

## Address by Senator Kennedy on the enlargement of the European Communities (9 April 1979)

**Caption:** José Lladró, Spanish Ambassador to Washington, sends the Spanish Foreign Minister a copy of the address given by Senator Kennedy on 9 April 1979 in the United States Senate, published in the Congressional Record, entitled 'Towards a Stronger European Community', in which he speaks of the enlargement of the European Community to include the countries of southern Europe.

**Source:** Archivo General del Ministerio de Asuntos Exteriores y de Cooperación, Madrid. 60 (E) 77 -1.

**Copyright:** (c) Ministerio de Asuntos Exteriores y de Cooperación de España

**URL:**

[http://www.cvce.eu/obj/address\\_by\\_senator\\_kennedy\\_on\\_the\\_enlargement\\_of\\_the\\_european\\_communities\\_9\\_april\\_1979-en-7c79476d-2d4b-4bc4-ac3d-7b0302af5354.html](http://www.cvce.eu/obj/address_by_senator_kennedy_on_the_enlargement_of_the_european_communities_9_april_1979-en-7c79476d-2d4b-4bc4-ac3d-7b0302af5354.html)

**Last updated:** 20/02/2014

GDE/erb



Washington, 18 de abril de 1979

1

Embajada de España

ASUNTO: Kennedy, las CCEE y España

43

Excmo. Sr.:

NORTEAMERICA

A

No. 466

Tengo honra comunicar a V.E. que el Congressional

Record correspondiente a la sesión del pasado 9 de abril recoge, en su sección "Speeches and Inserts" la intervención del Senador Kennedy, quien, sobre el tema de las Comunidades europeas y la ampliación de las mismas, se refirió en tres ocasiones a nuestro país junto con Portugal y Grecia. Aparte los datos de tipo histórico recientes contiene algunos juicios de valor generalmente positivos, tanto sobre las Comunidades y su futuro, como sobre los tres países en cuestión..."por primera vez, toda Europa occidental, incluyendo a España, Portugal y Grecia, está en manos democráticas.

1) REI  
2) Europa  
3) JLB

Aparte se envía fotocopia de la intervención de Kennedy, así como del artículo del New York Times sobre el Parlamento europeo al cual aquella sirvió de introducción.

Dios guarde a V. E. muchos años

EL EMBAJADOR DE ESPAÑA

P. D.  
*[Handwritten signature]*

José Liadó

RELACIONES ECONOMICAS  
8 MAYO 1979  
69

Excmo. Sr. Ministro de Asuntos Exteriores, MADRID. -

April 10, 1979

## CONGRESSIONAL RECORD—SENATE

S 4395

ment, he likewise shares the treaty-terminating power with the Senate.

## TOWARD A STRONGER EUROPEAN COMMUNITY

● **Mr. KENNEDY** Mr. President, this spring two developments promise to play a major role in determining the future character of relations between the U.S. and Western Europe.

Namely, the new European Monetary System (EMS) and the first direct elections to a European Parliament punctuate the initiative begun almost 30 years ago to create a European Community.

During these past years the community has already proved itself, in practical, not abstract, terms, as Dr. David Owen, the British Foreign Secretary, wrote recently in *Encounter*. The Community has become, Dr. Owen stated:

A weighty figure on the world stage and developed a distinctive personality of its own. The word personality is particularly appropriate, since it reflects the evolutionary or organic view of Community development which we in Britain find most natural and satisfying. Human personality is determined by both success and failure; a strong personality can put its failures to good account and build on the experience gained.

That experience began in the early 1950's when the Schuman plan created the European Coal and Steel Community. By the end of the decade, the Rome Treaty had established the European Economic Community (EEC), generally known as the Common Market.

Today, the European Community has expanded from the original six members (France, West Germany, Denmark, and Benelux) to nine member nations, including Great Britain, Ireland, and Italy. The way is now being paved for the further integration of Spain, Portugal, and Greece into the Community by the early 1980's—an expansion which should not be underestimated in terms of its contribution to the democratic institutions and the economic progress of these three key nations of southern Europe.

"It is generally acknowledged," M. Guy de Jonquieres commented this winter in a special section on Europe in *The Financial Times* of London, "that the Community which has done so much to foster an image as a bulwark of political stability, democratic principles, respect for human rights and rule of law, has a compelling obligation to respond positively to approaches by three neighbouring countries which have only recently emerged from dictatorial rule."

The past month another major step was undertaken by the members of the EEC, with the exception of Britain, to establish the foundation for a common monetary system throughout Western Europe. Introduced by Chancellor Helmut Schmidt and President Giscard d'Estaing this past July at the Bremen summit, the EMS will tie all Western European currencies together so as to create a common exchange rate, a reserve asset, and credit facilities for the participating member nations.

The European Currency Unit (ecu) is the basis for this innovative monetary system transcending national monetary

interests. It is important to note the ecu is a real currency although at first only central banks will have use of it.

David Shears recently wrote in *London's Daily Telegraph*:

Describing the thinking behind the EMS, jointly promoted by West Germany and France, Herr Schmidt recalled that when the Rome Treaty setting up the Common Market was signed in 1957 'we assumed fixed exchange.' But since then each member country had pursued different economic, fiscal and monetary policies. For more than five years European currencies had been separated. It was as if each of the 11 German Federal States had its own money, constantly shifting in value against the others.

The EMS is off to a smooth start since commencing operation this past March and has posed thus far no serious difficulties for the foreign exchange operators. If the EMS continues to meet success it will strengthen the Community, so that the serious challenges which will arise with the future integration of Spain, Portugal, and Greece can be met with equal success.

Moreover, Chancellor Schmidt and President Giscard expressed the belief this past December that the primary objective of an international monetary policy should be to harness world inflation and to encourage stable conditions for the growth of world trade. Thus they expect the linking of Europe's currencies together in an EMS will enable the EEC as a block to attack more effectively both inflation and the other challenges to a sound financial world order.

A strong, growing Europe—economically, as well as politically—can only serve as an asset to our interests abroad and here at home. Secretary Blumenthal and Secretary Vance are to be applauded for their joint statement this past December asserting the EMS "will contribute to sustainable growth in the world economy and a stable international monetary system." Moreover, increased monetary cooperation within the EEC "is an important step toward the economic integration of Europe, which we have long supported."

Complementing this dramatic economic change in Western Europe is the introduction of a fourth level of politics, as Karl Kaiser has suggested in a recent editorial. Beyond the municipal, provincial and national elections, there now will be elections this June to an all-European Parliament centered in Brussels.

For the first time all the nations of Western Europe, including Spain, Portugal, and Greece, are in democratic hands. The first democratic election of 410 representatives by Europe's 180 million voters to the new Parliament will not only underscore but hopefully strengthen this unprecedented trend within each of the member nations.

Behind this forward step in the movement for European unity was Jean Monnet, a man of rare dedication and vision. During his 90 years M. Monnet championed the cause for European unity with foresight and endless patience. M. Monnet pointed out the European Community "is the only way to ensure independence and progress for our peoples and peace in this part of the world."

Hopefully, the European Parliament

will fulfill M. Monnet's aspirations for a dynamic community. Although the Parliament will have to set a new tone for relations with the already powerful Council of Ministers and the Commission in Brussels, there is promise this can be accomplished to the benefit of the Community.

Dr. Owen has observed:

If it is to become a real Parliament it must be able to reflect the clash of national interests as well as the aspirations of a developing European identity. And it is essential that the Assembly work with the Council to improve the Community rather than setting itself up as a rival.

Thus, if the "new Euro-MPs include a number of distinguished elder statesmen as well as some promising newcomers to the political scene," Malcolm Rutherford of *The Financial Times* predicts debate of issues could reach a new level of interest and a new sphere of influence would be introduced to the politics of the Community and home governments.

These thoughts on the European Parliament are explored further in an article in *The New York Times* by the distinguished political scientist, Karl Kaiser. As Mr. Kaiser points out:

The first democratic elections to a West European Parliament in the Continent's history provides an opportunity to express the inherent bonds between democracies on both sides of the Atlantic and to establish a working partnership between the two parliaments representing the two largest democratic voting populations in the West.

Mr. President, I ask that Mr. Kaiser's thoughtful article be printed in the *Record*.

The article referred to follows:

[From the *New York Times*, Feb. 28, 1979]

## EUROPE'S PARLIAMENT

(By Karl Kaiser)

BONN.—Few of those who promoted the idea of direct elections to the European Parliament could foresee the developments set off by such a decision. Long before the 180 million voters cast their votes in June, this decision has already profoundly affected politics in Western Europe and unleashed processes with dynamics of their own. Three areas are particularly noteworthy.

1. The preparations for the elections are changing the substance and structure of national politics in Europe.

European themes have dramatically increased in importance in the party politics of all states of the European Community. Debates on election programs, political strategies and the selection of candidates keep parties busy down to the local level. The subject of Europe, in the past sometimes left to the foreign-policy elites, has become more than ever a part of domestic politics.

In some countries, the powers of the future Parliament are the subject of deep divisions, notably in France where the issue unites (not for the first time) parts of the Gaullists and Communists in a bizarre nationalist alliance. In most countries, if one can believe polls, the election outcome is likely to change the balance of forces among parties and to affect their domestic political structures. It appears that Communists in Italy, and Gaullists and Communists in France, will lose, while Socialists and Social Democrats in France and West Germany are likely to gain.

The elections will create a new, fourth level of political expression beyond local, state and national votes. Though parties will also use the European elections in terms of

S 4396

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD—SENATE

April 10, 1979

domestic politics, the process inevitably focuses principally on Europe. For most people, voting will be their first concrete act as European citizens. The community and the idea of European will gain a new legitimacy.

2. The preparation of direct elections is creating new trans-national political links in Europe.

Political parties have formed federations and alliances across national boundaries: democratic socialists, liberals, Christian Democrats and conservatives. They have worked out election programs and are attempting to conduct a trans-national election strategy. The beginnings of a political infrastructure, comparable to a national party system, are being built at the European level.

3. The direct elections are giving European politics a new focus.

When Social Democrats and conservatives in several countries compete for voters in terms of conflicting conceptions of the future Europe, they politicize the integration process. In the raising of issues of unemployment, economic order or foreign policy, the overdue departure from a much too technocratic Europe has begun.

Party elites are beginning to focus their career on Europe. By sending their staunchest opponents of a supranational Europe into the Parliament, Gaullists or the British Labor Party are preparing the ground for major conflicts in the future. But in doing so, the battles on supranationality and basic political issues will be fought within the Parliament, thus inevitably enhancing its standing.

Since Jean Monnet relaunched European integration after the defeat of the European Defense Community in 1954, Europe has not experienced such a feeling of a new departure.

Does this mean that the European Parliament will have more jurisdictions? Not necessarily! Formidable obstacles will stand in the way of a change of jurisdiction, above all the European Community treaty, which can be changed only with the consent of all states.

But 410 personalities with a direct mandate from Europe's population, comprising major figures like the Gaullist leader Jacques Chirac (an opponent of more jurisdictions) or the former West German Chancellor Willy Brandt are joining the Parliament for a serious purpose: to influence politics. The Parliament will, therefore, become a new focus for Europe's political life.

In any case, the question of formal jurisdiction may not be relevant at the beginning. The national parliaments, bogged down in technocratic details, need not be a relevant model. The European Parliament may well find a new and relevant role: It can fill a vacuum by raising and debating the fundamental issues of European politics—for example human rights, social protection, redistribution of regional wealth and Europe's place in the world. Its contribution to European politics would thus be profound.

It is to be hoped that the United States Congress will acknowledge the election as the great event that it is. The first democratic elections to a West European Parliament in the Continent's history provide an opportunity to express the inherent bonds between democracies on both sides of the Atlantic and to establish a working partnership between two parliaments representing the two largest democratic voting populations in the West. ●

#### THE NEED FOR AN EXPANDED PUBLIC AWARENESS OF AMERICA'S DEFENSE NEEDS

● Mr. GOLDWATER. Mr. President, the need for an expanded public awareness of America's defense needs has never

been more important than it is today. We are confronted by a steadily increasing Soviet military capacity and unless we understand precisely how this can affect this Nation's strategic interests, we are liable to pay a very costly price. I emphasized my very great concern over the need for greater public awareness of our defense needs in a speech before the New York Chapter of the Association of the U.S. Army.

Mr. President, because I believe it is of increasing importance, I ask that the text of my speech be printed in the RECORD.

The speech follows:

REMARKS BY SENATOR BARRY GOLDWATER

It is a special pleasure for me to be with you tonight. I welcome this opportunity to share with this dedicated group of Americans some thoughts on the national defense issues facing our country today.

This New York Chapter of A.U.S.A. is an influential one, and can play a major role in assuring that our nation achieves an adequate defense. The Association enjoys a fine reputation as a broad-gauged patriotic organization with the best interests of the nation at heart. A.U.S.A.'s factual, professional approach to the task of enhancing national security is well known. Their articles and white papers are of great value to me as a legislator.

The need to foster a public awareness of America's defense requirements has never been greater than it is today.

My thoughts tonight on our nation's security touch on a simple lesson from the past, some concerns about the present, and the challenges of the future.

The month of May will mark the seventh anniversary of the signing of the first U.S.-Soviet agreement on limiting strategic arms—SALT I. As my colleagues and I make ready to review the second SALT agreement, I am reminded of a period between the World Wars which offers a disturbing parallel to events today.

In 1932, with the bitter memory of war still vivid in the minds of its leaders, Great Britain entered the disarmament conference in Geneva with the hope of achieving lasting security through international arms control. In Berlin, Hitler quietly moved forward with a rearmament program designed for world conquest. German military strength grew steadily during the three years the Geneva negotiations lasted. The conference ended, as it had begun, without any positive result.

Though it boasted of a tough and realistic world view, the British government in the thirties was transfixed by the promise of a permanent peace engineered through arms reductions and diplomacy. National leaders of the time, who spoke earnestly of their resolve never to accept military inferiority, steadfastly refused to recognize the alarming rise in German military strength and their own weaknesses.

Prime Minister Baldwin addressed the House of Commons in July 1934 with these brave but empty words:

"It is not the case that Germany is rapidly approaching equality with us. All I would say is that His Majesty's government is determined in no condition to accept any position of inferiority with regard to whatever air force may be raised in Germany in the future."

There is a familiar ring to the censure motion brought in 1934 by the labor and opposition liberals on the occasion of a proposed five year spending program to modestly upgrade the Royal Air Force. The arms control advocates regretted that: "His Majesty's government should enter on a policy of rearmament . . . certain to jeopardize the prospects of international disarmament and to en-

courage a revival of a dangerous and wasteful competition. . . ." We hear similar words today in our land.

Germany's military strength grew unabated through 1938, allowing Hitler to move that year against Czechoslovakia. The outcome of Prime Minister Neville Chamberlain's Autumn Journey to Munich to decide Czechoslovakia's fate—to secure peace through appeasement—is history.

A few days after the Munich meeting—and with a new world war but a few months ahead—it remained for Chamberlain to explain to the House of Commons this simple truth: "Our past experience has shown us only too clearly that weakness in armed strength means weakness in diplomacy."

For those who would negotiate future limitations on arms from a posture of military inferiority, the lesson of four decades ago is clear.

With the signing of the new SALT accord now surfacing, I am struck by the recent declines in U.S. conventional arms capabilities that have occurred in a period of limitations on our strategic arms under SALT I.

Manning for our active forces has declined overall more than 10 percent since 1972. The Army Reserve and National Guard stand almost 15 percent below 1972 levels, and General Bernie Rogers warns that our ready reserves have fallen to more than half a million short of prudent requirements.

I count President Carter's decision in 1977 killing the B-1 bomber as not only a blow to the nation's strategic force but also as a major loss in future conventional might. The aging B-52 bomber proved the enormous non-nuclear capability of the manned bomber in Southeast Asia, a capability that must not be lost with the eventual passing of the B-52. In strategic capable aircraft, the Soviets now outnumber ours.

The fall in active Navy ships from 650 in 1972 to 450 today marks a dangerous change in this country's ability to secure the sea lanes so vital to our economic well-being.

The men and women who serve the country so courageously today—the keystone of our national security—have felt the squeeze, too. Outlays per person for pay, benefits, and bonuses have fallen in purchasing power by almost 10 percent since 1974. Further declines threaten to do great harm to the morale of the military.

These are disquieting indicators of our declining military posture. And one cannot help but be struck by a corresponding drift in the course of American foreign policy—from Angola to Africa's horn, then up to Iran and Afghanistan, and across to Taiwan. Indecision, question, retreat and weakness have replaced the firmness of our history.

Of course, not all is bleak today. I must say that I am encouraged by the Administration's commitment to finally reverse the downward trend in real defense spending—however modest the upturn. And, I remain confident that our land, air and sea forces can be prepared to execute the missions around the globe for which they are presently trained but partially equipped.

As for the future, I believe that Chamberlain's dictum presents a truly formidable challenge to those to whom America's security is entrusted. In the closing years of this decade, we are seeing signs that the global environments in the 1980's will be quite different than anything we as a nation have faced before.

The foremost challenge to our military/civilian leaders will be to organize, train and equip U.S. forces for an ever-broadening array of contingencies. I venture to say that rapid deployments of ground and air forces for limited engagements—to achieve limited objectives—will represent an increasingly crucial challenge.

As we undertake to adjust the size and composition of our forces for the coming decade, I would urge that critical attention