

FOR IMMEDIATE RELEASE

AUGUST 6, 1975

OFFICE OF THE WHITE HOUSE PRESS SECRETARY

THE WHITE HOUSE

PRESS CONFERENCE  
OF  
PHILIP C. HABIB  
ASSISTANT SECRETARY  
BUREAU OF EAST ASIAN  
AND PACIFIC AFFAIRS

11:35 A.M. EDT

MR. HABIB: You all have a copy of the Joint Statement and the Joint Announcement?

Q No, sir.

MR. HABIB: You ought to get a copy of it because there are discretions in the copy. The typescript you have has some major or significant typographical --

MR. NESSEN: Let me say the corrections are being incorporated into the re-typed version. You better go through it once for the uncorrected copies.

MR. HABIB: Take your second paragraph of the Joint Announcement, that is the one that has the errors. The Joint Statement is fine as it is. The Joint Announcement has a couple of errors in it. The second paragraph after the word "principles" in the first line, insert "and common purposes underlying relations" so the sentence will read, "The Prime Minister and President reaffirmed the basic principles and common purposes underlying relations between Japan and the United States."

The title of the thing should be the U.S.-Japan Joint Announcement to the Press following the Meeting, if you add the words "to the Press" after the word "Announcement" on the top.

Go to Page 3, the sixth paragraph, seven lines down, the areas of nuclear is the opening phrase. You should insert after the word "nuclear" -- "the areas of nuclear" -- insert the following "arms limitation, the security of non-nuclear weapons states, and the use of nuclear" and then the sentence continues "energy for peaceful purposes."

MORE

Then the sentence reads, "In the areas of nuclear arms limitation, the security of non-nuclear weapons states and the use of nuclear energy for peaceful purposes."

Those sentences were left out in typing. There will be a clean corrected version, I understand, available to everyone shortly.

If I may just take a couple of seconds to give you some general comments before taking any questions. I think it would be fair to say that U.S.-Japanese relations have never been better. I think that emerged very clearly from the conversations between the President and the Prime Minister.

Additionally, I think it is quite clear from these conversations that on the basis of firm ties of mutual understanding and trust, the President and the Prime Minister established close personal rapport. And in that sense this was a summit meeting of great importance.

They would expect, also, that that good personal rapport which has been developed and the relations that stem from it will affect and influence overall Japanese-American relations and will be reflected also in the direct contacts which will take place between other members of the Administration of both countries -- the Secretary of State and the Foreign Minister and Secretary of Defense and his opposite number in the Japanese Defense Agency who will be meeting later this month.

In addition, it is quite clear that out of these types of meetings has developed a great sense of full consultation between the United States and Japan on problems of interest to us and the actions that will be taken in response to those problems.

It is that full consultation, it is that personal rapport of which I spoke of a while ago that has emerged most significantly and most obviously from this meeting between the President and the Prime Minister.

I will be glad now to take any questions.

Q Mr. Habib, did the Prime Minister bring any messages of any kind from North Korean authorities?

MR. HABIB: The Prime Minister did not bring any messages from the North Korean authorities. There was some reference to Korea, as you know, yesterday, and again today, but he did not bring any messages, no. He did refer generally to what had been said to a Japanese Diet member by the North Koreans but he did not bring any messages.

MORE

Q Phil, why this technique of a Joint Announcement and a Joint Statement?

MR. HABIB: Peter, the answer is very simple, it was decided quite early on and really it was a Japanese suggestion, that what they would like to do is have sort of a statement of principles, a sort of, you know, a level of agreements on fundamental principles that the two countries recognize in their pursuit of their own interest and in their pursuit of the joint relationship we have had with Japan for a long time.

In addition to that, it was quite clear you ought to also at least present to the public of both countries some detailed outline of the sorts of things that were discussed, the perceptions that were expressed with regard to specific things. There is a clear difference between the Statement and the Announcement in that regard. You will know that the Joint Statement does deal with broad principles and fundamental values which are mutually shared by the two countries.

Q I don't want to belabor the point, but why didn't you use the word "communiqué?"

MR. HABIB: There really wasn't any reason. I would make nothing of that difference. I assure you there was no intent to make any distinction in that regard.

Q Going to the communiqué, where you talk about the American umbrella, there is a half sentence which says that Japan --

MR. HABIB: Which paragraph are you referring to?

Q I don't have it in front of me. I read it, the statement or communiqué, not the Joint Statement, the other one which you corrected.

MR. HABIB: They are both joint.

Q Anyway, it says, "Japan continues to carry out its obligations under the Treaty, the Defense Treaty, obviously. What are these obligations?

MR. HABIB: Among other things, of course, there are the provisions of the appropriate facilities that permit the United States to employ its forces in Japan. There are the various provisions of that agreement which call upon the Japanese to cooperate in allowing us to conduct those military functions necessary on Japanese territory. That is one of the fundamental principles of the agreements.

MORE

Q Was there any reference or any talk about the need to increase Japan's defense budget?

MR. HABIB: That did not arise, no.

Q On the matter of the commonwealth status of the Mariana Islands, does that come into the relationship of Japan?

MR. HABIB: That did not arise and certainly does not arise in connection with the new security treaty.

Q Are their defense forces going to be increased dramatically or to any great extent?

MR. HABIB: That was not discussed.

Q Does this bring the United States and Japan any closer to Henry Kissinger's vision of April, 1973, when he talked about a relationship between Japan and the United States and West Europe?

MR. HABIB: I think you see a fruition of that beyond anything that has been anticipated at that time. I think you will recall it was not so many years ago we were dealing with the question of shocks, misunderstandings and dealings of passing each other by. There was probably, or possibly, a situation in which we had not achieved that kind of mutual understanding and degree of trust which now exists and which has been developed over a period of time, which has reached a sort of peak, as demonstrated by this meeting between the President and the Prime Minister. So, if you compare that period that you are talking about or particularly the period preceding it when there was what is known as the shock affecting our relationship, it is like comparing night and day.

We have come a long way from that thing and both sides recognize the distance we have come and both sides prefer this kind of relationship.

Q In other words, you are saying the Japanese have fully recovered from what we call the Nixon shock?

MR. HABIB: On the basis of everything that has been said, the attitudes, the personal rapport, the understanding as to the future -- I want to emphasize something to you, that in these talks both the President and the Prime Minister talked about the future, about the future relationship, about the future problems, it was not a question of rehashing past things. As a matter of fact, that did not arise in that sense. It was that vision of the future and the future of our relationship which probably overshadowed anything else in the talks.

MORE

Q Prime Minister Miki calls for a policy of reconciliation in Southeast Asia. I understand he made some suggestion to the President in this respect. Did he specifically suggest re-establishing relationships between the United States and the current South Vietnam and Cambodia?

MR. HABIB: No, he did not and I don't think he had in mind that. I think what he generally had in mind and which emerges clearly from the Joint Announcement is that both the United States and Japan recognize that there is a situation in Southeast Asia in which quite clearly it is in the interest of peace and stability in the area as a whole that there be the kind of dialogue and the kind of -- call it equitable dealing--which will transcent questionsof past affairs in the interests of peace and stability in the area.

The Prime Minister did not, as you suggest, come with any specific remarks in regard to what the United States should or should not do in those cases. I think what they were trying to establish more clearly is that such things as the Association of Southeast Asian Nations, such things as the aspirations of our friends and others in the area, so long as they deal with the development of the kind of stable and peaceful world order that one hopes to achieve in that part of the world, that we can operate fully consistently even though we may not be doing the same things in the same places.

Q What is the United States policy?

MR. HABIB: You know what the United States policy is. I think it has been expressed previously by the Secretary. As far as the specific question you raise of relations with those countries, the United States has not closed anything out for the future, as the Secretary of State himself has said. But at this time we will wait and see how they behave and what their attitude is. There was no discussion of that particular policy problem.

MORE

Q Can you tell us what took place at the private meeting in the White House last night about 7 o'clock?

MR. HABIB: If I were to, it would not have been a private meeting. No, I cannot.

Q What was discussed?

MR. HABIB: It was a continuation of the kind of very close and personal discussion between the President and the Prime Minister which was part of what I characterized earlier as bringing about that kind of personal rapport which emerged in this kind of a meeting.

They obviously discussed a number of things which were on their minds. Precisely what they discussed, I am not able to go into.

Q Did the Kuala Lumpur incident enter into it?

MR. HABIB: Not particularly last night, but it has been mentioned on a couple of occasions during the talks. I think, as you know from what Ron said yesterday, the Prime Minister expressed his regret at the incident. We expressed our understanding of the efforts the Japanese Government has been making, and they did, at each stage that they met, sort of review the current status of it. As far as I know, it has not yet been resolved when I left the office this morning.

Q What is meant in the paragraph concerning the United Nations and Korea expressing the hope that all concerned will recognize the importance of maintaining a structure which would preserve the armistice, what is meant by that?

MR. HABIB: As you may know, there is a proposal that we and others have made, including the Japanese, which provides for the possible dissolution of the United Nations Command if the fundamental terms involved in the armistice agreement are preserved.

What the reference there quite clearly is to the necessity for preserving the structure which maintains the armistice or a structure which would maintain the armistice now in effect. It is quite obvious that we are not interested in dismantling a structure which provides the basis for an armistice unless that provision is made for maintaining the basic purposes and, of course, maintaining the armistice.

Q Was there any discussion of the 30th anniversary of the dropping of the bomb?

MR. HABIB: No, there was not.

Q Was there any discussion of the French proposal for a monetary summit conference?

MR. HABIB: Peripherally.

MORE

Q Was there any specific discussion on the oil consuming and oil producing nations?

MR. HABIB: There was in the sense that it is quite clear that both Japan and the United States are concerned and interested in what happens in the Middle East. The Japanese are, as you know, highly dependent upon imported oil, a good deal of it from the Middle East. And there was a sharing of views as to the necessity for consumer solidarity as well as the desirability of developing that kind of international regime with respect to these things, both in terms of financial means and saving -- what is the word I am looking for that is normally used in that?

Q Conservation?

MR. HABIB: Conservation measures, thanks a lot. (Laughter.) So there was nothing new broken in that regard. As you can imagine, those are subjects which have been discussed on a number of occasions with the Japanese, and we both understand quite clearly the significance of oil, the desirability of the achievement of peace in the Middle East and its effect on both the economy of Japan and to a lesser extent, but still very significantly, the economy of the United States.

MR. NESSEN: Let me say one word here. Phil has to go to lunch. There is a signing ceremony of the voting rights bill that will begin in five minutes, so those of you who wish to go to that should really leave now. I don't know whether others of you want to stay here for a few more questions.

Q Phil, why was there no mention of China in the announcement to the press? In previous communication when the Japanese have come here they have always mentioned China.

MR. HABIB: I don't think, in terms of the joint statement, any particular country is mentioned.

Q I am talking about the announcement, what they call the announcement with the numbers on it. You know, the specific one.

MR. HABIB: Well, what would you like to know about the question of China, Tom? It is quite obvious, as you heard yesterday from Ron, there was a brief discussion and the President informed Mr. Miki in general terms of our intentions with respect to that.

You did cover that yesterday, didn't you, Ron? That is about it, it was not discussed again today.

Q The harmony that you spoke about in U.S.-Japanese relations, I just wondered if it extended to the triangular relations among Japan, China and the U.S.?

MR. HABIB: I would say firmly that certainly the rapport that was developed illustrated this kind of mutual understanding of the general situation in East Asia, including the relations with others of that sort.

MORE

Q Was there any specific understanding reached about Japanese access to U.S. agricultural commodities?

MR. HABIB: No, there was not. There was only a general discussion of the Japanese interest and dependence upon the United States as a source of supply for such commodities.

Q Another question on the Mariannas. Does this mean we are going to expand our nuclear capabilities any further?

MR. HABIB: I wouldn't read anything further in it. If the people of the Mariannas are determining a relationship with the United States then that relationship is going to be processed through the Constitutional procedures. There is a bill before the Congress and it will go from there. I wouldn't read anything more beyond that at this point.

Q What does the United States expect that Japan would do if there were an armed conflict in Korea? Would we consider Japan to be a friendly neutral toward us?

MR. HABIB: Let me make it very clear. If you will note, it is specifically stated in the joint announcement, and I would like to refer you to that paragraph. There are two or three significant statements-- of course, significant in the sense that they are quite clear in terms of their meaning as far as the question you raise is concerned.

The sentence that begins "They agree that the security of the Republic of Korea is essential to the maintenance of peace on the Korean peninsula, which in turn is necessary for peace and security in East Asia, including Japan." And the following sentence, "They noted the importance of the existing security arrangements for maintaining and preserving that peace." Those existing security arrangements include, of course, the presence of U.S. forces in Korea, the armistice agreement and, of course, the mutual security agreement -- between Japan and the United States insofar as it affects the presence of U.S. forces in Japan. I think you can read the significance of those statements in that.

Q You are saying we would have full access then?

MR. HABIB: I don't want to answer any specific questions that were not specifically discussed. I am just referring you to the fundamental policy statement which I think you can draw conclusions from yourself just as well as I can.

Q One last question on the subject of conservation, did whale killing come up?

MR. HABIB: Not that I am aware of, at least not that I have been told.

Ron, do you know if it did?

MORE

MR. NESSEN: No.

MR. HABIB: Not that I am aware of.

THE PRESS: Thank you.

END

(AT 11:57 A.M. EDT)