

September 15, 1971 CONGRESSIONAL RECORD—Extensions of Remarks

ica that now exists in many countries. We will also urge that such a system eliminate the inequitable "reverse preferences" that now discriminate against Western Hemisphere countries.

The President was certainly correct when he said that—

United States trade policies often have a very heavy impact on our neighbors.

As an example, Mexico imported \$1.565 billion worth of American goods, mostly manufactured items, last year. The United States imported \$833 million worth of Mexican goods, resulting in a plus U.S. trade balance of \$832 million.

Mexico, like most of the developing nations in Latin America is striving to build its manufacturing capabilities in order to create jobs and raise its GNP.

President Nixon has not only broken his promise to "press for a liberal system of generalized tariff preferences for all developing countries, including Latin America," but he has slapped Mexico and our other neighbors with a surcharge of 10 percent on their exports to the United States.

Surely the President was correct when he said during the economic package announcement, that the "temporary" surcharge was aimed at trading nations with under-valued currencies. Given that, why did he break his promises to our developing neighbors and levy precisely the same surcharge against them as he applied to the developed nations?

But the levying of the surcharge was not the only broken promise. In order to increase the drama involved in announcing such a comprehensive economic package, President Nixon broke his express promise to have "advance consultation on trade matters" which he made in the Inter-American Press Association speech.

In a speech delivered yesterday before the U.S. Governors Conference in San Juan, P.R., OAS Secretary General Galo Plaza stated:

The new economic policy announced by the United States Government last month has, understandably, not been well received in Latin America. The surcharge on imports seems to undercut both the general U.S. commitment toward freer trade and the specific U.S. commitment to help Latin America expand and diversify its exports.

I find Secretary General Galo Plaza to be most diplomatic indeed. He might have stated simply: "President Nixon lied to us."

I would remind President Nixon and the Members of this body of one or two economic facts of life:

First, Latin America is the only major world area in which the United States maintains a favorable trade balance.

Second, That favorable trade balance amounted to \$790 million last year.

Third, The United States exported almost \$5 billion worth of goods to Latin America in 1969.

Fourth, The old days when the Latin American nations had nowhere else to go for their imports are over. West Germany, Japan, France, Great Britain, and even the Soviet Union are accelerating their exports to Latin American nations. As an example, in a recent closed session

of the Foreign Relations Committee in one of the houses of the Brazilian Congress, the Foreign Minister of Brazil stated that last year, for the first time in its history, Brazil traded more with the Common Market nations than it did with the United States.

This morning the Washington Post published an editorial which is very germane to the subject of the impact of the 10-percent import surtax on our southern neighbors. The editorial entitled, "Who Pays the Tariff?" follows:

#### WHO WANTS THE TARIFF?

In the current pushing and shoving among the world's great trading nations, a lot of small countries are getting hurt. Latin America illustrates the point. The United States did not really intend to harm the Latin economies last month when it imposed its 10 per cent surtax on imports. The truth is that the White House and the Treasury were not thinking about Latin America at all. But intentional or not, the damage is real and the consequences are going to be serious.

President Nixon worked out his economic program with the advice of a special committee of able and experienced citizens, headed by Albert Williams, whose report has now been published. But in the matter of tariffs the President overrode this committee, which urged him to move toward removal of all barriers to international trade. The Williams committee is right on this issue, and the President is wrong. The evidence is already visible to the south.

The Latin Americans protest, with good logic, that it is unjust to make them pay a surtax designed to remedy a trade crisis in which they played no part. Latin America has traditionally bought more from the United States than it sells here. The Latins are not the people to see about revaluing the yen and the Deutschemark. But the United States meets all objections with a shrug and the observation that it can't start making exceptions now.

Mr. Nixon attempted this week to placate the Latins with the decision that, for them alone, he would cancel the 10 per cent reduction in foreign aid; it had originally been part of the program announced a month ago, with the surtax. But the countries getting the most aid are not those hardest hit by the surtax.

The extreme examples are Mexico and Brazil. Mexico does more business with the United States than any other country in Latin America and will be more severely damaged by the surtax than any other. But Mexico takes no direct aid from the United States. On the other hand, the United States gives more aid to Brazil than to any other Latin country. Brazil does half as much business with the United States as Mexico does. Since coffee is exempt, the surtax applies only to about 15 per cent of Brazil's exports to this country. But it applies to fully 50 per cent of Mexico's exports here.

Less than two years ago Mr. Nixon delivered a glowing speech on this country's responsibilities to Latin America. "They need," he said then, "to be assured of access to the expanding markets of the industrialized world." He promised them advance consultation on trade matters, and he also promised to pursue, worldwide, "a liberal system of generalized tariff preferences." They got no consultation on the surtax, obviously, and now they see the United States taking the lead in raising tariffs. Unfortunately the price of these moves comes high, and much of it is ultimately paid by small nations that cannot afford their large neighbors' mistakes.

BILDERBERG: THE COLD WAR  
INTERNATIONALE

HON. JOHN R. RANICK  
OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 15, 1971

Mr. RANICK. Mr. Speaker, on several occasions during recent months, I called the attention of our colleagues to activities of the Bilderbergers—an elite international group comprised of high Government officials, international financiers, businessmen and opinionmakers—see CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, E4016-8 of May 5, 1971, entitled "Bilderbergers' Woodstock Meeting," H3701 to H3707 of May 10, 1971, entitled "U.S. Dollar Crisis—A Dividend of Internationalism," E4979 to E4985 of May 24, 1971, entitled "Secret Bilderberg Meeting and the Logan Act," and E7786 to E7787 of July 16, 1971, entitled "Bilderberg Case: Reply From U.S. Attorney General's Office."

This exclusive international aristocracy holds highly secretive meetings annually or more often in various countries. The limited information available about what transpires at these meetings reveals that they discuss matters of vital importance which affect the lives of all citizens. Presidential Adviser Henry Kissinger, who made a secret visit to Peking from July 9 to 11, 1971, and arranged for a Presidential visit to Red China, was reported to be in attendance at the most recent Bilderberg meeting held in Woodstock, Vt., April 23-25, 1971. The two points reportedly discussed at the Woodstock meeting were "the contribution of business in dealing with current problems of social instability" and "the possibility of a change of the American role in the world and its consequences."

Following these secret discussions, which are certainly not in keeping with the Western political tradition of "open covenants openly arrived at," the participants return to their respective countries with the general public left uninformed, notwithstanding the attendance of some news media representatives, of any of the recommendations and plans agreed upon as a result of the discussions—or for that matter even the occurrence of the meeting itself.

Because the American people have a right to know of any projections for a change in America's role in the world and because Henry Kissinger and other Government officials and influential Americans met with high Government officials and other powerful foreign leaders, I sought to have more information about the recent Bilderberg meeting made public by raising the question to the U.S. Attorney General of a possible violation of the Logan Act by American participants and asked if the Justice Department anticipated taking any action in the matter.

The reply from the Justice Department, in effect, was that all of the elements constituting a violation of the Logan Act were present and that the Department contemplated no action but

Rees Russelot, John  
Rees Ford, R.  
Org 1 Bilderberg  
Org 1 John Birch Society

## Secret Is Out: Rep. Ford Is Ein Bilderberger

By Richard L. Lyons  
Washington Post Staff Writer

The John Birch Society's answer to attacks by Republican leaders on the secret, far right organization is this: House Republican leader Gerald R. Ford is a "Bilderberger."

Was ist ein Bilderberger?

John Rousselot, a national public relations director of the Birch Society and a former Republican congressman, said in California that the Bilderberg group is a secret organization and Ford should be asked about it.

Ford said it is an unofficial, changing group of public and private leaders from Atlantic Community nations that meets twice a year to discuss world problems. Sponsored by Prince Bernhard of the Netherlands in 1954, it took its name from its first meeting place, the Bilderberg Hotel in Oosterbeek, Holland. It met last year at Williamsburg, Va.

"You don't really belong," said Ford. "You get invited to attend by the Prince." He said he has gone to two of the 13 three-day conferences.

"It's secret to the extent that they don't put out any releases," said Ford. But he said they don't do anything but talk. They make no decisions, cast no votes, have no power or standing, he said.

"I'm also a 33d degree Mason and a member of Delta Kappa Epsilon, Phi Delta Phi and Michigamua—all secret societies," he said. "The last

is a senior honorary society at the University of Michigan.

Right-wing organizations got on to the Bilderberg group some time ago, and it pops up frequently in their literature as an example of what they see as One-World Eastern Establishment groups working behind the scenes to sell out America.

Phyllis Schlafly discussed the Bilderbergers in her pro-Goldwater book, "A Choice Not an Echo," last year in a chapter titled "Who are the secret kingmakers?" She called the group an example of "a little clique of powerful men (who) meet secretly and plan events that appear to 'just happen.'"

Ford had some Bilderberg literature, which showed that those attending its discussions have included Christian A. Herter, Dean Rusk, Gen. Alfred Gruenther, Gen. Lyman Lemnitzer, Paul-Henri Spaak, Guy Mollet, Hugh Gaitskell and Per Jacobsson.

Until redistricting, Ford represented Holland, Mich., often visited by Prince Bernhard, and his district is still about 60 per cent Dutch descent.

"Just put in that this was started by Prince Bernhard and I don't care what else you say about it," he said.