

would give the administration the authority to grant preferences for the import of steel from less-developed countries? I don't believe it for a minute.

While I agree entirely with what you say, Mr. Rockefeller, I just don't think it is politically feasible.

Chairman BOGGS. Mr. Reuss, do you have any questions?

Representative REUSS. Thank you, Mr. Chairman, for bringing before us these two wise and thoughtful witnesses.

Mr. Ball, you and I over the years have had a genial debate, but nevertheless a debate, about the Common Market. To caricature our positions a bit, I accuse you of being excessively in love with the Six, and you accuse me of being excessively doctrinaire. And I want to pursue the dialog this morning.

You, in effect, say that you are ready to throw in the sponge and go to a closed system, let Europe, with perhaps an expanded Common Market to include the United Kingdom, take over Africa, accept African imports into Europe on a preferential basis, and let African countries receive European exports on a preferentially low basis, and devolve upon Europe the general aid and welfare burden of the developed world. And you then say, let the United States do likewise, generally speaking, for Latin America.

If you want to correct my statement, do so.

Mr. BALL. No, I think that is about right.

Representative REUSS. May I put to you my alternative, so you may comment on it. My alternative is that I don't think we are yet forced to that unpleasant position of dividing the world into zones of influence, having papal lines of demarkation. And I don't think it is a policy very relevant to the world of quick communications and the seamless web in which we now live.

Now, I do not in any way belittle the valiant diplomatic efforts you made 3 or 4 years ago to try to get Europeans out of their parochial closed system view. But I would hate to see our country toss in the sponge and operate a closed system without making it the utmost object of public discussion, without allowing some time for a public great debate on it, and particularly without making an all American, all out stand to revive the principle of nondiscriminatory multilateralism, the principle of GATT, at the very highest public level, I mean summit conferences with heads of State. And if we don't succeed, if we are forced to it, admittedly there would be no alternative. But where you and I think differently is that you say that that point is now—that we should sort of slide into a closed system. I would much prefer us trying to get the Europeans, the French, the Italians, and the Germans, that have great historical ties with Latin America, to come in and help us on that burden, and conversely, to try to get the Europeans progressively to diminish these preferences so that Latin America can come into their markets. There really is a policy choice.

I think I must get some help for my point of view later from David Rockefeller, but please come back to that.

Mr. BALL. I don't quarrel with the way you described it, Mr. Reuss, but I think you are putting it a little more easily than I did.

In general, I am completely in agreement that closed systems make a very bad use of resources—if you were to sectionalize the world and