200 years, a tradition of adaptiveness, moral purpose, creativity and justice.

But, as T. S. Eliot noted, a great tradition cannot be inherited, it can only be maintained by great labor. In this century, Americans have consistently demonstrated their readiness to undertake such labor. Because they have done so, we possess yet another asset -- the record of achievements of our foreign policy since World War II.
The generation since the end of World War II

We now stand at the end of the postwar era. It has been an
era of achievement and foreign policy
political stability,
also of growth -- in economic progress, and
in international understanding. An era which we and the world

survived owing, in large part, to the courage and far-seeing

leadership of a group of remarkable Americans: leaders such as

Harry S. Truman, Arthur Vandenberg, George Marshall, Ralph

Bunche, Dean Acheson, [Eleanor Roosevelt, William Fulbright],

(Martin Luther King, Arthur Schlesinger, Dan Ellsberg]

They built the national consensus for responsible

Their creative response to challenge was founded upon a

American leadership in the world. The European, economic

fundamental unity of international purpose. Such unity enabled

recovery, the stabilization of the postwar world in a period of

Cold War, tension laid a foundation on which, in recent

them and their dedicated successors to carry their vision through

years, we have been able to regularize relations with

more than a quarter-century of achievement. As a result, many

our adversaries and chart new dimensions of cooperation

of the problems of politics, security, ideology, and national rivalry

with our allies. We should not take for granted the

which have occupied us for the past three decades have been con-

many issues of political conflict, ideology, or potential

tained, through negotiation with our adversaries and through

confrontation that have been moderated or contained by

cooperation with our allies.

The successful exertion of our policy.

One of the penalties of success

in foreign policy is obedience to leaders in momentary despair.
The essence of our current challenge is that the agenda of the past has been solving cooperation or continued through negotiation with one ally and negotiation with our adversaries and that cooperation is no longer sufficient to deal with reality. Demand a new effort of creativity.

As Edward Luttwak said, "The military theories are always on the side of the ablest men, the necessities.

But one must take account of the fatigue of the lehetmen. He must fuse through the elements as he finds them. It were unjust not to return to fundamentals. It was a confusion — perhaps even less. America had taken its position, labor upon itself. After some initial hesitation, it was an American victory.
32) The ultimate goal of our task as President is the role of building a stronger and more unified America. Vietnam shattered our sense of unity. We must rebuild it. The future of our country depends on this task. Then we can move forward. I urge you to see to it that our debates become more and more a dialogue among citizens who can make themselves engaged in a common enterprise. Only then can we hope to meet the realities of our age about which President Franklin D. Roosevelt said, in his State of the Union address, "As time goes on, our nation's history will tell the story of the nation depends more heavily on the state of the world, and whether, if war, the state of the world depends more heavily on the state of our nation."
B3. The Traditional Agenda of Peace

The issues of war and peace faced by the past generation will now be reconsidered. If we wish to continue to engage our efforts, we still live in a world of war.

[Signature]
THE TRADITIONAL AGENDA OF PEACE AND WAR

But despite their legacy of success, the issues of war and peace which they faced will continue to engage our efforts. In a world of political turmoil and proliferation of nuclear technology, a world of weapons of horrifying destructiveness, we still are called upon urgently to adjust traditional alliances to changing conditions; to build new ties to old adversaries, and to seek to bring peace in areas where chronic instability threatens global security.

What we have achieved.
In the last few years we have made crucial progress in dealing with these questions—progress which has laid the foundation for future achievement; progress which reminds us how much remains to be done.

Let me review some of the basic elements of our foreign policy today. Before speaking of the new challenges we face, I want to review the major achievements we have made and upon which we can build.
Building Upon the Successful Allied Relationship

Our foreign relations are built upon the bedrock of cooperation with our allies. Geography, history, trade, shared cultural and intellectual values are a reality. Our nation's interests and purposes will continue to be most closely aligned with Europe, Canada, Japan, and Latin America. These special ties and of the postwar world -- and our more recent common aims have been indispensable to the progress we have achieved since World War II. Our future success will be measured by our ability to moderate our relations with our adversaries -- is very much the product of our ability to achieve our common global aspirations while steadfast commitment to our allies. Today, in a new era of crisis, it is to our allies that we naturally turn in the first instance to seek a collaborative solution to what is clearly a global challenge.

At stake is the future of the industrialized democracies. We are who have perceived their destiny in common and sustained it in common for 30 years. Our decisive action now is essential -- not simply to pool technology, but to recover the conviction...
dialogue with Western Europe.
that our future is in our own hands, not at the mercy of external forces. The health of freedom in many countries will be affected by our success.

Building the Foundations of International Restraint

The second major element of our foreign relations is our effort to build a new relationship with our Communist adversaries. There can be no peaceful international order without a constructive relationship between the United States and the Soviet Union -- the two nations with the power to destroy mankind.

moral autogestion

The fundamental differences between our two systems have not been ignored; it is the heart of the problem. will not soon disappear. But we have taken important steps in our relations with the Soviets toward conducting relations between ourselves, moderating tension, restraining Soviet action, and thereby encouraging more positive evolution of Soviet and with the rest of the world in a more restrained and rational conduct. The SALT agreement, Berlin agreement, the demarcating way... Our agreement at Vladivostok was a major achievement of crises over Cuba and the Middle East, the easing of tension in this process. For the first time in the nuclear age a ceiling... Europe, the building of a network of cooperative bilateral relations with the Soviet Union in many fields -- these mark an undeniable change over the state of our relations 10 or even five years ago. The recent SALT agreement...
at Vladivostok places, for the first time, a long-term ceiling on all the principal strategic weapons on both sides. For the first time the arms race will not be driven by the fear of what the other side ultimately is capable of doing. We next must strive for further arms control measures and for eventual force reductions. What will long remain as we have bested, Prelude to a strategic planning of both sides will take place in the context of and eventual agreement.

While progress on SALT is of cardinal importance it is only one of a wide range of important agreements through which we seek to achieve further restraint and cooperation. We have had a setback in one of the most important of these areas - trade. But we cannot allow the momentum of progress to fade. We have already begun consultations with Congress on how, in a spirit of national partnership, the legislative and executive can repair the damage and reach agreement on a way to apply the purpose of the Trade Bill to the Soviet Union.
Building the Foundations of International Restraint

There can be no peaceful international order without a constructive relationship between the United States and the Soviet Union -- the two nations with the power to destroy mankind.

The fundamental differences between our two systems will not soon disappear. But we have taken important steps with the Soviets toward conducting relations between ourselves and with the rest of the world in a more restrained and rational way.

Despite fluctuations, a positive trend has been established: the new web of bilateral agreements; the easing of confrontation over Berlin, over the arms race, over the future shape of Europe and the emerging regions of the world. These steps are changing the character of international politics.
In recent years we also have ended a generation of estrangement and confrontation with the People's Republic of China. There cannot be a stable international environment without the constructive involvement of one-quarter of the world's people. Progress in our bilateral relations to date has opened channels of understanding and reduced regional and global tensions. Our new relationship with China is sound and on course. We intend to persist in the months and years ahead in the steady development of more-constructive ties in accordance with the Shanghai
Communique. The President's visit to the People's Republic of China later this year will be one more important step in our search to create a more stable and cooperative world structure.

Our relations with the Communist countries are a basic determinant of the world environment. If we seek peace, we
Our relations with the Communist countries are a basic determinant of the world environment. If we seek peace, we must seek to stabilize these relationships and build a long-term basis for our coexistence. We will stand by our principles and our interests; we will act firmly when challenged. But the kind of world we seek to build depends on a broad policy of creating mutual incentives for restraint and for cooperation.

Containing Regional Conflicts

The urgent political responsibility of our time is to resolve conflicts without war. It is tragic that long-standing national and regional enmities and rivalries have so often broken the peace and posed dangers to the wider world order. Much of the world is now free of local conflicts, yet we have achieved a certain momentum in containing regional chronic tensions persist. It has always been America’s policy to offer our help when we are in a position to promote peaceful settlement, and at
a minimum to seek to disentangle the local dispute from larger questions of big-power rivalry, and to enable the peoples of these areas return to a peaceful and productive life.

In the Middle East, since October of 1973, we have been involved in intensive searching political solutions for a just peace negotiations and we see some positive signs:

-- we have narrowed and clarified the alternative negotiation and helped bring about its first fruits; ways in which the negotiations may proceed;

-- all parties now view the consequences of continued stalemate more seriously and are reconsidering positions which their own interest, to the process of negotiation, have threatened to perpetuate this;

-- And each party better understands what proposals the realities of the other, and the common interest in negotiated solutions, for practices of the other parties can accommodate. The needs and

The question of momentum in the Middle East is all-important. For no problem has greater potential for a disaster which could engulf us should we fail to act effectively.
In Indochina we brought an honorable conclusion to American participation in a bitter war. In the Paris agreement, left to the parties the resolution of their political conflict; it provided a sound framework for the development of a framework of principle for settlement of these issues in durable peace which would permit an acceptable political and economic existence for all the parties involved. But the military conflict again is erupting on a dangerous scale.

It is by now clear that the South Vietnamese and Cambodian people do not lack spirit, courage or resolve. All they ask are the means by which they may defend themselves. Our goal is the means by which they may defend themselves. Our goal is when the adversary is once again persuaded of the peace. In view of our long and costly national commitment we, as a determined and externally-supplied adversary, owe it to ourselves as well as to our friends not to let this hard-won progress be lost. Our abandonment of our allies will doom Vietnam to continuing war.
THE NEW AGENDA OF INTERDEPENDENCE

Today, the traditional issues and problems of our

While we strive to manage the traditional concerns of

distant, recent past, any part of our agenda. We face, increasingly,

foreign policy, we must also grapple with the fact that the

by one ability to contribute to the emergence of a new international order, yet unborn, by

international order is undergoing fundamental change,

which requires our imagination and vision for

that a whole new series of challenges is emerging which

requires a new approach. With the benefit of hindsight there

in history, it is little difficulty in identifying moments when humanity broke from old ways

and moved in a new direction

swings out of its old paths onto a new route — the fifth

century B.C., the twelfth century, the Renaissance, the

Reformation, the great industrial and political revolutions

usually of the past two centuries. But it is often difficult for those

living in

who live during periods of great change to see events as more

than a series of unrelated crises; to perceive accurately the

ultimate significance of what is taking place; to avoid disaster

by acting from a new perception of reality.
We now are beginning to be able to see, however dimly, the outlines of the era which we are entering. While much of the unfinished business of the past -- problems of war, peace and unprecedented in type and scale national security -- remains to be dealt with, it is now clear that we also are confronting a new agenda -- one which contains problems of heretofore unimaginable scale. The insistent problems of energy, resources, environment, population, the uses of space and the seas, have begun to overshadow the narrow national military questions of politics, ideology and territorial rivalry which until recently have been regarded as the essential issues of this century.

But our approach to this new agenda has a familiar starting point. As in the past, our first priority must be to define our national interest and to devise ways to protect it.
As a result, what is not yet fully understood is that we no longer can separate our domestic concerns from our international concerns; that strictly national measures can only partially solve our national problems; and that our national self-interest is bound up with the self-interest of all other nations.

The advent of the nuclear age permanently transformed America's perception that our security could rely on the breadth of two oceans. Now the energy and food crises have made an equally revolutionary change in our situation— for it is evident that America's economic health is inextricably tied to the world's economic health.

The central challenge of our time, the challenge of man's irreversible interdependence, is to reconcile the national interest and the global interest.
These urgent issues illustrate the reality of our interdependence:

--- in energy, we and the industrial nations built a generation of prosperity on cheap imported fuel. Now we confront a cartel that can manipulate the supply and price of oil almost at will, threatening jobs and output and stability.

--- in agriculture, we and a few other countries have achieved incredible productivity. Now we see the survival and well-being of much of humanity threatened because the world has failed to expand food production in step with population growth.

--- For twenty years we and the industrial countries achieved sustained prosperity. Now we see our economies afflicted by worldwide simultaneous inflation and recession, and threatened by a worldwide depression.
These challenges will not only if we fail to see in them the birth pangs of a new international order. What seems to-day's as a challenge can be tomorrow's opportunity. The industrialized nations must take the initiative to re-establish international structures. It is entirely possible to make *necessary* reforms until our time's destiny is clear. This is essential for their political as well as their economic well-being.

This is why the United States have taken the lead in advocating an energetic energy policy as the prerequisite of a new international order. We have based our policy on this foundation.
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from overdependence on imported oil. Consuming countries move confidently to free their economies from overdependence on imported oil.

The first is solidarity among the major consumers. Alone, no consuming country can defend against an oil embargo or a withdrawal of oil dollars. Alone, no country except perhaps the United States can invest enough to develop new energy sources to achieve self-sufficiency. Only by acting together can the major consuming countries move confidently to free their economies from overdependence on imported oil.

But these challenges need not overwhelm us. We are already moving to regain control of our economic destiny. In the past year, this Nation has taken meaningful steps to address the challenge of our economic destiny. Economic solidarity is a cooperative solution among the energy producing and consuming countries. Only by acting together can the consuming countries move confidently to free their economies from overdependence on imported oil.

Energy security, economic solidarity, and the reassertion of control of our economic destiny are all aspects of a new world of peace and prosperity.
November the United States and 15 other countries signed an unprecedented agreement to help each other in a new emergency.

The agreement commits each country to build an emergency stock of oil; if a new embargo comes, each country will cut its consumption by the same proportion, and available oil will be shared. The agreement means that an embargo against one will not be an embargo against all; it means that the oil consumers are prepared and united, determined to resist any new interruption in oil supply.

Equally important is solidarity for financial security.

The stability of individual industrialized countries can be threatened if producers elect to stop the flow of oil dollars, or to withdraw funds already deposited. But we can meet this
R 20 is a symptom of the decline of self-confidence in the Western world that we have barely noticed the important progress that has been made in the past 20 years since the Washington energy conference.
danger also by acting together. For oil producers have no choice but to put their money in the industrial world; whatever they take out of one industrial country they must deposit in another. The industrial countries can offset such financial shifts by relending the money to each other. This is the purpose of the $25-billion dollar financial safety net, which the industrial countries agreed to establish ten days ago. It is not an aid fund; it is a mutual insurance scheme. It will defend the consumers against financial domination by the producers. And it demonstrates that resolve to shape our own destiny remains thoroughly alive among our people and governments.

The second imperative is for major consuming countries to reduce their dependence on imported oil. This means a concerted effort to reduce energy uses—driving, lighting, heating—which we have come to accept as our way of life. It also means
null if the safety must never lead to the invest.
accelerated development of alternative energy sources, such as nuclear power, oil shale, the oil of the outer continental shelf, Alaska, the North Sea, and elsewhere.

Such policies will be costly. Conservation measures may initially have a depressant effect on output and jobs. Development of new energy sources will divert investment capital from other sectors, slowing growth in non-energy sectors of the economy.

But if we fail to take these steps we will remain too vulnerable to the power of the oil producers, our economy exposed to disruption, our position in the world permanently impaired. And our allies, who depend on us to act with impact and decisiveness, could lose confidence in our will to resolve the problem.

This is the meaning of President Ford's State-of-the-Union proposals calling for national self-sufficiency in energy by 1985.

To achieve this goal, it is essential that we develop a national consensus for a national program. However much we may wish otherwise,
voluntary efforts, one-time emergency programs, trial and
error approaches, will not give us the sustained ten-year
effort we need.

The choice then, is not whether we will achieve energy
independence, but how. President Ford will work with Congress
in finding solutions all can accept. But he has made clear that
we cannot long delay; he will use his administrative powers to
limit imports if effective legislative programs are not agreed upon
promptly and carried out.

America cannot and will not solve the energy crisis alone.

We are asking our allies in the new International Energy Agency
to match our conservation actions by similar cuts of their own.

And they are responding. We will ask them to join us in
indeed several have anticipated
our program with major imaginative
efforts of their own.
developing alternative energy sources through price and
financial incentives to investors and through on a large scale
joint programs in research and development.

Once the consuming countries have taken decisions on
these matters we will be ready to go on to the next stage in
mastering the energy crisis] multilateral negotiations with
not the producers. We will enter such discussions to petition
or to threaten. But we will point out that there is a choice:

Either the producers and the consumers can cooperate on oil
security, investment, industrial progress and price, thereby
achieving a new mutually beneficial relationship of equilibrium.

Or, the producers can retain their complete freedom of action --
and risk an intensified consumer effort to be free of dependence
upon their oil.
The third step will be a dialogue between consumers and producers. The United States seeks to base its relations with producers on unconditionality and sincerity. cooperation. The realities of interdependence have no doubt guaranteed that no one will profit from conflict. Producers, economists, and consumers will all perceive the benefits of open, mixed, and open markets. The United States is prepared to discuss agreed to enter a dialogue on the whole range of issues of interdependence: assured supplies, security of investment, the relationship between oil and the state of the world economy. A mixed and mutually beneficial relationship can result from lowering the producers' costs and complete freedom of action. The consumers must be prepared to increase their own efforts.
This one we are far from the end of the energy crisis. Hard-line strategy is clear in its implications and small within our capacity. The basic challenge is whether the industrialized nations have the determination to dominate their setting and whether producers and consumers can then jointly master their vision for an agenda of interdependence.

The great spirit of interdependence cannot be enframed to those areas where the United States relies on other nations for its essential supplies. The withdrawal of such nations cannot call on the producers of raw materials for a sense of responsibility if they do not show a notable sense of responsibility with respect to those commodities which they have in surplus. The industrialized nations produce not only eighty percent of the world's
industrial goods and also exported consumer goods. According to present projections, the world's food deficit would rise from 60 million tons in 1985 (even if pessimistic statistics drawn from food speed-up picture are justified). This is incompatible with our moral values, with international stability and with cooperative global relationships.

This is why the United States..., 1985, at the World Food Conference in Rome last November, 5470 conference participants and the United States put forward a five point program:

- to increase massively food production in the developing countries;
- to bring about food security through an internationally agreed system of global food reserves...
increasing food production in the developing nations.

- to develop international financing for increasing food production
- to increase US food aid and military food aid in developing countries increases. The United States must substantially increase its own food aid effort.

In the next few months the United States must make a special effort to prepare a mission plan with special attention to energy and food aid. The items on the agenda that should encompass a survey of world food materials in relation to the needs.

We thus return face a problem similar to that of the late nineteen-thirties: defeated Germany and defeated devastated Japan, and a perceived American leadership. Now a far different approach seems needed. The vision of the world we

helped create through our efforts throughout the entire postwar period.

As we deal p 30
As we deal with this new agenda of global interdependence,

the first requirement is cooperation with our traditional

friends, Europe, Canada and Japan. Together we produce

eighty percent of the world's industrial goods and most of its

surplus food. We are the major source of the technology which

holds out such promise for the future. And our own economies

are now so inextricably linked that neither inflation nor recession

can be contained within national borders. Thus whether each of

us prospers and whether the global economy returns to the path

of economic growth depends above all on what we do together.

We must coordinate our economic policies more closely

than ever before. This has been a primary purpose of the

President's meetings this winter with the leaders of Germany,
Japan, France, Canada and Britain. Each country is taking action to stimulate economic activity -- through lowered taxes, higher spending, easier money, or all three.

But we share something even more fundamental in this time of profound crisis and change. For at stake is the future of the industrialized democracies, who have perceived their destiny in common and sustained it in common for 30 years can continue this dynamism or whether they must decline.

Our decisive action now is essential -- not simply to stimulate our economies, but even more to preserve our moral and political dynamism, to recover the sense that our future is in our own hands, not at the mercy of external forces.
Need for National Unity

Thus a great responsibility rests upon us in America. For many years America has carried a burden which it did not seek to share. We have often been tempted to push the peace, to feed the hungry, or to give hope to those seeking to improve themselves. But our size, our wealth, and our values have given us no other choice. We must do our share for this is still a people of the frontier which will not reject a task well done. To help bring peace to the world we must first make peace with ourselves.

The bitterness that has marked so much of our national debate for a decade may be overcome. Debate in a democratic society should find its ultimate limit in a spirit of
recognition that we are all engaged in a common enterprise.
Thus the United States has a special interest and obligation to make cooperation with those countries the heart of the larger framework of peace and prosperity we are seeking to create.

The Need for National Unity

But our striving for a more secure and stable world, our attempts to master the challenges which confront America today, will be unavailing unless we in the United States are united in a new national partnership.

This will require an achievement totally unprecedented in our history: the conduct of a complex foreign policy in close cooperation with Congress. Foreign governments can only deal with our government as an entity, not as a complex of divided institutions. They must be able to count on our maintaining both our national will and our specific undertakings.
Recently disagreements between the Congress and Executive have resulted in certain patterns which could undermine our reputation as a responsible and reliable partner in world affairs.

Therefore, we must urgently address the question of relations between Congress and the Executive. We do so not with the object of assigning blame. If our divisions lead to a failure of our policy, the consequences will be national, affecting us all. To appeal for cooperation on foreign policy in our government is not a maneuver or a slogan designed to cloak a supremacy of the Executive. It is not merely a preference. It is a necessity for our national survival.

The Administration recognizes the constitutional responsibilities of Congress in the field of foreign affairs.

We actively seek a national partnership between Congress and
the Executive, as equal branches, in the making of American foreign policy. It has been said that the Executive wants a blank check to conduct foreign affairs without interference. But we would not, even if it were possible, seek to return to the excessive discretion which the Executive enjoyed in the 1960's until recently.

For to try to exclude Congress from a major role would deny our policy, at a critical time, the broad support that is indispensable in a democracy. A new level of public understanding is required because of the urgency of our challenges and the direct impact which efforts to solve them will have on our domestic society. And public support is impossible without Congressional support.

Thus, the issue is not whether Congress should play a central role in foreign policy. It is how Congress and the Executive can best share a partnership which both branches of government affirm.
This is why our foreign policy has been most effective when it reflected a wide bipartisan support. The close ties between the Executive and legislative branches sustained our foreign policy during two post-war decades until the Vietnam war shattered this consensus. Recently its bipartisan backing of the Congress preserved our foreign policy during its launching constitutional crisis of Watergate. The nation owes the Congress a debt of gratitude for insulating our foreign policy from its adversities.
This simply indicates that if one must devise new approaches to foreign policy as we need new methods for executive-legislative relations. The Administration will make every effort to meet long-standing concerns more than half-way.
There are many broad areas of agreement between us.

The Administration fully acknowledges the responsibility of Congress to participate in defining the goals and general directions of our policy. The use of legislation and appropriations totals for this purpose is entirely legitimate. We may disagree with a particular decision and argue for a different course, as we have done, for example, concerning the amount of foreign aid for Indochina. But we do not question that to legislate the basic conceptions of policy is a proper exercise of Congress constitutional mandate.

Problems have arisen, however, concerning the respective roles of Congress and the Executive in the day-to-day conduct of foreign policy. Here, too, Congressional oversight
-- A denial of assistance to Chile has weakened our ties to an established friend, thereby weakening, rather than strengthening, our ability to secure improved respect for human rights.

-- A denial of generalized trade preferences to the OPEC countries has penalized Ecuador, Venezuela, and other countries who did not participate in the oil boycott, thus jeopardizing the future of our New Dialogue with Latin America.

-- A precipitate reaction to our interim agreement on strategic arms at Vladivostok could complicate the process of obtaining a final agreement.

It is absolutely essential that we find ways to reflect Congressional concerns without tying this nation's hands in the daily conduct of policy. Legislative and budgetary instruments are essential for setting the main lines of our policy, but they are
too rigid and general to guide its implementation.

Equally, Congressional consent for the objectives, and for the results, of our negotiations abroad is essential. But to have to review every stage of the negotiating process publicly risks hardening the positions of both sides and making final agreement difficult...actually impossible...will cooperate to the fullest with...We support, rather, the exercise of Congressional review over the implementation of policy through hearings and testimony. We take very seriously requests for information, testimony, and the advice we receive from committees. There are, of course, some physical limits to our capacity to keep members informed, especially that with individual congressional staffs...This is a particular problem...at a time when the number concerned for issues abroad has expanded beyond far beyond the leadership and the membership of the committees traditionally concerned with foreign affairs...and when the Democrats new organization with larger has restored the influence of some of the traditional leaders...
Congressional scrambles
We will work closely with Congress to find practical ways to reconcile the necessity for Congressional oversight with the need for an active Executive role in the execution of policy. However, cooperation between us will be promoted if both branches seek to understand the issues before us in realistic terms.

--- The question is, not how much our policy serves the interests of others, but how it can best serve our own interests.

Elements of our policy such as foreign aid and food aid should be understood, not as handouts to others, but as vital tools that we need to help our friends help themselves, to construct more positive relations with potential adversaries, and to help solve the pressing economic problems of the developing world.

--- The issue is, not whether morality or expediency governs our policy, but how we can best promote our purposes. Every foreign policy must combine a concern for the ideal with an attention to what is practical. Tension is inevitable between
our values, which are inherently absolute, and our efforts to
realize them, which of necessity involve compromises with
other countries. The choice we face is not between principle
and the lack of it but between two desirable objectives. To achieve a fruitful balance of the two is a central
dilemma of foreign policy.

The issue is, not Executive flexibility, but national
flexibility. The Administration does not seek discretion for
its own ends. But we are concerned that our government as a
whole be able to respond rapidly and creatively to shifting
conditions abroad. Congressional participation in the definition
of our policy, which we support, will prove meaningless if it is
understood to preclude the Executive role in the implementation of
policy. For without some flexibility in execution, the conception
The problem is, not Congressional authority over individual policies, but the maintenance of the overall fabric of our policy. The Administration fully recognizes the right of Congress to influence specific policies. But this authority cannot be exercised prudently without a sense of nuance and proportion. American policy is a complex mosaic in which our actions towards different countries, and our actions over time, are interrelated. To concentrate exclusively on a few strands of policy risks unraveling the fabric of the whole. To concentrate on short term advantages for ourselves risks incurring larger long-term costs in the future, in which Congress has joined cannot relate fruitfully to a changing world.
Partnership between Congress and the Executive will depend, not only on an effort to view the issues in parallel terms, but on an active commitment to cooperation and goodwill within our government:

- There must be close consultation. During our tenure in office, President Ford and I have made strenuous efforts to consult with Congress, both formally and informally. I pledge, on behalf of the President, that these efforts will continue and intensify.

- There must be nonpartisanship. The Administration actively seeks consensual support for our foreign policy. We do not seek, or expect, a total and sterile agreement regardless of party. True nonpartisanship is achieved, not by an impossible unanimity, but by a debate which transcends narrow political
viewpoints and addresses our problems with the level of vision they require. Our challenges confront us as a nation, not as a single party or Administration. Our government must be able to respond to them resolutely, whatever the political complexion of the White House and Congress. And we must be able to sustain our policies over a period of years if they are to make a lasting contribution to our security and well-being. There must be mutual restraint. The Administration pledges that we will not seek to press Congressional consent to its limits, either in letter or spirit. We ask in return that Congress not exercise its right to participate without appreciation of the Executive perspective. The objective of both institutions, working together, must be to fashion policies which will truly advance our national interests in the world on a long-term basis and with flexibility of tactics.
CONCLUSION

In 1947 at another moment of crisis calling for consensus and creation, a member of the Senate recalled Lincoln's words to the Congress during crisis a century ago: "The dogmas of the quiet past are inadequate to the stormy present. The occasion is piled high with difficulty, and we must rise with the occasion. As our case is new, so we must think anew, and act anew. We must disenthral ourselves, and then we shall save our country."

For more than a decade our country has been dismayed by war and disheartened by constitutional crisis. We have often been more conscious of what divides than of what unites us. But this time of travail has brought us a new, more mature national strength. We have glimpsed the limits of power, but
we also have felt the strength of our resilience. I believe we will emerge with a new realism, a new confidence, a new readiness for the future. Adversity has never daunted Americans. It has hardened and honed a creative and courageous pioneering spirit.

More than once have we learned that this century demands much of America. Now we are challenged once again, to help ourselves and the world find the way from a time of despair to a time of hope. It is the challenge of recapturing for our country the dynamism and probity we held at the time of the Marshall Plan -- to recapture qualities which persuaded the greater part of mankind that the flourishing of this Republic was important to the well-being and the progress of the world.
There is no doubt that it is only our country which can take the lead in structuring a response to these new global challenges.

Our economy, our military strength, our background of commercial and cultural experience and influence in the world sets us apart. Other major nations recognize this and, once again, are looking to us for leadership. We face, with the high expectations placed upon us, there is no more time for self-deprecation or doubt. We must turn to this work united in our resolve and conception of what will be required if we are to transform challenge into opportunity and opportunity into achievement.

For two centuries in no area of our national life have we been more united than in our view of America's meaning for the world. Now as we strive to achieve a new balance between our limits and our potential, between our new sense of the
possible and our continuing striving for the ideal, let us remember
that our influence for good or ill will be measured by the world's
assessment of our constancy and self-confidence. Our foreign
policy will mean little if other nations see our actions as unre-
fective of a coherent national purpose or consensus. No foreign
policy -- no matter how creative or courageous -- can succeed
if it is born in the minds of a few and carried in the hearts of
one.

We have no illusions that complete agreement on every
issue can ever be achieved. No genuine democracy can
obtain, nor should it strive for, total unanimity. But it does
mean that we can chart a common course and achieve a new
consensus about our larger purposes as a nation. For with it,
history could remember this as a time of great national
creativity and of truly major accomplishment. The times and circumstances call out for us to rise above narrow conceptions, to make the kind of lasting and fundamental achievement which comes only once in a generation. Let us join together in that endeavor.