

# Ronald Reagan Presidential Library Digital Library Collections

---

This is a PDF of a folder from our textual collections.

---

**Collection:** Public Affairs, Office of: Records  
**Folder Title:** Kissinger Commission (1 of 2)  
**Box:** OA 9011

---

To see more digitized collections visit:

<https://www.reaganlibrary.gov/archives/digitized-textual-material>

To see all Ronald Reagan Presidential Library Inventories, visit:

<https://www.reaganlibrary.gov/archives/white-house-inventories>

Contact a reference archivist at: [reagan.library@nara.gov](mailto:reagan.library@nara.gov)

Citation Guidelines: <https://reaganlibrary.gov/archives/research-support/citation-guide>

National Archives Catalogue: <https://catalog.archives.gov/>

*Last Updated: 07/12/2023*

THE WHITE HOUSE  
Library and Research Center  
and Law Library

7/19/83

TO: MIKE

FROM: HELEN AMMEN <sup>H/A</sup>  
Director

Kissinger

FYI: press reaction to the  
President's speech yesterday  
and Kissinger's new role.

(Also sent to Gergen and Sims.)

Mike G —  
Thought you'd  
like a little  
light reading!  
J.

# The Kissinger Commmission

By selecting Henry A. Kissinger to head a bipartisan commission on U.S. policy in Central America, President Reagan has piled controversy atop controversy. It is a strange choice, a gambler's plunge that could parlay Mr. Kissinger's prestige into the forging of a national consensus or could forfeit one of the administration's few big chances to gain support for what remains an unpopular venture threatening U.S. military involvement.

Like most things about the former secretary of state, Mr. Kissinger's negatives for this new posting are out-sized and imposing. He is regarded throughout Latin America as the architect of the 1973 overthrow of Salvador Allende, the Marxist president of Chile. He is detested by the extreme right wing in this country, which succeeded with Mr. Reagan's blessing in using the 1976 Republican National Platform to condemn his stewardship. He is loathed by human rights advocates on the left and lately is the target of a savage book that depicts him as a master of deceit.

Against these negatives, Mr. Kissinger brings powerful positives — not least his reputation as perhaps the consummate practitioner of the diplomatic art in this era. He brings to the leadership of this important commission a commanding view of world affairs and a personal clout that neither the president nor the country can ignore. Perhaps, after all these years, Latin America will get the priority it warrants.

The bipartisan commission approach has been

used twice before by the administration to reach consensus on Social Security reform and strategic arms development. In both these instances, the president turned to conciliatory figures, Alan Greenspan and Brent Scowcroft. Mr. Kissinger, conversely, is a contentious man whose "Lone Ranger" reputation makes him suspect as leader of a team operation.

Names under consideration for the Kissinger Commission suggest the group will be oriented more to domestic considerations than to Latin sensitivities. This is not unreasonable. In recent weeks the White House has named former Senator Richard B. Stone as a peripatetic envoy and Langhorne Motley, former ambassador to Brazil, to head Inter-American affairs at the State Department. Where the administration has been hurting is in its relations with a Congress that has been niggardly in appropriations and skeptical about U.S. maneuvers in El Salvador and Nicaragua. President Reagan eagerly seized upon congressional proposals for a bipartisan commission charged with coming up with the Latin American equivalent of a 50-year Marshall Plan.

This is a worthy goal that could generate national support. But given the controversial nature of the Kissinger appointment, the bipartisan commission will have to overcome suspicions that its purpose is really to buttress the administration's short-term political-military strategy rather than any long-term economic attack on Latin poverty.

# Kissinger to run Latin commission

From Wire and Staff Reports

Hollywood, Fla. — President Reagan yesterday named former Secretary of State Henry A. Kissinger to head a commission to draw up a bipartisan policy for strengthening Central America against what Mr. Reagan sees as Communist threats.

The president thus seized upon an idea promoted for weeks by key Democratic and Republican members of

*Furgurson says Reagan adroitly takes bipartisan route.....A3*

Congress. In Mr. Kissinger, he has a controversial but prestigious outsider — one not always welcomed at the Reagan door — whose turbulent years in power produced several dramatic turns in official U.S. policy around the globe.

A senior administration official said Mr. Reagan would soon name eight other members of the commission, in addition to Mr. Kissinger, and that Republican and Democratic leaders would appoint "senior consultants" to the study group.

White House sources said that among those expected to serve on the commission were Terence Cardinal Cooke of New York, Lane Kirkland, president of the AFL-CIO, and Robert S. Strauss, influential Democrat and former Carter administration troubleshooter.

Other possible members included Nicholas Brady, former Republican senator from New Jersey; former Supreme Court Justice Arthur J. Goldberg or Potter Stewart; Thomas A. Murphy, chairman of General Motors, or Reginald Jones, chairman of General Electric; John R. Silber, president of Boston University, and Carlos F. Diaz-Alejandro, professor of economics at Yale.

The final list is expected to be announced later this week.

Mr. Reagan made clear in an address to the International Longshoremen's Association that while he awaits recommendations of the new commission by December 1, he will not yield on his own embattled program for Central America, including \$362 million in military and economic aid for El Salvador this year alone.

He did promise "a truly bipartisan approach," but said "without the necessary funds, there's no way for us to prevent the light of freedom from being extinguished in Central America."

He called Mr. Kissinger "a very distinguished American, outstanding in the field of diplomacy — virtually a legend in that field."

Mr. Kissinger was reported by his office to be traveling yesterday. He could not be reached for comment.

The president, who must certify to Congress by the end of the month that El Salvador is improving its human rights record if U.S. aid is to continue, told the dockworkers "we realize the human rights progress in El Salvador is not all we would like it to be. The killing must stop."

"But you have to realize much of the violence there — whether from

the extreme right or left — is beyond the control of the government," he said. "El Salvador is moving in the right direction. Its elected government is committed to further improvement. They need and deserve our help."

The president's decision to create the commission, and make Mr. Kissinger the chairman, is but his latest effort to rally public support by bringing fresh personnel, including Democrats, into the policy-setting process.

Last month, former Florida Democratic Senator Richard B. Stone became special envoy to Central America, with a mandate for promoting peace in the region. Mr. Stone has attempted to open a U.S. dialogue with leftist insurgents in El Salvador, but so far has come up empty-handed.

Deputy White House press secretary Larry Speakes said Mr. Stone, who testified to a closed-door session of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee yesterday, would continue to serve independently of the new panel and "will be returning to the region sometime in the near future."

Appealing for the dockworkers' support, the president said "we cannot afford the luxury of turning away from our neighbors' struggles as if they didn't matter. If we do turn away, we will pay a terrible price for our neglect."

By turning to a bipartisan commission, the president was following the advice of Senator Henry M. Jackson (D, Wash.), Senator Charles McC. Mathias, Jr. (R, Md.), Representative Michael D. Barnes (D, Md., 8th) and Representative Jack F. Kemp (R, N.Y.).

Mr. Reagan was also following a path that has helped him resolve partisan problems over Social Security financing and the MX missile. In

those cases, commissions made up of Democrats and Republicans came up with recommendations that he followed after his own proposals met strong opposition.

Mr. Reagan said the panel would focus on "what we must do in the years ahead to meet the underlying problems of the region."

Congressional advocates see the commission as one that would develop a "Marshall Plan" for U.S. aid to Central American countries. The Marshall Plan, named for Gen. George C. Marshall, was a \$12 billion effort that helped rebuild Europe after World War II.

The two primary Senate sponsors put no dollar figure on the idea, but said the commission should have a hand in preparing a policy that the United States could follow for up to 50 years.

Mr. Reagan was said to have offered the job to Mr. Kissinger via telephone Sunday night. The former secretary accepted on the spot, White House officials said.

Mr. Reagan, the first president to address the longshoremen's convention, said "some people . . . say poverty and violence and repression in Central America are just the way of life, that democracy can't work. I say baloney — and I think we'd all say something stronger down on the docks."

Of the \$392 million that Mr. Reagan is seeking for El Salvador this year, he wants \$136 million for military purposes. So far, Congress has approved \$56 million.

"We must not allow totalitarian communism to win by default," the president said. "But we cannot succeed unless the Congress approves the necessary resources."



# Kissinger's high-profile return draws criticism right and left

By Gilbert A. Lewthwaite  
Washington Bureau of The Sun

Washington — The high-profile return of Henry A. Kissinger to diplomatic activity produced sharp criticism from both the political left and right yesterday, immediately making the veteran diplomat the center of new controversy.

The left was incensed over Mr. Kissinger's selection because of his alleged involvement in the overthrow of Chilean Marxist President Salvador Allende in 1973, and what it called his lack of insight into Central American affairs.

The right voiced its constant criticism of Mr. Kissinger as an accommodator willing to make concessions to the Kremlin, who was likely to put his own stamp on U.S. policy in the area, which conservatives believe presents a military, not an economic or political, problem.

Between the two extremes, other experts felt that Mr. Kissinger's personal prestige and independent operating style would enhance his chances of producing a consensus approach to the Central American crisis.

Senator Charles McC. Mathias, Jr. (R. Md.), a member of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, said: "Henry Kissinger doesn't have to make his name. He is already in the history books. He can be independent and objective, and I hope that he will. He doesn't have to toe the line for any particular administration point of view."

Mr. Mathias credited Mr. Reagan with putting the appointment of the commission in "proper perspective" by emphasizing its search for a long-term solution to the area's problems.

"I think you have to devise a program that the people of the area will accept and that the people of this country will sustain. One of the problems with Central American is that

North America has been off again, on again," he said.

Senator Paul S. Sarbanes (D, Md.) said bluntly: "I think the appointment is a mistake. Henry Kissinger doesn't have the confidence of a broad segment of the public in this country or abroad to give credibility to the commission.

Mr. Sarbanes, who is a member of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, said there were "serious and legitimate questions" about Mr. Kissinger's past policies and tactics, and added: "The commission should have had a chairman who doesn't bring those serious questions with him, and who commands broad confidence. . . . I don't understand why they made an appointment of this sort, but I don't understand a lot of what the Reagan administration does."

Representative Clarence D. Long (D, Md., 2d.), chairman of the key House appropriations subcommittee controlling foreign aid, said: "I hope it is only a trial balloon, and as far as I'm concerned I'd like to see it shot down."

Blaming Mr. Kissinger for widening the U.S. role in Southeast Asia

during the Vietnam war, he said: "I think he has done a great deal of mischief over the years. . . . He is a thoroughly disingenuous person."

Representative Michael D. Barnes (D, Md., 8th), chairman of the House subcommittee on hemispheric affairs, said: "The Latins will regard this as a very strange choice of the man best known as the architect of the overthrow of Allende."

Equally strong criticism came from liberal activist groups.

Laurence Birns, director of the labor-backed Council on Hemispheric Affairs, said: "The Kissinger appointment is vintage Reagan. It again reflects a White House tactic of selecting illogical, if not tainted, candidates to perform crucial tasks.

"Rather than seeking a universally respected figure, such as former Secretary of State Cyrus Vance, to head this effort, the president instead has chosen one of the most controversial figures in American public life, a man distrusted by much of the North American population and loathed by many throughout Latin America. He is the wrong man for the job."

# Reagan may co-opt foes as well as issues

By Ernest B. Furgurson

Chief of The Sun's Washington Bureau

Washington — Even before Mr. Reagan formally announced that Henry Kissinger would head a bipartisan presidential commission to study Central American policy, the Kissingerphobes of the "New Right" announced a press conference to denounce the whole idea as a threat to the Republic.

But their complaints about the former secretary of state, echoing Mr. Reagan's own complaints about him only an election or two ago, were so predictable as to be non-news.

What concerned less ideological politicians was not the personalities involved, but the process. What will it mean to partisan politics if the president keeps turning over his hardest problems to bipartisan commissions?

Suspicious Democrats might fear Mr. Reagan is trying to take the heat out of their best 1984 issues by involving the opposition party in these blue-ribbon efforts toward solutions. The Democrats cannot complain very convincingly about policy in Central America if they have helped devise it; on the contrary, they will have to share the blame for whatever happens.

There are even signs that the president is so canny as to co-opt both the issue and some of the practical politicians who would normally detect such a ploy and stay more than an arm's length away.

Of this breed, there is none more practical than Robert Strauss, who in the past 15 years has been almost everything except a Republican. And where is Bob Strauss on this question? Not on the sidelines commenting on this bipartisan commission, but in the middle of it — a commission member himself.

Yesterday he was telling reporters about a series of Democratic issues forums to be organized by himself and Gillis Long, who heads the party's caucus in the House. And he was tossing out fighting advice to any Democrat who intends to run soon.

"Too often we're not partisan enough," he declared, urging his comrades to put the party label in big letters on their billboards. "Don't hide from the past, brag about it. . . . When we fail to do

## U.S.A.

### BIPARTISAN POLITICS

that, we let the Republicans set the agenda."

But then in the next sentence, he changed his tune when he conceded he had had a conversation about being a member of Mr. Reagan's bipartisan commission on Central America. "Bipartisan commissions can make things more difficult" when the campaign comes, he conceded, "or they can prevent the out party from being in an obstructionist role. . . . If the Democrats were obstructionists for cheap political reasons, that would be worse."

He was asked where he would draw the line if Mr. Reagan tried to use the same technique to bring Democrats on board on other potential campaign issues, such as the economy.

"I would serve on a bipartisan commission to deal with any major national issue," Mr. Strauss insisted. "Refusing only puts you in a bad light politically. It's better to show a sense of responsibility" than to turn away from those problems, he said.

Thus he made clear that he knows the difference between being bipartisan and being apolitical. The old saying that politics stops at the water's edge has never been quite accurate in U.S. history, but it always sounds good. And Mr. Strauss suggested that in the past, when the Democrats have tried to base a campaign on "high-flown, foreign policy issues" the Republicans win.

He cited some examples of how the bipartisan approach had solved, or at least offered solutions for, problems freighted with partisan potential — most recently, the Social Security and MX commissions used by Mr. Reagan.

There are plenty of other examples in recent history, but typically those commissions are appointed as substitutes for action, a way of putting problems way back behind the back burner.

In Jimmy Carter's administration alone, there were presidential commissions on mental health, balanced growth, neighborhoods, military compen-

sation, air quality, minimum wages, antitrust laws, pension policy, world hunger, coal, refugees, Three Mile Island and an agenda for the Eighties.

Who, except the special interest groups in each case, remembers now what those commissions recommended? Yet bipartisan commissions thrive, at least partly because the very words have the ring of statesmanship.

Mr. Reagan has developed the habit of asking for bipartisanship every time he wants something from Congress. Coming in the midst of politically loaded speeches and press conferences, those appeals have not moved many Democrats. But as Mr. Strauss's response on Central America demonstrates, to be asked to serve on a bipartisan commission is a different proposition.

Felix Rohatyn, the New York investment banker, is one of the few who can argue from firsthand experience that such commissions are the way to get important things done, not just postpone them. This Democrat brought government, business and labor together to solve New York City's fiscal crisis. Looking at the nation's economic problems since then, he maintains that bipartisanship is needed to solve them.

In fact, he was asking not long ago, since his Municipal Assistance Corporation, the Social Security commission and the MX commission all worked, why not try the same approach in government itself?

"Our problems have reached the magnitude where no one party can solve them," he said. "Eventually, we'll have to go to a government of national unity, a bipartisan government, whether Republicans or Democrats are in the White House.

"Everybody," he emphasized, "is going to have to share the price we pay for past mistakes, and share it for four to eight years. Then we can go back to partisan politics."

That kind of talk may not be intended to, but it should delight Ronald Reagan as he repeats the performance of political nimbleness that preceded his second-term election in California. The more he can blur party responsibility for whatever is wrong, the better his prospects.

And the madder he makes his recent comrades of the remote right-wing, the more reasonable and moderate — and bipartisan — he will seem.

# Kissinger named to head panel on Central America

By Storer Rowley  
Chicago Tribune

**HOLLYWOOD, Fla.**—President Reagan chose former Secretary of State Henry Kissinger Monday to head a nine-member blue-ribbon bipartisan commission to help formulate a long-range Central America policy that would be acceptable to a reluctant Congress.

Reagan called on Americans to join him in "an effort to keep the light of liberty alive in Central America," and he said his panel of experts would be led by "a distinguished American outstanding in the field of diplomacy, virtually a legend in that field."

The presidential commission will be the third such panel Reagan has turned to in order to break a deadlock with Congress. He appointed similar panels to work out compromises on Social Security and the MX missile.

This commission, he said, would "lay the foundation for a long-term, unified national approach to the freedom and independence of the countries of Central America."

Senior administration officials traveling with Reagan here said Kissinger's role as chairman was finalized in a phone call Sunday evening with Reagan following discussions over the last few days between Kissinger and the White House staff.

**SEEKING TO SHORE up support for his embattled policies in the region, Reagan called on Congress to "bear its share of responsibility" to keep Central America secure from communist subversion armed by Cuba and the Soviet Union and launched from Nicaragua.**

"This is the first real communist aggression on the American mainland," the President told a subdued audience at the 46th quadrennial convention of the International Longshoremen's Association meeting here. "We must never forget that here in the Western Hemisphere we are Americans from pole to pole."

In one of his strongest appeals to date, Reagan warned, "There is a war in Central America that is being fueled by the Soviets and the Cubans." However, he insisted that the administration's emphasis there is on "economic and social progress, not on a purely

military solution."

Administration officials said the new commission would consist of representatives of government, business, labor, education, religion and Hispanics. In addition to its nine members, consultants would also be appointed by members of Congress.

**WHITE HOUSE spokesman Larry Speakes** said their functions would be to "study the nature of U.S. interests in Central America and the threat now posed to those interests."

The commission will report to Reagan Dec. 1 unless its mandate is expanded.

Kissinger, 60, was President Richard Nixon's powerful national security adviser.

His "shuttle diplomacy" has been credited with laying the groundwork for major breakthroughs in the Middle East and China. He was secretary of state from 1973 through 1976 and has not held government office since the end of the Ford administration.

Reagan defended El Salvador's U.S.-backed government despite its slow progress on human rights and claimed much of the violence there is beyond control of the government. "They need and deserve our help," he said.

The President also denounced the Sandinista government of Nicaragua for "abusing its own people and its neighbors." He accused Nicaragua's leaders of reneging on their promises to bring freedom and democracy after their revolution toppled dictator Anastasio Somoza in 1979.

"**ALL THEY'VE DONE** is replace the former dictatorship with their own," Reagan said, "a dictatorship of counterfeit revolutionaries who wear fatigues and drive around in Mercedes and Soviet tanks, and whose current promise is to spread their brand of revolution throughout Central America."

Reagan's request for an additional \$110 million in military aid to help the struggling government of El Salvador ward off attacks from Nicaraguan-backed leftist guerrillas has stalled in Congress.

Reagan credited the idea for this commission to Senators Henry Jackson [D., Wash.] and Charles Mathias [R., Md.], who have called for such a panel to break a stalemate over policy in the region and build a united concern for the issues.

"We all know Central America suffers from decades of poverty, social deprivation and political instability [which] are now being exploited by the enemies of freedom," the President told 700 delegates and 300 guests of the longshoremen's association.

He also promoted his Caribbean Basin initiative for trade and economic growth in the region and emphasized his support for the Contadora nations' proposal for a multinational approach to peace there.

Presidents Miguel de la Madrid of Mexico, Belisario Betancur of Colombia, Luis Herrera Campins of Venezuela and Ricardo de la Espriella of Panama—four of the so-called "Contadora" nations—issued a communique Sunday after a weekend meeting in Cancun, Mexico, appealing to Reagan and Cuban President Fidel Castro to help avert war in central America.



# Time and votes at stake in Kissinger pick

## New Central America panel in race with events, politics

By Daniel Southerland

Staff correspondent of The Christian Science Monitor

Washington

President Reagan's use of bipartisan commissions is widely viewed in Washington as among the most effective tactics he has used.

But bipartisan commission No. 3, on Central America, may make the task of the earlier two — which dealt with social security and US strategic forces — look like child's play.

President Reagan announced Monday that he was appointing former Secretary of State Henry A. Kissinger to head a new special commission on the problems of Central America. The President is expected to name other members to the bipartisan panel shortly.

The main target of such commissions is the Congress, and the first two commissions went a long way toward building a bipartisan consensus there on difficult major issues. President Reagan's hope apparently is that by appointing a new commission to deal with Central America, he will not only obtain proposals for long-range solutions to the region's underlying problems, but he will also buy time and votes for his short-range aid proposals for Central America.

But events are moving so swiftly in both Central America and in the Congress that it is unclear whether the President's new panel will be able to catch up in time and stay ahead. Dr. Kissinger's appointment comes at a critical time:

- The Congress is trying to decide this week whether to cut off funds to CIA-backed guerrillas fighting against the Sandinista-led regime in Nicaragua.

- The State Department said recently that military supplies reaching Nicaragua from East-bloc nations had been arriving at a rate higher than that of last year. In a speech on Central America to the International Longshoremen's Association in Hollywood, Fla., on Monday, President Reagan said, without elaboration, that "more Cuban soldiers" have



arrived in Nicaragua.

- In Honduras, guerrilla leaders have announced that they plan to strike deeper inside Nicaragua. One of the directors of the CIA-supported Nicaraguan Democratic Forces said the aim was to start urban insurrections in Nicaragua and have some offensive actions coincide with the fourth anniversary on Tuesday of the Sandinistas' coming to power.

- Apparently because of fears that the fighting could spread and produce a war between Nicaragua and Honduras, four Latin American presidents hastily convened a meeting in Cancun, Mexico, on Sunday. The presidents of Mexico, Venezuela, Colombia, and Panama — the so-called Contadora group — repeated their earlier calls for dialogue to resolve conflicts and urged a halt to militarization of the region as well as an end to foreign intervention.

In his Florida speech, President Reagan said the new Kissinger-led commission will make recommendations to him later this year on what the United States must do to deal with the underlying problems in the region.

The commission idea has been under discussion for some time now in the Congress. Sens. Charles McC. Mathias Jr., a Republican from Maryland, and Henry M. Jackson, a Democrat from Washington, two men of decidedly different approaches to many foreign policy issues, introduced a resolution calling for such a commission a few weeks ago. It has already gathered more than 30 cosponsors.

But congressmen were withholding comment on Kissinger's appointment until they could see who other members of the commission would be. In private comments, some Democratic as well as Republican liberals were skeptical about the appointment, because the former secretary of state is, in their view, a controversial figure who might polarize opinions rather than bring them closer together.

But within President Reagan's ideological spectrum, a move toward Kissinger is a move away from the political right and toward the center. In earlier times, Reagan had criticized Kissinger's role in the Panama Canal negotiations, arguing that he had engineered a "giveaway." He had also criticized SALT negotiations which Kissinger engaged in as leading to flawed strategic arms agreements. But once Reagan was elected, his administration was quick to call on Kissinger for advice concerning the Middle East and later concerning plans for deployment of the MX missile.

One administration official said that the Kissinger appointment was a safe one for the President, because he could be sure that any panel headed by Kissinger would not recommend a lessening of US involvement in or aid to Central America. Kissinger has in recent years recommended vigorous action to counter Soviet and Cuban influence worldwide.

"I think it's a move toward building up support in the center of the political spectrum for the continuation and perhaps the intensification of the Reagan approach to Central America," said I. M. Destler, a scholar who has written frequently on executive-congressional relations.

An administration official added that it was hoped that the new commission will "offer a way out" for congressmen who are unsure which is the right course in Central America.

Some of those sponsoring the commission idea say the use of the term Marshall Plan to describe it was meant to capture the nation's imagination and show that the commission's recommendation will be for a long-term commitment. But few experts believe that Central America could absorb aid on the original Marshall plan scale, or that the US public would support such a massive commitment of resources.



# Excerpts From the President's Speech

to Longshoremen on Central America

**HOLLYWOOD, Fla. July 18 (AP)**— Following are excerpts from a transcript of President Reagan's speech today to the International Longshoremen's Association, as recorded by the White House:

Our democracy encompasses many freedoms — of speech, of religion, of assembly and of so many other liberties we often take for granted. These are rights that should be shared by all mankind.

This union has always patriotically stood up for these freedoms. That's why I want to talk to you today about freedom not in the United States but in a part of the world very close and very important to us — Central America.

We all know Central America suffers from decades of poverty, social deprivation and political instability.

And because these problems weren't dealt with positively, they are now being exploited by the enemies of freedom.

We cannot afford the luxury of turning away from our neighbors' struggles as if they didn't matter. If we do turn away, we will pay a terrible price for our neglect.

In April I reported to the Congress that the problems in Central America have the potential to affect our national security.

This is still the case and I want to reinforce it.

Many of our citizens don't fully understand the seriousness of the situation, so let me put it bluntly:

¶ There is a war in Central America that is being fueled by the Soviets and the Cubans.

¶ They are arming, training, supplying and encouraging a war to subjugate another nation to Communism — that nation is El Salvador.

¶ The Soviets and the Cubans are operating from a base called Nicaragua.

## Why the Region Matters

This is the first real Communist aggression on the American mainland. We tend to forget sometimes that here in the Western Hemisphere we are Americans from pole to pole. This Florida community where we meet today is closer to Nicaragua than it is to Washington, D.C. Two-thirds of our foreign trade and nearly half of our petroleum pass through the Caribbean.

It's well to remember that in early 1942, a handful of Hitler's submarines sank more tonnage in that area than in all of the Atlantic. And they did this without a single naval base anywhere nearby. Today, Cuba is home to a Soviet combat brigade, a submarine base capable of servicing Soviet subs and military air bases visited regularly by Soviet military aircraft.

If the Nazis during World War II and the Soviets today have recognized that the Caribbean and Central America is vital to our interests, isn't it about time we did, too?

Some people throw up their hands and say there's not much we can do down there. They say poverty and violence and repression in Central America are just the way of life, that democracy can't work.

I say baloney — and I think we'd all say something stronger down on the docks.

## Democracy Can Work

Costa Rica is as strong a democracy as you will find anywhere, with a long history of peace, free elections, and stability. They don't even have an army. If democracy can work in Costa Rica and Honduras, it can work in El Salvador and Nicaragua and Guatemala.

There is still time for the peoples of Latin America to build a prosperous,

peaceful and free future. And we have an obligation to help them — for our own sake as well as theirs.

People throughout Latin America are waiting to see if Republicans and Democrats in this country can work together to make the United States what it should be: A loyal friend and reliable defender of democracy and human decency.

I believe we must exercise that leadership. And the time is now.

Since I spoke to the Congress in April, Cuba has sent one of its best-known combat generals to Nicaragua. More Cuban soldiers and Soviet supplies have arrived in Nicaragua. This cannot be allowed to continue.

Tomorrow, July 19, is the fourth anniversary of the Sandinista revolution in Nicaragua. This was a revolution that promised to bring freedom to the Nicaraguan people — history will call it the revolution of broken promises.

Tomorrow the nine military commanders who rule Nicaragua with Cuban and Soviet power will indulge in boastful revolutionary rhetoric. But there are few left who will believe them.

## Promises and Performance

The consensus throughout the hemisphere is that while the Sandinistas promised their people freedom, all they've done is replace the former dictatorship with their own — a dictatorship of counterfeit revolutionaries who wear fatigues and drive around in Mercedes sedans and Soviet tanks and whose current promise is to spread their brand of "revolution" throughout Central America.

What kind of freedom have the Sandinistas established? Just ask the 1,300 stevedores at the Nicaraguan port of Corinto. Last month, their union assembly was packed with Sandinistas and six union leaders were arrested. Their presumed crime was trying to develop ties with independent trade unions, including some affiliated with the A.F.L.-C.I.O. I can

tell you one thing. If all the longshoremen in Corinto are like Teddy Gleason, the Sandinistas have a real fight on their hands.

What kind of democracy is it? Ask the Nicaraguan refugees who have risked starvation and attack to escape into Honduras. Let me read to you directly from a recent newspaper article, "One Nicaraguan man — still filthy, ragged and, above all, hungry after an odyssey that began five weeks ago — breathed a note of thanks: 'God has smiled on us.'"

## 'We Left Everything'

Imagine, with barely clothes on his back and nothing in his stomach, he believed God had smiled on him because he had arrived in free, democratic Honduras. This man fled Nicaragua in May with many others when they learned the Sandinistas planned to relocate their villages.

Let me quote again what one of the refugees had to say: "We left everything. We left the pigs, the corn, the animals. This year they wouldn't let us plant because they wanted us to move closer to the military bases, they wanted us to be in the militia, and we did not want to be executioners."

When the Sandinistas first took power, all their neighbors hoped they would embrace democracy as they promised.

In the first year and a half after the revolution, the United States sent \$118 million worth of emergency relief and recovery aid to Nicaragua, more than provided by any other country in the world.

But the Sandinistas had lied. They rejected their pledges to their own people, to the Organization of American States and to the world.

## A Contract for Democracy

Let me say a few more words about those specific promises.

The Sandinistas promised the O.A.S. that they would hold elections and grant all human rights that go

10f2

with a democracy. In short, they literally made a contract to establish a true democracy.

The dictator Somoza was persuaded to resign and the Government was turned over to the revolutionaries and recognized by the O.A.S.

So far so good.

But then one faction of the revolutionaries — backed by Cuba and the Soviet Union — seized total power and ousted those revolutionary comrades who had been fighting to establish a real democracy.

Nicaragua is today a nation abusing its own people and its neighbors.

The guerrilla bands fighting in Nicaragua are trying to restore the true revolution and keep the promises made to the O.A.S. Isn't it time that all of us in the Americas worked together to hold Nicaragua accountable for the promises made and broken four years ago?

There is a vital link between what's happening in Nicaragua and what's happening in El Salvador. And the link is very simple: The dictators of Nicaragua are actively trying to destroy the budding democracy in neighboring El Salvador.

#### Progress in El Salvador

El Salvador is moving toward a more open society and government in the midst of a foreign-supported guerrilla war. National presidential elections are planned. Through their peace commission, they have offered to talk even to the violent opposition about participation in the forthcoming elections. They have implemented an effective land reform program which has provided land for over half a million Salvadorans, and they've given amnesty to former guerrillas.

This is El Salvador's revolution — it is one that is building democracy.

Contrast this with the corrupted revolution in Nicaragua — one which has repressed human liberties, denied free unions and free elections, censored the press, threatened its neighbors and violated public pledges.

It's true, El Salvador's path has been a hard one. Peaceful change has not always been easy or quick. We realize the human rights progress in El Salvador is not all we would like it to be. The killing must stop!

But you have to realize much of the violence there — whether from the extreme right or left — is beyond the control of the Government.

El Salvador is moving in the right direction. Its elected Government is committed to further improvement. They need and deserve our help.

#### The People and the Ballot

Just remember that scene last year when, after months of campaigning by a variety of candidates, the people of El Salvador were offered a chance to vote, to choose the kind of government they wanted. The guerrillas threatened death to anyone who voted. They destroyed hundreds of buses and trucks to keep the people from getting to the polling places. Their slogan was

brutal: "Vote today, die tonight."

But on election day, an unprecedented 80 percent of the electorate braved ambush and gunfire and many of them trudged for miles to vote for freedom.

Members of our Congress who went there as observers told me of a woman who was wounded by rifle fire on the way to the polls who refused to leave the line to have her wound treated until after she had voted.

Another woman had been told by the guerrillas that she would be killed when she returned from the polls, and she told the guerrillas, "You can kill me, you can kill my family, you can kill my neighbors. You can't kill us all."

The real freedom fighters of El Salvador turned out to be the people of that country. The world should respect this courage and not allow it to be belittled or forgotten. And I say we can never turn our backs on that.

The United States has only recently attempted to correct past neglect so that we could help Central America's struggle for freedom. We are working for political and economic development. Most of our aid is not military at all.

#### Shield for Development

Seventy-seven cents out of every dollar we will spend there this year will go for economic assistance — food, fertilizers and other essentials to help break the vicious cycle of poverty.

And make no mistake about this — of all the words I've spoken today, let me underline these especially: America's emphasis in Central America is on economic and social progress, not on a purely military solution.

But to give democracy and development a chance to work in the face of increasing attacks, we are providing a shield of military training and assistance to help our neighbors protect themselves.

Meanwhile, the trade provisions of the Caribbean Basin Initiative will stimulate production and employment. Last week's congressional vote on the C.B.I. is a step toward more work for their longshoremen and ours.

Nor is that all. We are actively supporting the search for political solution and dialogue among and within these nations. We know that ultimately peace can come only if people talk to each other and learn to accommodate in an atmosphere of freedom. To this end I dispatched my special emissary to the region. Despite the fact that the guerrillas rejected our offer, we remain ready to facilitate free and open elections. We also support the process started at Contadora for a multilateral approach to peace.

#### A Bipartisan Commission

In my speech to the joint session, I asked the Congress to join me in a bold, generous bipartisan approach to the problems of peace and poverty, democracy and dictatorship in this region.

Many members of the Congress have responded in a genuine spirit of cooperation — despite divergent views on specific strategy.

Senators Jackson and Mathias, Congressmen Barnes and Kemp, have suggested the formation of a national commission to build on our bipartisan concern for these key issues. I agree with them that this is a good idea.

So, today, I am announcing a bipartisan national commission on Central America.

The commission will lay the foundation for a long-term unified national approach to the freedom and independence of the countries of Central America.

The commission will be honored by a very distinguished American, outstanding in the field of diplomacy — virtually a legend in that field — will be headed by Dr. Henry Kissinger, who will present recommendations to me later this year.

Their focus will be long term, looking to what we must do in the years ahead to meet the underlying problems of the region.

#### Need for Congress to Help

In the meantime, we must not allow totalitarian Communism to win by default. But we cannot succeed unless the Congress approves the necessary resources. All that our neighbors ask is for the tools to do the job themselves.

And I ask you and every American regardless of party to join in a common effort to promote freedom for all the people of this hemisphere. Just as you work so your children will have a better future, the United States must work so that the fledgling democracies of this hemisphere will have a better future — and so that our own future can be more secure.

The legislative branch must bear its share of responsibility for insuring this promise. Human rights means working at problems, not walking away from them. Without the necessary funds, there's no way for us to prevent the light of freedom from being extinguished in Central America. A truly bipartisan approach to these problems can produce the kind of progress that will help the people of the region help themselves.

President Harrison once said, "In America, a glorious fire has been lighted upon the altar of liberty. Keep it burning; and let the sparks that continually go up from it fall on other altars, and light up in distant lands the fire of freedom."

Today I ask you to join me in an effort to keep the light of liberty alive in Central America. We must never let freedom fade where there is a chance to save it. We must never let the embers of human dignity die out simply because it's easier to turn the other way. With a timely investment now, we can save freedom in Central America. I believe we must make that investment. I believe we have a moral responsibility to do so.

2072

## IN THE NATION

## Hiding Behind Henry

By Tom Wicker

President Reagan's decision to set up a "bipartisan" national commission to underpin his unpopular Central American policy is bad news for more reasons than the rebirth of Henry Kissinger.

It's tricky politics, too, calculated to generate for Mr. Reagan the Congressional and public support he hasn't otherwise achieved, and to give cold-footed opponents an easy way out of standing up to the President as an election year approaches.

Worse, the plan extends the already worrisome practice of turning over hard-fought political issues to supposedly blue-ribbon, nongovernmental commissions. When such a panel delivers what appears to be an arbitrator's Solomonic decision in substitute for the political judgments of Congress and the President, the result is dangerous to oppose and even difficult to modify.

Both the Greenspan commission on Social Security and the Scowcroft commission on the MX, the predecessors of the Kissinger commission, insisted that their conclusions were "package" decisions, to be accepted in full. The current difficulty of MX opponents in trying to defeat the 100 missiles recommended as part of the Scowcroft report suggests the effectiveness of the "package" tactic.

How long will it be before President and Congress give the Federal budget to, say, a Milton Friedman commission, or the school prayer issue to a Jerry Falwell commission? Maybe the Democrats, next time in office, could handle world trade policy with a Lane Kirkland commission.

None of these would be more incongruous than the proposed Kissinger commission, to be headed by the Great Destabilizer of Chile; a less appropriate person to act as arbiter of policy anywhere in Latin America could not be found this side of General Pinochet. Dr. Kissinger's well-known world view, moreover, does not allow the possibility that an insurgency in El Salvador might not have been conceived in Moscow and planned in Havana; and even if it did, his oft-proclaimed geopolitical concepts won't tolerate even an elected Marxist government in this hemisphere, let alone one achieved by revolution.

Besides, the commission gambit is misdirected at such a relatively narrow foreign policy issue as the Central American problem — one certainly no more complex and not generally considered as serious as the Middle East.

The Greenspan commission, partly appointed by Speaker Tip O'Neill, dealt with a genuine party and Presidential-Congressional deadlock on a serious domestic institutional ques-

tion. Social Security outlays were forcing some kind of decision. Enormous public interest attended the question; political posturing on both sides obscured it. Difficult technical, financial and actuarial questions were involved. And the final "package" pretty well split the differences between contending approaches.

The Scowcroft commission was more nearly a mere instrument of the President. The White House made no secret of the fact that the commission was appointed to legitimize some form of MX deployment over Congressional objection, and a fair reading of the membership left little doubt that the commission would do so. While it also performed useful service (dismissing the "window of vulnerability" and recommending a shift to single-warhead missiles), the commission's labored MX recommendation did not settle the question nor suggest a totally disinterested inquiry.

The Kissinger commission is even more suspect and less necessary. Mr. Reagan's stated aim is to build a "national consensus" on Central American policy, which means behind his policy; after all, he could change it without a commission. With such sponsorship and under such a leader, the panel is unlikely to recommend a new direction; it's doubtful there will even be enough dissenters of sufficient weight to shake the predictable "package" recommendation.

Why isn't the usual play of Presidential and Congressional power as proper here as in the case of, say, the Awacs sale to Saudi Arabia? What's at issue other than whether Congress puts up the money for the Reagan policy? Mr. Reagan apparently fears it won't unless he provides opponents a shield to hide behind; and the Scowcroft precedent suggests that the tactic works.

But whatever weight the new commission may achieve here, a group headed by a born-again Henry Kissinger and organized to develop a consensus around a military attack on Nicaragua and a military approach to El Salvador — both of which require the Reaganization of Honduras — will not be welcome south of the border.

The Contadora group (Mexico, Venezuela, Colombia and Panama), for instance, has just called on states interested in Central America to "contribute their political influence in strengthening the cause of understanding and commit themselves without reservation in favor of the diplomatic option for peace."

That's hardly what Mr. Reagan expects to hear from the Kissinger commission; else he wouldn't establish it.



# Reagan Chooses Kissinger to Run New Latin Team

By STEVEN R. WEISMAN

Special to The New York Times

HOLLYWOOD, Fla., July 18 — President Reagan announced today that he would establish a bipartisan Presidential commission headed by former Secretary of State Henry A. Kissinger to "lay the foundation for a long-term unified national approach" to the problems of Central America.

"We must not allow totalitarian Communism to win by default," Mr. Reagan said in a speech to 1,000 delegates at the

*Excerpts from speech, page A6.*

International Longshoremen's Association convention here.

While the commission will examine "underlying problems," the President declared, there remains an urgent need for Congress to approve the entire \$110 million aid package he has requested for Central America this year.

"Without the necessary funds, there's no way for us to prevent the light of freedom from being extinguished in Central America," Mr. Reagan said. He added that "the legislative branch must bear its share of responsibility" in averting a defeat.

The President's establishment of a commission is a response to appeals from Democrats and Republicans in Congress, where Mr. Reagan's military aid requests have met with skepticism and opposition.

Administration officials said they embraced the idea of the commission because the military situation was becoming increasingly worrisome, at a time when Mr. Reagan and his Congressional allies have failed to build popular support for the sort of long-term military commitment that many experts say is necessary.

Mr. Reagan left unclear the precise mission of the Presidential panel, other than to say that its objective would be to examine underlying problems and define a long term "approach" for the United States that could command the support of a broad spectrum of Americans.

It thus appears likely that the exact mandate of the commission will be defined and debated in the days ahead as the panel is established. Larry Speakes, the deputy White House press secretary, said the remaining eight members of the commission would probably be announced by the White House later this week.

A senior official said that the commission would consist of specialists from the fields of government, business, labor and education, as well as Hispanic-Americans and religious figures. Its nine members are to be appointed by the President, but it is to have a group of "senior consultants" named by Democratic and Republican leaders in Congress. The panel members are not subject to Congressional confirmation.

## Panel to Report by Dec. 1

The official said the commission would report to the President by Dec. 1, and that Mr. Kissinger, a private consultant in New York City, accepted appointment in a telephone conversation with Mr. Reagan Sunday evening. That conversation was preceded by talks between Mr. Kissinger and William P. Clark, the President's national security adviser.

The choice of Mr. Kissinger had a certain irony for Mr. Reagan, who attacked the Secretary of State in 1976 for his policy of détente with the Soviet Union, at a time when Mr. Reagan was

challenging President Ford for the Republican Presidential nomination.

Recently, however, Mr. Kissinger has been an occasional visitor at the White House and has lunched from time to time with Mr. Reagan. He also speaks frequently with Mr. Clark and with Secretary of State George P. Shultz, an old friend.

Today Mr. Reagan praised Mr. Kissinger for his diplomatic skills, terming him "a very distinguished American, virtually a legend in that field."

## Urgent Appeal for Support

Although Mr. Reagan's speech was one of his most urgent appeals for support — as well as one of his angriest denunciations of Cuba, Nicaragua and the Soviet Union — he delivered it in a quiet, sometimes halting fashion, apparently because of a malfunctioning teleprompter.

The 1,000 delegates at the Diplomat Hotel responded with tepid applause, reserving louder ovations for the passages in which Mr. Reagan praised the union for its patriotism, and for a song delivered by Thomas W. Gleason, the union president, that Mr. Gleason sang at his wedding 60 years ago.

Administration officials have likened the commission idea to the concept of recent Presidential panels on Social Security and the MX missile, both of which came up with compromise proposals that were approved on Capitol Hill.

However, Administration experts portray the Central American commission as aimed at "providing a rationale" for current policies, as one put it. Thus the commission is expected within the Administration to be scrutinized by Congress to see if it reflects a genuine willingness by Mr. Reagan to examine all alternatives.

## Several Legislators Praised

Mr. Reagan singled out several members of Congress today for what he said was their "bipartisan concern" for Central America. He cited Senators Henry M. Jackson, Democrat of Washington, and Charles McC. Mathias, a Maryland Republican, as well as Representatives Michael Barnes, a Maryland Democrat, and Jack F. Kemp, a Republican from suburban Buffalo.

President Reagan said the commission would examine underlying economic causes of the turmoil in Central America. He belittled the idea that "democracy can't work" just because of the history of "poverty and violence and repression" in the area.

"Some people throw up their hands and say there's not much we can do down there," Mr. Reagan said. "I say baloney, and I think we'd all say something stronger down on the docks." The audience of longshoremen laughed appreciatively.

Mr. Reagan said that "people throughout Latin America are waiting to see if Republicans and Democrats in this country can work together to make the United States what it should be: a loyal friend and reliable defender of democracy and human decency."

## 'War Fueled by Soviets'

"There is a war in Central America that is being fueled by the Soviets and the Cubans," the President declared. He noted that July 19 would mark the fourth anniversary of the revolution in Nicaragua that brought the Sandinistas to power.

"The consensus throughout the hemisphere," he said, "is that while the Sandinistas promise their people freedom, all they've done is replace the former dictatorship with their own, a dictatorship of counterfeit revolutionaries who wear fatigues, and drive around in Mercedes sedans and Soviet tanks, and whose current promise is to spread their brand of revolution throughout Central America."

## 'Moving in the Right Direction'

Human rights in El Salvador "are not all we would like them to be," and "the killing must stop" there, the President said. But, he went on, "you have to realize much of the violence there — whether from the extreme right or left — is beyond the control of Government."

El Salvador, he declared, is "moving in the right direction" by seeking to diminish the violence and install an elected government.

Mr. Reagan said that his Administration would continue to "search for a political solution and dialogue among and within these nations" but that the insurgents in El Salvador had "rejected our offer" to participate in "free and open elections."

# Kissinger on Central America: A Call for

By BERNARD GWERTZMAN

Special to The New York Times

WASHINGTON, July 18 — Henry A. Kissinger, who will head the Presidential commission on Central America, has already indicated he believes a firm American response is needed in that region to maintain the credibility of the United States in other parts of the world.

**• News Analysis** On the crucial issues that are being debated here and that the commission will be asked to discuss, Mr. Kissinger has made it clear that he opposes any cuts in American military aid to El Salvador and would even approve an American military presence on the Honduran-Nicaraguan border if covert aid to rebels in Nicaragua is no longer feasible.

President Reagan's decision to appoint Mr. Kissinger to head the special panel on Central America aroused considerable comment here today, even before the rest of the commission is named. Some people, like Senator Howard H. Baker Jr., the majority leader, praised the choice. But a number of members of Congress, both liberal and conservative, were sharply critical.

The reaction was not unexpected. In the eight years that Mr. Kissinger was President Nixon's national security adviser and then Secretary of State for Presidents Nixon and Ford, he was assailed by liberals and conservatives.

#### Criticized by Reagan in 1976

One of his major critics was Mr. Reagan, who in 1976, during his losing primary battle with Mr. Ford, said one of his first actions if elected would be to dismiss Mr. Kissinger, whose policy of détente had antagonized the right wing of the Republican Party. No explanation was given why Mr. Reagan chose Mr. Kissinger for this assignment.

Mr. Kissinger had been passed over

in the selection of the special envoy to the Middle East and the head of the special commission on the MX missile.

While Mr. Kissinger has had extensive experience in Middle East diplomacy and in strategic arms negotiations, he has no special expertise in Latin America, and this was noted by some of the critics today. But in recent months he has spoken out forcefully on what he has described as the need for the United States not to allow Communists to make gains in Central America.

In a published interview last spring he said he viewed the outcome in that part of the world as crucial for overall American foreign policy objectives.

#### 'How Central America Comes Out'

"A lot will depend on how Central America comes out," he said in an interview in Public Opinion magazine. "If we cannot manage Central America, it will be impossible to convince threatened nations in the Persian Gulf and in other places that we know how to manage the global equilibrium," Mr. Kissinger said. "We will face a series of upheavals that will absorb so much of our energies that we will be deflected from our previous policies."

He said he would oppose going to war with Nicaragua over its aid to guerrillas in El Salvador. But he also said he would do whatever was needed — supporting through covert aid guerrillas in Nicaragua, or "an overt American military presence" on the Honduran-Nicaraguan border.

Asked if he backed the Administration's policy of giving covert aid to the Nicaraguan guerrillas, he said he did.

"It escapes me why we have to apply the Brezhnev Doctrine in Central America and assert that any Communist government that has established itself can never be changed," he said.

"As a policy I support it," he said. "But I don't think it can be carried out

with the present system for handling covert operations. If the purpose of the covert operations is to prevent infiltration from Nicaragua through Honduras, then I would rather see an overt American military presence on the Honduran-Nicaraguan border.

"I am sympathetic to the covert operations if we can still conduct them the way their name implies. But if covert operations have to be justified in a public debate, they stop being covert and we will wind up losing public support."

White House officials said Mr. Kissinger was in Denver today and due in Los Angeles on Tuesday. They said he was formally asked to take the assignment Sunday night and was surprised by the rapid disclosures in the press, which originated with some Republicans opposed to his being named.

The officials would not say when they would announce the other appointments to the commission. But they confirmed that these people had been asked to serve: Terence Cardinal Cooke, Archbishop of New York; Lane Kirkland, president of the A.F.L.-C.I.O.; Robert S. Strauss, former chairman of the Democratic Party, and Prof. Carlos F. Diaz-Alejandro of Yale, a specialist in economic development.

#### No Outright Opponents of Policy

An Administration official acknowledged that no outright opponents of Administration policy were being asked to serve.

The idea for the commission came from Senators Henry M. Jackson, Democrat of Washington, and Charles McC. Mathias Jr., Republican of Maryland, and Representatives Michael D. Barnes, Democrat of Maryland, and Jack F. Kemp, Republican of upstate New York. None of them said they had been consulted on the appointment.

Mr. Jackson, who was a frequent

critic of Mr. Kissinger when he was in the Government, said, "It's a good appointment, one that will bring prestige to the commission." Mr. Mathias said Mr. Kissinger "has the ability to be totally objective and totally independent."

Mr. Barnes said he was afraid that the controversy over Mr. Kissinger would make it difficult to focus on Central America. "I am afraid that we're going to spend the next month talking about Kissinger than about Central America," he said.

Senator Jesse Helms, Republican of North Carolina, who heads the Foreign Relations subcommittee on Latin America, was sharply critical. He said, "There may be someone in this broad land farther down my list of choices than Henry the K, but I can't think of anyone." He said he wanted to call Mr. Kissinger before his committee to see if there was any conflict of interests with Mr. Kissinger's consultant work for banks and American corporations.

The Conservative Caucus held a special news conference today to denounce the appointment of Mr. Kissinger. Richard A. Viguerie, publisher of Conservative Digest, said, "It would be difficult to find a spokesman less trusted by conservatives and liberals alike."

"He was this nation's No. 1 foreign policy official when U.S. foreign policy virtually collapsed, leading to the loss of Angola, Vietnam, Laos and Cambodia," he said.

Senator Christopher J. Dodd, Democrat of Connecticut, a liberal opponent of the Administration's Central American policy, said he opposed the whole commission idea and questioned the appointment of Mr. Kissinger. He said, "Dr. Kissinger has few rivals in terms of diplomatic experience or expertise, but that experience has made him a symbol for a foreign policy many would rather forget than repeat."

U.S. Firmness

# U.S. SAID TO PLAN MILITARY EXERCISES IN LATIN AMERICA

## MANEUVERS ARE WARNING

### 2 Sets of Games Are Meant to Show Cuba and Nicaragua Arms Can Be Stopped

By PHILIP TAUBMAN  
Special to The New York Times

WASHINGTON, July 18 — The Reagan Administration, as a warning to Cuba and Nicaragua, is planning two large military exercises within the next four weeks in Central America and the Caribbean, Administration officials said today.

The officials said the exercises, which will involve ground, air and naval forces, would be officially described as routine. They said privately, however, that the exercises had been ordered by the White House only in recent weeks and that they were intended to signal Cuba and Nicaragua that the United States has the means to stop the shipment of military supplies from Cuba to Nicaragua.

#### Quarantine a 'Last Resort'

Senior Administration officials said President Reagan had not ruled out the possibility of establishing a military quarantine around Nicaragua at a later date, an option that the Reagan Administration has had under consideration since shortly after Mr. Reagan took office. The officials said that the possibility of a quarantine was under active discussion but that no decisions had been made to put one into effect.

They added that Mr. Reagan and his advisers considered a quarantine to be a "last resort" if other forms of diplomatic and military pressure do not succeed in persuading the Cubans to stop the shipment of arms to Nicaragua.

Defense Secretary Caspar W. Weinberger has said that a blockade of Nicaragua would require a major commitment of United States forces, and Defense Department officials, many of whom oppose such a move, have argued that it would drain crucial American military resources from other parts of the world.

#### 'Might Call It Gunboat Diplomacy'

One senior official said that although the two military exercises would be presented as routine, "some might call it gunboat diplomacy." Officials said the Defense Department was in the final phases of planning for the exercises.

In a speech on Central America today, President Reagan said that "more Cuban and Soviet supplies have arrived in Nicaragua" and that "this cannot be allowed to continue." The Administration has accused the Soviet Union and Cuba of sending arms through Nicaragua to guerrillas in El Salvador.

Officials said the land exercises, which will take place in Honduras, would be similar to joint American-Honduran maneuvers last fall in which United States Air Force planes carried

Honduran troops to the border with Nicaragua.

At sea, the officials said, United States warships would cross the Panama Canal and practice various naval maneuvers, including blockades, in the Caribbean. They said the ships might also sail down the west coast of Central America.

The officials provided no other details on either exercise.

#### Other Steps Being Considered

Mr. Reagan and his top aides, as part of a review of Central American policy, are considering several other steps that would increase the American military presence in the region, according to senior officials and a classified working paper prepared for the White House earlier this month.

These steps include an increase in military assistance to pro-United States governments, the prepositioning of United States military equipment in Honduras for use in a crisis and a continuation of covert intelligence operations directed against Nicaragua.

The working paper, which was prepared for a meeting of the National Security Council on July 8, emphasized the need to take steps to counteract Cuban assistance to Nicaragua.

#### Policies Facing Key Tests

Planning for the exercises comes at a time when the Administration's policies in Central America face several key tests in Congress during the next two weeks, including a House vote on legis-

lation to cut off covert aid to rebels in Nicaragua and further consideration of a request for supplemental military assistance to El Salvador.

Before the end of the week, the Administration must also report whether El Salvador has made sufficient progress on human rights issues to qualify for further American aid. Although this semiannual certification process has frequently touched off Congressional opposition to policies of both the Salvadoran and United States Governments, Administration officials say they plan to submit a favorable report, perhaps as early as Tuesday.

Administration officials view the outcome of the House vote on covert aid as a crucial test of Congressional and public support for their actions in Central America. The Administration has tried, so far without success, to forge a compromise that would permit the continuation of covert operations in Nicaragua until the Nicaraguan Government agrees to stop aiding guerrillas in El Salvador.

#### Not Enough Votes So Far

House Democratic leaders say they do not yet have sufficient votes to approve the legislation, which is named after its two chief sponsors, Edward P. Boland, Democrat of Massachusetts, the chairman of the House Intelligence Committee, and Clement J. Zablocki, Democrat from Wisconsin, the chairman of the House Foreign Affairs Committee.

The House is due to begin formal consideration of the legislation on Tuesday in a rare secret session in which members will review classified information about the covert activities. The session, which is scheduled to last four hours and will include a report by Mr. Boland, will be only the third secret meeting of the House in the last 153 years.

The Boland-Zablocki legislation would end American support for anti-

Government forces in Nicaragua and substitute an overt aid program designed to help Central American nations stop the shipment of arms that the Administration says flows from Cuba through Nicaragua to the insurgents in El Salvador.

#### \$80 Million for Overt Aid

Members of Congress say the \$80 million that would be put in the budget for such overt assistance over the next two years is roughly equal to the amount of covert aid the Reagan Administration has proposed using to back rebel operations in Nicaragua.

Administration officials, contending that the covert activity is necessary to force the Nicaraguan Government to

end its support of the Salvadoran guerrillas, have told members of Congress that approval of the Boland-Zablocki bill would be a major setback for American policy in Central America.

In negotiations with House leaders last week, Administration officials offered to accept the terms of the aid cutoff, provided that a termination in aid would be linked to an agreement by Nicaragua to cease its support of Salvadoran guerrillas. The compromise proposal was rejected.

#### More Compromise Talks Expected

Further compromise discussions are expected before the bill comes up for floor debate on July 26, according to House leaders. Administration officials are concerned that even though the Republican-controlled Senate is unlikely to approve a cutoff of covert aid, House passage could produce a deadlock when the issue comes up in conference committee meetings in which House and Senate members try to reconcile differences between bills — in this case budget authorizations, passed by both houses.

The Administration is also closely watching Congressional consideration of a request for \$110 million in extra military assistance to El Salvador in the fiscal year that ends in September.

In March, the Administration asked Congress to provide the assistance in two pieces: \$60 million that would be reprogrammed, or diverted, from money already earmarked for other nations, and \$50 million to be added to the original request for El Salvador.

The House Appropriations subcommittee on foreign operations, the only Congressional panel that needed to vote on the reprogramming request, approved a diversion of only \$30 million and stipulated that the money be linked to the willingness of the Salvadoran Government to begin a dialogue with the guerrillas.



# Does Reagan want to hear the truth about Salvador?

El Salvador has been independent of Spain since 1841. Its population is a bit smaller — 4.35 million — than that of metropolitan Philadelphia. Half that population is children, half can read. It has not been a happy or stable place. In 1932, a peasants' revolt was put down by the army at the cost of 30,000 dead. Governments have been overthrown routinely. Funeral homes are one of the few growth industries.

There was an El Salvador — a Central America — before Ronald Reagan was elected President of the United States. The United States has had policies regarding that impoverished part of the world. They have not been very coherent. Now Mr. Reagan, facing a Congress reluctant to fund his anti-Communist crusade, would like to study Central America, the neighbor to the south. He is convening, he has announced, a national, blue-ribbon, bipartisan commission.

The commission would tell the President what to do about Central America — what to do about El Salvador, where this month the United States-backed forces are winning, or at least pushing around, the leftist guerrillas. In January and February and March, the word was that the rebels were striking targets at will. So it goes, month to month, congressional vote to congressional vote.

The idea for a commission has broad support in Congress. Liberals and conservatives embrace it. What is there to lose? "We can no longer follow the familiar pattern of sporadic attention when we feel our interests threatened by coup or revolution — then abandonment and unconcern," declared Sen. Henry Jackson (D., Wash.). "What we need is a policy that has a 30- to 50-year aim."

That sounds nice, indeed.

But there is more a scent of desperation about the move to compose a commission, more a sense of improvisation — to get through a presidential election year? to win funding for Salvadoran military action and aid to Nicaraguan rebels? — than of an effort at building a long-range foundation for U.S. policy. Lord knows, there are studies aplenty to choose from if Mr. Reagan feels unenlightened about the dynamics of what is happening in Cen-

tral America.

One such study, cited yesterday by columnist Philip Geyelin, is the report of the "Inter-American Dialogue," co-chaired by Sol Linowitz, a former U.S. ambassador to the Organization of American States, and Galo Plaza, one-time president of Ecuador. Its members included New York banker David Rockefeller; a former chairman of the joint chiefs, David Jones; former World Bank president and former Defense secretary Robert McNamara — hardly a bleeding-heart crowd.

"On two important points," the report concluded, "we all agreed: the basic roots of insecurity — and the basic problems of security — in this hemisphere are primarily economic, social and political, not military; and the sources of insecurity are mainly *internal to each nation ... External influences are secondary.*"

Yet, even as he was announcing the commission — which will be headed by former Secretary of State Henry Kissinger — the President was sticking doggedly to his East-West confrontation view of Central American conflict. "Let me put it bluntly," he told longshoremen in Florida: "There is a war in Central America that is being fueled by the Soviets and the Cubans." The aim, in Mr. Reagan's world view? "To subjugate another nation to communism."

That there is war is plain enough. But it has been the country's conservative, murderous, land-owning oligarchy — hugely wealthy amidst El Salvador's poverty and squalor — that has done more than the Kremlin to fuel unrest in the smallest country in Central America.

To the extent Mr. Reagan's military aid would prop up a government unable to contain that element's violence or its lock on El Salvador's farmland, it will not keep the light of liberty alive in Central America. It will bring instead only prolonged darkness and widened war.

The President certainly could stack a commission to tell him that is not true. But it would have to ignore the recent findings of those who have looked at Central America nonpolitically and it would have to close its eyes to the sad, exploited history of the whole region.

# Kissinger given major policy role

By Saul Friedman  
Inquirer Washington Bureau

HOLLYWOOD, Fla. — President Reagan, in a bid to defuse his problems in Central America, called former Secretary of State Henry A. Kissinger back into a major foreign policy role yesterday.

Reagan's appointment of Kissinger to head a bipartisan National Commission on Central America, announced by the President in a speech here to the International Longshoremen's Association, touched off an immediate protest from critics on the left and the right.

In Washington, Richard Viguerie, publisher of *Conservative Digest*, said Kissinger "does not have the trust and confidence of a broad cross-section of our citizens. ... He bears much of the responsibility for the giveaway of the Panama Canal and for policies that winked at the continued enslavement of Eastern Europe."

Joseph Eldridge, director of the liberal Washington Office on Latin America, said that Kissinger, as secretary of state, "humbled himself only twice to visit Latin America for any reason."

"Kissinger's major initiative toward Latin America was the destabilization of Chile. What kind of credentials are these to provide the leadership required to bring peace and development in Central America?"

(As President Richard M. Nixon's national security adviser, Kissinger played a key role in the CIA-led move to replace the elected Marxist government of Chile in 1973. As secretary of state, he also was instrumental in negotiations to turn over control of the Panama Canal to Panama by the end of the century.)

"There may be someone in this broad land who is lower on my list of choices than Mr. Kissinger, but I can't think of him," said Sen. Jesse Helms (R., N.C.).

Helms, chairman of the Western Hemisphere affairs subcommittee of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, said he was arranging to call Kissinger before the panel to find out "what, if anything, he knows about Central America."

Moderate Republicans like Senate Majority Leader Howard H. Baker Jr. called the appointment "an excellent idea."

The appointment affords Kissinger a chance to again achieve high visibility in foreign policy, particularly since Secretary of State George P. Shultz has been almost totally occupied with Soviet and Middle Eastern affairs.

In his speech, Reagan said the commission would "lay the foundation for a long-term unified national approach to the freedom and independence of the countries of Central America."

He hailed Kissinger as "a distinguished American ... a legend."

While the President gave no details about the makeup of the commission, officials traveling with Reagan said it would have nine members, including the chairman, and a number of "senior consultants" to be chosen by Congress.

The appointment of a bipartisan commission has been a favorite Reagan technique when one of his programs is in trouble. He used it successfully in the Social Security and MX missile controversies. Now his request for \$10 million in military aid and his policies of involvement in Central America have run into difficulty.

Administration officials said the commission would operate much like the MX commission, which helped get the MX missile approved by Congress.

But the Kissinger commission's function, one official said, would be to "study the nature of U.S. interests in Central America and the threats now posed to those interests."

The commission would report to Reagan by Dec. 1, when it would go out of business unless its life were extended by the President.

Kissinger, who has been conferring about his appointment with White House staff members for several days, accepted the job during a telephone conversation with Reagan late Sunday, officials said.

Almost from the moment Reagan took command of the Republican Party on his way to the presidency, Kissinger has sought to play a role that would give him some influence on the President.

In 1980, at the Republican convention in Detroit, Kissinger acted as the go-between in abortive negotiations aimed at making former President Gerald R. Ford Reagan's running mate. Since then, Kissinger has been a consultant at the White House on arms control and on the Middle East. He also served as a consultant to the MX commission.

Kissinger, who won a Nobel peace prize for negotiating an end to the U.S. involvement in Vietnam, also laid the groundwork for Nixon's trip to China in 1972 and the re-establishment of U.S. relations with that nation.

In his speech, Reagan responded to critics of his Central America policy, saying that the United States aims for "economic and social progress" in the region, "not ... a purely military solution."

While Reagan noted that "Central America suffers from decades of poverty, social and political instability," most of his message was a harsh

denunciation of Cuba, Nicaragua and other leftist influences.

"There is a war in Central America," he said. "The Soviets and the Cubans are operating from a base called Nicaragua. This is the first real communist aggression on the American mainland. We tend to forget sometimes that here in the Western Hemisphere we are Americans from pole to pole."

Nicaragua, Reagan said, was a "dictatorship of counterfeit revolutionaries who wear fatigues and drive around in Mercedes sedans and Soviet tanks and whose current promise is to spread their brand of 'revolution' throughout Central America."

On the other hand, Reagan said the government in El Salvador, which was backed by U.S. aid and advisers, "is one that is building democracy." He acknowledged, however, that "human rights progress in El Salvador is not all we would like it to be."

But while he said "the killing must stop," Reagan added that "much of the violence there — whether from the extreme right or left — is beyond the control of the government."

Reagan's speech was the fourth major address he has given on Central American policy. But he received only a lukewarm response from his labor audience despite his fervent efforts to emphasize why he regards Central America and Latin America so important.

Reagan, departing from his prepared remarks, noted that all the countries of the Americas "worship from North Pole to South Pole the same God. ... What a power for good we could be ... if we help them achieve what we have in this land."

The remark served to emphasize how deeply Reagan and his top advisers feel about Central America and thus how important Kissinger and his commission could become.

The trip was Reagan's third to Florida, a key Sun Belt state, since March. Reagan campaign strategists are eager to strengthen his appeal in the South and among blue-collar union members, a major source of his 1980 victory. The Longshoremen's group was one of the few unions that openly supported him.

## COVER STORY

# Inquiry today examines our commitment

Reagan sees 'Communist aggression on mainland'; critics see Viet specter

Special for USA TODAY

WASHINGTON — As the full House of Representatives meets today behind closed doors — for only the third time in 153 years — and discusses Central America, two main questions are at hand:

How deeply is the USA already committed to the developing crises there, and how much further should we go?

The Reagan administration's commitment involves money, materials and — in the controversy that particularly raises the specter of Vietnam — men. It includes:

■ Strong support for the government of El Salvador against an estimated 6,000 rebels. The administration has a self-imposed limit of 55 military advisers there; 25 medical workers have been sent. President Reagan is seeking to increase military aid for El Salvador from \$56.3 million to

\$136 million. It has 27,000 army troops.

■ Providing not-so-secret military training for 6,000-8,000 rebels — the contras (counter-revolutionaries) — fighting the Marxist government of Nicaragua (the Sandinistas).

■ A larger presence in Honduras, with the recent opening of a Green Beret training base for Salvadoran troops, \$13 million for airfield improvements necessary to handle larger USA planes and 58 U.S. Air Force technicians who man a \$5-million regional radar installation.

Reagan's fears of communist revolution spreading throughout Central America fuels concern at home. Said Don Edwards, D-Calif., earlier this year: "The similarities between El Salvador and Vietnam are terrifying."

Reagan strongly rejects that parallel. He says there are no plans to send USA combat troops to Central America — but he has refrained from flatly ruling out the possibility: "Presidents never say never."

Said Reagan Monday: "There is a war in Central America that is being fueled by the Soviets and the Cubans. They are arming, training, supplying and encouraging a war to subjugate another nation to communism. That nation is El Salvador. The Soviets and the Cubans are operating from a base called Nicaragua. This is the first real communist aggression on the American mainland."

He also said: "We tend to forget sometimes that here in the Western Hemisphere we are Americans from pole to pole."

In recent months, controversy about USA involvement in Central America has intensified, spurred by the May murder of USA military adviser Lt. Cmdr. Albert Schaufelberger in El Salvador (one of about 30,000 deaths recorded there in recent years) and last month's killing of two newsmen on the dangerous Nicaragua-Honduras border.

For many in the USA, the countries of Central America seem bewildering: References to policy and politics often lump them together. But it isn't that simple.

In tiny Belize (pop. 150,000), adjacent to Mexico and Guatemala, the issue is a long-standing territorial dispute with Gua-

temala. Costa Rica has no army and has been a democracy since 1948; and in Panama, anti-USA sentiment has declined since the 1977 treaty to turn the canal over to Panama.

But questions involve four countries: El Salvador, Honduras, Guatemala and Nicaragua. All but Nicaragua have governments friendly to the USA.

■ El Salvador is fighting guerrillas on several fronts, with rebels controlling some areas. Congress imposed restraints on military aid; this week Reagan must certify that the country is improving its human rights record so it can continue receiving military aid. He is expected to do so.

■ Honduras, poorest nation in the region, is among the USA's closest allies there. Reagan calls the USA-trained rebels based there "freedom fighters."

■ Guatemala is run by a born-again Christian who has been accused of major human rights violations. A December election is planned, and Reagan has proposed sale of \$10 million in military hardware to the government.

■ Nicaragua's government is fighting USA-trained contras as well as a smaller group of anti-Sandinista rebels based in Costa Rica. Nicaragua's government has received Soviet military equipment. About 2,000 Cubans work with Nicaraguan military and security forces, as do several hundred Soviet bloc advisers.

The USA's involvement with rebel forces seeking to overthrow the Nicaraguan government is the focus of today's secret hearing.

Congress in December 1982 barred USA aid "for the purpose" of overthrowing the Sandinistas or provoking a Nicaragua-Honduras war.

Before the House today is a proposal to replace covert aid with \$80 million in open aid to help friendly governments stop the supply of weapons to insurgents, particularly in El Salvador. Democrats in Congress are divided on how to proceed.

"It has not reached the point the Vietnam War split reached; the intensity isn't there," said Rep. Matthew McHugh, D-N.Y. "In this case, there's still a sort of groping around."

Contributing to these accounts: George Edmonson, Darcy Trick, Juan Walte, David Bauman.



# SHOWDOWN: USA begins debate on Central America

**Belize**

**Guatemala**  
Pop. 7.2 million

**Honduras**  
Pop. 3.7 million

**El Salvador**  
Pop. 4.7 million

**Nicaragua**  
Pop. 2.9 million

**Costa Rica**

**USA**

**Mexico**

**Cuba**

**Guatemala:** Military government of Gen. Jose Efraim Rios Montt supported by USA. Military aid was cut off for human rights policy by Carter; Reagan said Rios Montt got "bum rap," wants to sell him military equipment. Leftist guerrillas have been active since 1962.

**El Salvador:** Military government supported by USA with economic and military aid and 55 military advisers. Government's 27,000 Army troops fighting a 3-year-old civil war against 6,000 rebels. President Reagan has declared the war a direct threat to USA's interests, but Salvador's tactics have splintered USA over support.

**Honduras:** Fledgling democratic government is USA ally being used as base for Nicaraguan rebels crossing the border to fight their government. USA improving airfield, providing military trainers and manning \$5 million regional radar installation. Long-time enemy of El Salvador, with which it fought border war in 1969.

**Nicaragua:** Marxist government (*Sandinistas*), with close ties to the Soviet Union and Cuba, cut off from USA aid. Reagan's charge: It exports revolution, threatens hemisphere's stability. Backed by USA, 6,000-8,000 rightist guerrillas (*contras*) seek to overthrow government.

Photo by James Nachtwey, Black Star; Graphic by George Rorick, USA TODAY  
**WEAPONS DRILL:** U.S. Army adviser in El Salvador instructs local soldiers in machine gun class.

# The controversial Kissinger returns to the limelight

Henry A. Kissinger, the heavyweight of USA diplomacy, is returning to the arena of foreign policy where he has thrived during six of the last seven administrations.

After a brief spell on the sidelines — writing his memoirs, consulting, lecturing for as much as \$20,000 a speech and giving television commentary — the former secretary of state was named Monday by President Ronald Reagan to chair a bipartisan commission on Central American policy.

The original shuttle diplomat, once called "Super K," Kissinger is better known for orchestrating policy in the Middle East, Indochina and Europe than he is for influencing affairs in Central America.

His appointment, experts say, indicates a new willingness to formulate a well-defined Central American policy.

Kissinger, who speaks three languages, but not Spanish, served every administration since Eisenhower until 1978 when the Carter White House cut him off.

During Reagan's first two years as president, Kissinger was equally ignored until George Shultz succeeded Alexander Haig as Reagan's secretary of state. Lately, his advice has been sought more often.

Recipient of the Nobel Peace Prize in 1973 for negotiating an end to the Vietnam War, Kissinger became the object of intense controversy as national security adviser and secretary of state during the Nixon and Ford administrations.

He is adored and vilified, despised by liberals as well as conservatives, yet is granted audience with world leaders.

Former *New York Times* reporter Seymour Hersh has at-



KISSINGER: Joins Reagan's team on Central America.

tacked Kissinger as deceitful and manipulative.

In his recent book *The Price of Power, Kissinger in the Nixon White House*, Hersh contends Kissinger bypassed the secretary of defense to carry out secret bombings of Cambodia and routinely set up fall guys to take the blame for his failures.

Kissinger called the charges "a pack of slimy lies."

Sen. Christopher Dodd, D-Conn., and a member of the Foreign Relations Committee, says Kissinger is "a symbol for a foreign policy many would rather forget than repeat."

But the former Harvard professor, plucked from obscurity by Nelson Rockefeller, also has an unending stream of devoted and well-placed admirers. In May, 300 of them attended his 60th birthday party at the swank Pierre Hotel in New York.

The bash cost more than \$50,000.

Reagan described Kissinger Monday as "virtually a legend" in diplomacy.

— Leslie Phillips

## Reagan Names Kissinger to Head Panel On Long-Range Central America Policy

By KAREN ELLIOTT HOUSE  
And BROOKS JACKSON

Staff Reporters of THE WALL STREET JOURNAL

President Reagan turned to Henry Kissinger, a man he once derided, for help in building political support for his increasingly controversial policy of U.S. military involvement in Central America.

Calling the former secretary of state "virtually a legend," the president named him to head a bipartisan commission that he said would "lay the foundation for a long-term unified rational approach" to Central America.

The idea for the commission came from Sens. Henry Jackson (D., Wash.) and Charles Mathias (R., Md.), who last month suggested that a bipartisan panel might head off a destructive battle between Congress and the administration over how and whether to preserve and foster democracy in Central America.

The decision to accept the senators' suggestion and to name Mr. Kissinger to the top job was urged on Mr. Reagan by his national security assistant, William Clark. For months, Mr. Clark, a driving force behind the president's hard-line policies on Central America, has been meeting almost once a week with Mr. Kissinger, the nemesis of most other right-wing Republicans. The two apparently find each other's company flattering.

### Attack by Conservatives

The appointment of Mr. Kissinger, however, is likely to provoke more than pacify the passions surrounding U.S. policy in Central America. Never well-liked by many in Congress because of his disdain for consultation, Mr. Kissinger will face criticism from some Democratic lawmakers. (He doesn't need Senate confirmation for this job.)

Furthermore, conservative Republicans, who see Mr. Kissinger as too accommodating to Moscow, already are attacking. Richard Viguerie, publisher of *Conservative Digest*, wired newspapers nationwide yester-

day asserting that Mr. Kissinger had presided over the near collapse of U.S. foreign policy. "It would be difficult to find a spokesman less trusted by conservatives and liberals alike," he said.

Most important, the commission's task is much more difficult than that of other commissions the president has named. The bipartisan blueribbon panels on Social Security and the MX missile each faced real legislative deadlines that could be used to urge both extremes to compromise. Here, as the emphasis is on long-term policy, the commission, which doesn't report to Mr. Reagan until December, won't be under the same pressure to agree.

Also, some foreign policy analysts say, the situation in Central America is changing so fast that events in the area and U.S. decisions made to deal with them may set long-term policy irrespective of the commission.

"It's a silly idea that a commission can solve any problem," says a Republican foreign policy expert with close ties to the administration.

Although the president often criticized Mr. Kissinger's stewardship of U.S. foreign policy in 1976 when Mr. Reagan was running against President Ford for the republican presidential nomination, he apparently chose Mr. Kissinger now because he hopes the former secretary's prestige will help him hold the support of the political center for his policies in Central America. White House officials believe the far right and the left won't matter too much if Mr. Reagan can count on the support of moderates such as Sens. Jackson and Mathias.

The announcement of the commission was the only real news in Mr. Reagan's speech on Central America to the International Longshoremen's Association in Hollywood, Fla.

### Current Policy to Continue

Until the commission reports, the president said, he intends to pursue his policy of economic and military support for friendly governments in Central America. "We must not allow totalitarian communism to win by default," he said.

The president ignored the suggestion of four Latin American presidents that Central America be immediately demilitarized. Over the weekend, the presidents of Mexico, Panama, Venezuela and Colombia called on both President Reagan and Cuban Premier Fidel Castro to end foreign intervention in Central America and urged a ban on foreign bases there.

The U.S., Mr. Reagan said, isn't trying to impose a purely military solution on Central America but is working for economic and social progress. But, he said, "to give democracy and development a chance to work in the face of increasing attacks, we are providing a shield of military training and assistance. . . ."

The president didn't disclose the names of other commission members. Administration officials say the White House plans to consult with certain senators and congressmen before naming academicians, businessmen and foreign policy experts to the panel.