

1.3:

7/1838



THE DEPARTMENT OF STATE BULLETIN

Volume LXXI • No. 1838 • September 16, 1974

AMERICA'S STRENGTH AND AMERICA'S PURPOSES
Address by Secretary Kissinger 373

PRESIDENT FORD'S NEWS CONFERENCE OF AUGUST 28
Excerpts From Transcript 378

U.S.-EGYPTIAN JOINT COOPERATION COMMISSION
MEETS AT WASHINGTON
*Remarks by Secretary Kissinger and Foreign Minister Fahmy
and Text of Joint Communique 380*

Boston
Superintendent of Documents

SEP 11 1975

DEPOSITORY

THE OFFICIAL WEEKLY RECORD OF UNITED STATES FOREIGN POLICY

For index see inside back cover

THE DEPARTMENT OF STATE **BULLETIN**

VOL. LXXI, No. 1838
September 16, 1974

The Department of State BULLETIN, a weekly publication issued by the Office of Media Services, Bureau of Public Affairs, provides the public and interested agencies of the government with information on developments in the field of U.S. foreign relations and on the work of the Department and the Foreign Service.

The BULLETIN includes selected press releases on foreign policy, issued by the White House and the Department, and statements, addresses and news conferences of the President and the Secretary of State and other officers of the Department, as well as special articles on various phases of international affairs and the functions of the Department. Information is included concerning treaties and international agreements to which the United States is or may become a party and on treaties of general international interest.

Publications of the Department of State, United Nations documents, and legislative material in the field of international relations are also listed

For sale by the Superintendent of Documents
U.S. Government Printing Office
Washington, D.C. 20402

PRICE:

52 issues plus semiannual indexes,
domestic \$29.80, foreign \$37.25
Single copy 60 cents

Use of funds for printing this publication approved by the Director of the Office of Management and Budget (January 29, 1971).

Note: Contents of this publication are not copyrighted and items contained herein may be reprinted. Citation of the DEPARTMENT OF STATE BULLETIN as the source will be appreciated. The BULLETIN is indexed in the Readers' Guide to Periodical Literature.

Ame

I b
Ford,
looks
tional
I ar
this e
organiz
securi
life fo
write

swerv
centur
fects
nizati
natio

The
only t
by its
a dec
Amer
emerg

For
War
thing
volven
do no
anniv
turne

By lea
possib
treme
which
This h
nition

Mad
Americ
lease 30

Septem

America's Strength and America's Purposes

*Address by Secretary Kissinger*¹

I bring you the greetings of President Ford, who has asked that I tell you that he looks forward to being with you at your national convention next year.

I am proud to accept the honor you do me this evening. The basic objective of this organization, the maintenance of our national security, has been the central concern of my life for over two decades as a teacher and writer as well as a public servant. Your unswerving dedication to that goal for half a century, through good times and bad, reflects not only the striving of a single organization but also the purposes of an entire nation.

The greatness of a nation is measured not only by its courage in an hour of crisis but by its response to a prolonged ordeal. After a decade of national tragedy and travail, America and the American people have now emerged strong and united.

For two decades after the Second World War we believed that we could do everything; more recently some spoke of overinvolvement and began to believe that we could do nothing. But as we approach our 200th anniversary our faith in ourselves has returned. We are the better for our experience. By learning our limits, we have learned our possibilities as well. We have rejected the extremes of world policeman and isolation which have too long dominated our debate. This has enabled us to move toward the definition of a foreign policy that the American

people can support and sustain over the decades to come.

Our constancy is the hope of the world. As President Ford stated in his first address to the Congress last week:

So long as the peoples of the world have confidence in our purposes and faith in our word, the age-old vision of peace on earth will grow brighter.

There is no goal which occupies more of the time and thought and prayer of any President than to bring peace to America and peace to the world.

Each age has striven for peace; yet wars inevitably came either by decision or miscalculation. No generation in this century has avoided it. This age must be different. For the first time in history, man has the capacity quite literally to destroy mankind. In our era, miscalculation could end life itself.

No group of men understands better the meaning of peace than those who have experienced personally the agonies of war.

The greatest of America's military leaders have always been in the forefront of those who have sought to turn man's eternal history of conflict into a new international order of justice and cooperation and peace.

Thus George Marshall's contribution to mankind after the Second World War may have surpassed even his historic contribution during the war. He helped forge the national conviction that America's security is inseparable from the world's security and that the great issues of national defense transcend party and partisan purpose. This tradition has served us well through five administrations.

¹ Made at Miami, Fla., on Aug. 20 before the American Legion National Convention (press release 335).

Dwight Eisenhower added another dimension. He called attention to the necessity of a strong standing defense. In his words "the weak have no assurance of peace. They can only accept the future without influence upon it." But he also understood that in the nuclear age strength cannot be an end in itself. He proclaimed what no President since has ever forgotten: "There is no longer any alternative to peace."

So our search for peace begins with America's strength. For other nations to have confidence in our purposes and faith in our word, America must remain a military power second to none. As I can attest from experience, in time of crisis and at the conference table, America's military might is the foundation of our diplomatic strength. We have made progress toward peace in recent years because we have been flexible, but also because we have been resolute. Let us never forget that conciliation is a virtue only in those who are thought to have a choice.

—A strong defense is the essential deterrent to aggression. By demonstrating that there is no alternative to negotiation, it is the precondition of our policy of relaxing tensions with our adversaries.

—A strong defense is the cement of our alliances, reinforcing our partners' will to join in the common defense. It is the basis of mutual confidence and thus of our cooperation across the whole spectrum of our common interests.

Since the Second World War, each administration regardless of party has supported the maintenance of our military strength. And on every major question of national defense for the past quarter century Congress has supported the President. This is a proud record which we must and will sustain.

But we are living in an age when the issues of defense are of unprecedented complexity. In the nuclear age we must:

—Allocate resources between strategic and tactical forces.

—Relate military strength to foreign policy goals.

—Maintain our security while ending and ultimately reversing the arms race.

In an era of rough strategic balance, the threat to launch an all-out nuclear war grows less and less credible; hence it is less and less likely to deter the full range of potential conflicts. Military challenges at the conventional level may become more difficult to prevent. Thus the political and military importance of tactical forces grows correspondingly.

Our conventional forces must therefore be strong. They keep the nuclear threshold high by helping to contain, discourage, or altogether prevent hostilities. They are the essential tool of our diplomacy in times of crisis. In no recent crisis did we come close to using our strategic forces, but on many occasions our tactical forces were alerted or deployed to deter aggressive actions or to defend the interests of America and its allies. About one-third of our conventional forces are deployed abroad. They are there to serve these purposes. They are not overseas as a favor to foreigners; they are abroad as part of our defense.

American forces in Europe are a vivid illustration of these principles. Reducing our forces there unilaterally would risk serious military and political instability in the center of Europe, enhance Soviet political influence by default, and, ironically, make reliance on nuclear weapons more necessary. It would undercut promising negotiations for the mutual reduction of forces. The defense of Western Europe remains—as it has been throughout the postwar period—the cornerstone of our own security.

Just as we must assure a balance of conventional forces, so we must also assure a nuclear balance. We are determined never to fall behind in nuclear arms. We will never accept the strategic preponderance of another power. We will maintain our strategic weapons program at whatever level is required to achieve this end.

The definition of adequacy or sufficiency or equivalence is not simple, however. Throughout history the essential task of national se-

curi
wom
erat
conl
poli
T
mus
claw
of m
sent
Whe
strop
yond
litica
struc
diffe
obje
litica
A
by be
rity.
er le
orbit
of ho
cal c
time
and se
Thi
vocate
acts a
ers to
negoti
tion of
We
—F
gotiate
streng
not fal
—Se
Arms
convict
We are
our ow
The
that in
maintai
actions
all possi
tiations

curity was to accumulate military power. It would have seemed inconceivable even a generation ago that such power, once gained, could not be translated directly into foreign policy advantage.

Today we, as well as the Soviet Union, must start from the premise that in the nuclear era an increase in certain categories of military power does not necessarily represent an increase of usable political strength. When two nations are already capable of destroying each other, an upper limit exists beyond which additional weapons lose their political significance. The overwhelming destructiveness of nuclear weapons makes it difficult to relate their use to specific political objectives and may indeed generate new political problems.

A continual expansion of strategic forces by both sides will not result in greater security. It will only lead to new balances at higher levels of complexity and risk and at exorbitant cost. It will generate an atmosphere of hostility and suspicion that makes political conflict more likely and that will over time thwart aspirations for a more tranquil and secure world.

This is why President Ford, an ardent advocate of national defense, as one of his first acts as President has invited the Soviet leaders to join with us in an intensified effort to negotiate an effective and equitable limitation of strategic arms.

We will be guided by two basic principles:

—First, until further arms limits are negotiated we will maintain American strategic strength, whatever the cost. Our power will not falter through lack of resolve or sacrifice.

—Second, we will pursue the Strategic Arms Limitation Talks with an energy and conviction equal to the challenge before us. We are determined to become the masters of our own technology, not its slave.

The President has asked me to emphasize that in his view the choice is clear. We will maintain the nuclear balance by unilateral actions if we must and by negotiations if at all possible. I can assure you that these negotiations will not fail for lack of good will and

readiness to explore new solutions on our part.

Winston Churchill once said to the American people:

The destiny of mankind is not decided by material computation. When great causes are on the move . . . we learn that something is going on in space and time, and beyond space and time, which, whether we like it or not, spells duty.

America now has an opportunity—and hence a duty—which comes rarely to a nation: to help shape a new peaceful international order. This challenge exists for us as a people, not as partisans of any cause. This is why this effort—even in periods of great domestic strain—has had bipartisan support. The leaders of both parties in Congress deserve the nation's gratitude for having insulated our foreign and security policies from our recent domestic travails.

President Nixon's legacy to President Ford is a world safer than the one he found. President Ford has dedicated himself to leaving to his successor a world at peace and living with a consciousness of peace.

Many of the conflicts that have haunted the past three decades have been overcome. We have muted the constant crises over Berlin; for the first time it is possible to conceive of a lasting settlement in the Middle East; our combat involvement in the Vietnam war has been ended honorably and the level of fighting reduced. The United States and the Soviet Union, after decades of profound suspicion, have perceived a common interest in avoiding nuclear holocaust and in establishing a broad web of constructive relationships. And two decades of estrangement between the United States and the People's Republic of China have given way to constructive dialogue and productive exchanges.

But if this world is better than our fears, it is still far short of our hopes. We have eased many crises; we have not yet eliminated their roots. Our achievements, solid as they are, have not yet resolved the dangers and divisions of the postwar era. We have begun but not completed the journey from

confrontation to cooperation, from coexistence to community. We are determined to complete that journey.

In pursuing our course we shall encounter many obstacles. There will be turmoil in many parts of the world, such as the current situation in Cyprus. Our attitude will be that we cannot be the world's policeman but that we will always use our influence for peace and conciliation. We will not yield to pressure groups but we will always listen to reason. We will act in foreign policy as trustee of the future, conscious that we will be judged on how well we built an enduring peace and not how often we bowed to the emotional demands of the moment.

America is still the hope of the world, not only because of our physical resources and military might but because of the creativity of our people, the vitality of our institutions, and the ideals of our nation.

At a time when some in this country doubted our ability to cope with the challenges of our future, most of the world perceived that America was emerging stronger than at any period in the past decade. Our alliances are strong. A nation once preoccupied with Viet-Nam is now addressing its broader purposes. A nation once isolated from one major Communist power and in a posture of confrontation with the other has opened a constructive dialogue with both. And a nation facing the crises of a world grown economically interdependent has, unsatisfactory as it is, one of the lowest rates of inflation in the world and is less dependent on foreign sources of energy than any other industrialized nation.

Thus we have a firm base on which to build.

—We must insure that the heart of American foreign policy, our alliances with the Atlantic community and Japan, can meet the challenges of the next generation. America's principal alliances have overcome a period of strain brought about by the inevitable adjustment to new conditions. We now have an opportunity for a new period of creativity in joint efforts to deal with the problems and opportunities of an increasingly interdependent world. Maintaining the vitality of our al-

liances and giving even greater impetus to their joint efforts will be one of the principal goals of President Ford's foreign policy.

—We must insure that a history in which brief moments of improved Soviet-American relations gave way to prolonged periods of confrontation is replaced by an irreversible commitment to the maintenance of peace. We will spare no effort to reconcile the reality of competition with the imperative of cooperation. In the nuclear era there is no rational alternative.

—We must sustain the process of growing understanding and respect which we have launched with the People's Republic of China. Deep differences in ideology and policy remain. But we believe the new relationship serves fundamental national purposes of both countries; it can be strengthened with dedication and care, and it will endure.

—We must create in the Middle East a lasting peace, not just another cease-fire. My trips throughout that tragically torn area have convinced me of one essential fact above all others: The peoples of the Middle East, be they Arab or Jew, have had enough of bloodshed; they cry out for peace. And peace can be theirs if they and we have the will and patience to achieve it. For the Arabs, there can be no peace without a recovery of territory and the redress of grievances of a displaced people. For Israel, peace requires both security and recognition by its neighbors of its legitimacy as a nation. Our Arab and Israeli friends have, with our help over the past six months, taken the first difficult steps down the road toward fulfillment of these aspirations. We have a long distance yet to travel, but with patience and hard work we will complete the journey. The people of the Middle East deserve it; the peace of the world demands it.

—We must work with our friends in Africa and the nonaligned world in support of their national independence, economic growth, and social progress.

—We must build in the Western Hemisphere a new relationship of equality and partnership. We shall be guided by the conviction that a shared history creates an opportunity and common aspirations provide

the basis for fresh approaches. The relationship between industrialized and developing nations cannot be solved creatively anywhere if not in this hemisphere.

—We must strengthen the ability of the peoples of Indochina to determine their own destiny. After the Second World War we spent hundreds of billions to help former ally and enemy alike to recover from the devastation of six years of war. After the Korean war we spent billions to assist in the rebuilding of South Korea. Yet today, after a decade of war and the loss of 50,000 American lives, some hesitate to give South Viet-Nam—for whom the war has not yet ended—the help it so desperately needs to maintain itself as an independent nation. It would be tragic; it would break faith with all those Americans who have fought and died there if we now fail to make the relatively modest effort that the administration has proposed to the Congress to enable South Viet-Nam to survive.

There is an item of unfinished business in Indochina that I know is of special concern to this audience: the accounting for our men who are missing in action, including the dead whose bodies were never recovered. I have met periodically with the families of our missing men continually over the past five years; I know how difficult it is for them to live without knowing the fate of their loved ones. More than 18 months have passed since the signing of the Paris agreement, which specified that there should be cooperation on this humanitarian problem. Surely there should be no political or military advantage in a proper accounting for the missing and the return of the remains of the dead. Our efforts will continue until we have obtained the fullest possible accounting as required by solemn agreements.

Peace, however, is something more than the absence of armed conflict. It is something deeper than the establishment of stability. To enlist the support of humanity it must reflect man's eternal hopes for a humane and prosperous world.

The excitement of creation, of crossing new frontiers, has characterized every major

period of American history. Now we face an unprecedented new challenge.

The products of man's technical genius—weapons of incalculable power, a global economic system, a technology that consumes finite resources at an ever-expanding rate—have compressed this planet and multiplied our mutual dependence. In an age of instantaneous communication the quest for justice and dignity has become universal. The national interest can no longer be pursued in isolation from the global interest, as the problems of energy, food, and inflation have recently made clear.

Man has made his world interdependent. Now the challenge is to make it whole.

An enlightened national self-interest requires major American initiatives for an open and cooperative world. Without global solutions our own economy will stagnate. Without an American contribution there can be no global solution. Industrially, we are the most advanced nation in the world. We are still a pioneering nation, on the frontiers of the most important revolutions of the last third of the 20th century in technology, communications, agriculture, and health.

With your support and the support of the American people we will contribute to:

—Cooperative efforts to insure an expanding supply of energy and other essential materials at an equitable price.

—Overcoming rampant global inflation by cooperating in building a trade, monetary, and investment system that stimulates global economic growth.

—Fashioning a long-term policy for dealing with chronic global food shortages and striking a balance between food production and population growth.

—Helping the third of mankind threatened with starvation and permanent underdevelopment create a better future.

We in the United States cannot alone assure that the overriding need of cooperation will overcome the historic selfishness of the nation-state. But it is equally clear that mankind cannot fulfill its needs without the faith, the dynamism, and the creativity of our country.

We have a long tradition in this country of arming with great haste when war comes upon us and disarming with even greater haste when the war is over. We have tended to view our relations with nations in terms of absolutes—friend or foe, ally or adversary, unlimited war or permanent peace. We have acted in cycles of overcommitment and withdrawal, enthusiasm and cynicism.

This we can no longer afford. We must commit ourselves for the long haul. The search for peace is not a part-time job.

We must learn to deal with nuance, to strive for what is good while never forgetting what is best. Fate has offered us an unprecedented opportunity for creativity in the search for peace.

Let us not rest on the achievements of recent years, but let us summon new hope and new faith in ourselves to go beyond.

If we are true to ourselves, America can be both strong and purposeful, principled and realistic, equally devoted to deterring war and to achieving man's greatest hopes. Over three decades ago President Roosevelt said of his generation that it had a rendezvous with destiny. Let it be said of our generation that it had—and met—a rendezvous with peace.

President Ford's News Conference of August 28

Following are excerpts relating to foreign policy from the transcript of a news conference held by President Ford in the East Room of the White House on August 28.¹

Q. Some oil governments and some commercial cartels, notably Aramco in Saudi Arabia, are restricting oil production in order to keep oil prices artificially high. Now, the United States can't do anything about Venezuela, but it can conceivably vis-a-vis cartels like Aramco. What steps and actions do you plan to take in this regard?

President Ford: I think this points up very vividly the need and necessity for us to accelerate every aspect of Project Independence; I think it highlights the need and necessity for us to proceed with more oil and gas drilling—a greater supply domestically. I believe it points up the requirement that we expedite the licensing processes for new nuclear reactors. I think it points up very dramatically the need that we expand our geothermal, our solar research and development in the field of energy.

In the meantime, it seems to me that the effort that was made several months ago to put together a group of consumer-industrial nations requires that this group meet frequently and act as much as possible in concert, because if we have any economic adverse repercussions because of high oil prices and poor investment policies, it could create serious economic problems throughout the industrial world.

So it does require, I believe, the short-term action by consumer nations and the long-term actions under Project Independence.

Q. Mr. President, you said last March in an interview, I think in Sea Power magazine, that you came down quite strongly in favor of establishing a U.S. Indian Ocean fleet with the necessary bases to support it. Do you still stand by that, and do you favor the development of Diego Garcia?

President Ford: I favor the limited expansion of our base at Diego Garcia. I don't view this as any challenge to the Soviet Union. The Soviet Union already has three major naval operating bases in the Indian Ocean. This particular proposed construction, I think, is a wise policy, and it ought not to ignite any escalation of the problems in the Middle East.

Q. Mr. President, my question applies to a 1972 statement in which you said that an impediment to a regional peace settlement is

¹ For the complete text, see Weekly Compilation of Presidential Documents dated Sept. 2.

an impediment to preserve the fiction that Jerusalem is not the capital of Israel. My question, sir, is would you, now that you set foreign policy, request that the Embassy be shifted from Tel Aviv to Jerusalem along with 17 other national Embassies?

President Ford: Under the current circumstances and the importance of getting a just and lasting peace in the Middle East, I think that particular proposal ought to stand aside. We must come up with some answers between Israel and the Arab nations in order to achieve a peace that is both fair and durable.

Q. Mr. President, do you contemplate any changes in our policy with Cuba?

President Ford: The policy that we have toward Cuba today is determined by the sanctions voted by the Organization of American States, and we abide by those actions that were taken by the members of that organization.

Now, if Cuba changes its policy toward us and toward its Latin neighbors, we of course would exercise the option, depending on what the changes were, to change our policy. But before we made any change, we would certainly act in concert with the other members of the Organization of American States.

Q. Mr. President, when do you expect the SALT talks [Strategic Arms Limitation Talks] to resume? And is there a disagreement over our position in the Pentagon and State Department and other agencies?

President Ford: At the present time, there is an effort being made to bring the Department of Defense, the State Department, and any others together for a resolution of our, the U.S. position regarding SALT Two. This decision will be made in the relatively near future.

I don't think there are any basic difficulties that cannot be resolved internally within our government. I believe that Secretary Kissinger is going to be meeting with representatives from the Soviet Union in the near

future, I think in October, if my memory is correct, and we of course will then proceed on a timetable to try and negotiate SALT Two. I think a properly negotiated effective strategic arms limitation agreement is in the best interests of ourselves, the Soviet Union, and a stable international situation.

U.S. Humanitarian Assistance to Cyprus

Following is a statement read to news correspondents on August 20 by Robert Anderson, Special Assistant to the Secretary of State for Press Relations.

The Secretary has authorized an additional cash grant of \$500,000 to the International Red Cross to meet urgent needs that that group is in the process of identifying on the island of Cyprus.

This is in addition to a previous grant of \$225,000 that was made available through the American Red Cross to the ICRC [International Committee of the Red Cross].

In addition, the United States has made available from its AID regional disaster stockpile in Leghorn, Italy, over \$600,000 worth of tents, blankets, water containers, and other material which have been requested by the Red Cross.

The Secretary also instructed Ambassador [L. Dean] Brown, who is proceeding to Cyprus as his personal representative, to assess current needs urgently with the aid of a disaster relief expert from AID and report urgently on these needs.

The Secretary also welcomed U.N. Secretary General Waldheim's decision to ask the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees to use his best efforts to actively pursue a humanitarian relief effort to help the people of Cyprus.

The Department is contacting representatives of European governments to encourage them to make a greater effort to meet what we are certain will be additional requirements for food, shelter, and medical supplies.

U.S. Egyptian Joint Cooperation Commission Meets at Washington

Ismail Fahmy, Minister of Foreign Affairs of the Arab Republic of Egypt, made an official visit to Washington August 12-19. Following are remarks exchanged by Secretary Kissinger and Foreign Minister Fahmy on August 19 upon signing a joint U.S.-Egyptian communique, together with the text of the communique.

EXCHANGE OF REMARKS

Press release 334A dated August 19

Secretary Kissinger

Mr. Foreign Minister: I would like to express the gratification of my colleagues, myself, above all, the President, for the very fruitful meetings we have had here.

The discussions were in two parts. One concerned the direction of future peace efforts in the Middle East. We found these talks extremely constructive, and they will be exceedingly helpful as we jointly plan the next phases of movement toward a just and lasting peace in the Middle East.

Egypt has played a crucial role in the first phase, and we know it will play an equally crucial role in the future phases.

At the same time, we have had very detailed discussions about the bilateral relations that have developed between Egypt and the United States.

We should always keep in mind that it is only 10 months since my friend Ismail came here for the first time. I won't say what he is expecting me to say— [Laughter.]

No one could imagine then that such a

dramatic turn in our bilateral relations would be possible.

The administration is strongly supporting the requests we have made to Congress. In addition, we will give the highest priority to Egypt's needs that we can meet under the P.L. 480.

But beyond all the specifics, we consider the growing friendship between Egypt and the United States a cardinal point of our foreign policy which will come to expression in the general area of the Middle East, as well as in our joint effort to strengthen our mutual alliance.

I would like to say, on behalf of the President and all of my colleagues, that the Foreign Minister's visit here has made a very major contribution in all of these respects.

Foreign Minister Fahmy

Mr. Secretary: On behalf of my colleagues of the Egyptian delegation and in my name, I would like to thank you personally and thank your colleagues for the very constructive and useful discussions which took place between both of us, separately and between our two delegations, on the Joint American-Egyptian Commission.

I can't leave this historical moment without thanking your President for the honor he gave me in receiving me and having a working lunch with him, with your presence. It was a very constructive meeting, which I consider is very indicative in the sense that it will build on the friendship between our two countries, and I can assure you from

our part we will do our best to cement this friendship.

I am grateful, too, Mr. Secretary, for the reception which was given to me by the members of the House Foreign Affairs Committee and the members of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee.

I am grateful to every individual who participated in one way or another in my mission.

I am grateful to the information media for the coverage they have made to our talks, and I can assure you and assure the American people that we in Egypt have the best of intentions toward the American people. I think I would be very faithful in conveying through this opportunity to the American people the friendship of President Sadat and the Egyptian people and that we are looking forward for the visit of my President to your country upon the invitation of President Ford and we are sure that we will work together for a better future from every point of view.

TEXT OF JOINT U.S.-EGYPTIAN COMMUNIQUE

Press release 334 dated August 19

His Excellency Ismail Fahmy, Minister of Foreign Affairs of the Arab Republic of Egypt, made an official visit to Washington, August 12-19, at the invitation of Secretary of State Henry Kissinger. The Foreign Minister met with President Ford and Secretary Kissinger for a wide-ranging and productive exchange of views. He also led a high-level delegation to meetings of the United States-Egyptian Joint Cooperation Commission.

Foreign Minister Fahmy was the guest of honor at a small working luncheon with President Ford on August 14. The Foreign Minister also attended the Joint Session of Congress August 12 and heard in person President Ford's commitment to the continuity of United States foreign policy, and specifically his commitment that the United States Government would continue determined efforts to help bring about a peace settlement in the Middle East.

The discussions the Foreign Minister held with President Ford and Secretary Kissinger were a constructive contribution to the consultations now underway looking toward the next stage in negotiations for a just and durable peace in the Middle East—a

peace which they agree should take into due account the legitimate interests of all the peoples in the Middle East, including the Palestinian people, and the right to existence of all states in the area. They agreed that the Geneva Peace Conference on the Middle East should resume its work as soon as possible, building on the progress achieved, with the question of other participants from the Middle East area to be discussed at the Conference.

The President declared that he was dedicated to strengthening in all ways the relationship of growing friendship and trust between Egypt and the United States. In this connection, the President reaffirmed to the Foreign Minister that he was looking forward with pleasure to the visit of President Anwar al-Sadat later this year.

During the week, the Foreign Minister consulted with members of the Foreign Affairs Committee of the House of Representatives led by Chairman Morgan, and with members of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee led by Senator Fulbright. While noting that further legislative action is required, the Foreign Minister expressed his gratification that during this past week the Senate Foreign Relations Committee had included in its report to the Senate an authorization for \$250 million aid for Egypt. He discussed evolving United States-Egyptian relations with journalists and businessmen.

The Joint Cooperation Commission

A centerpiece of the activities in Washington this past week was the second session of the Joint Cooperation Commission, the first having been held in Cairo on June 12. The Commission meetings were attended by Ismail Sabri Abdallah, Egyptian Minister of Planning, Ashraf Ghorbal, Ambassador of Egypt, Dr. Ahmed Effat, Coordinator of Egyptian-American Economic Cooperation, and other high officials of the Egyptian Ministries of Foreign Affairs, Industry and Mining, Agriculture, Finance, Reconstruction and Housing, Electricity, Supply, Higher Education and Scientific Research, and Public Health, as well as from the Federation of Egyptian Industries, the Agency for International and Arab Economic Cooperation, and the Suez Canal Authority.

The United States delegation included Secretary of the Treasury Simon, Deputy Secretary of State Ingersoll, Under Secretary of the Treasury Bennett, Under Secretary of Commerce Tabor, AID Administrator Parker, and high officials from the Departments of State, Treasury, Commerce, Agriculture, and Health, Education and Welfare, as well as the National Science Foundation.

The two delegations joined in lengthy and detailed discussions of mutually beneficial programs in the economic, scientific, and cultural fields that would be undertaken under the auspices of the Commission. Both sides expressed their satisfaction with the

progress made thus far in designing measures for deepening cooperation between Egypt and the United States, and reaffirmed their intention to continue building on the foundation of the June 14 Statement of Principles and Cooperation.

There was mutual agreement that the membership, procedural rules and meeting schedules for the working groups under the Commission should remain flexible.

At the conclusion of the Commission session, the Foreign Minister and the Secretary of State as co-chairmen announced a number of results and conclusions:

Economic and Financial Cooperation

—The first meeting of the Commission's Joint Working Group on Economic and Financial Cooperation took place at the Treasury Department on August 13. It was decided there that certain Egyptian representatives would remain in Washington for further discussions on matters of mutual interest.

—It was agreed that, in order to reduce obstacles to trade and investment between the United States and the Arab Republic of Egypt, it would be useful to enter into a convention for the avoidance of double taxation and for mutual cooperation between the tax authorities of the two countries. A revised draft of such a convention was reviewed this past week by the working group and agreement in principle was reached on basic objectives and subjects to be covered. Both parties are hopeful that final agreement can be reached during discussions at meetings of the working group and sub-committees scheduled to commence in the United States on October 7.

Private Investment

—Ways of stimulating a greater flow of private investment capital to promising industrial and infrastructure projects in Egypt were discussed. The United States delegation expressed its intention to send experts as soon as possible to consult with the Egyptian National Institute of Management Development on the means of giving this organization added capability for preparing feasibility studies which would attract foreign investors. The United States side noted with interest the Egyptian hope that this organization might ultimately serve as a nucleus for wider regional endeavors.

—The Egyptian delegation presented detailed studies on a number of projects susceptible to joint venture arrangements with American business firms, and the United States delegation undertook to explore means of bringing these opportunities to the attention of interested American companies.

Suez Projects

—Useful discussions were held on specific areas in which, subject to Congressional authorization and

approval, United States assistance might contribute to the satisfaction of urgent needs concerning the reopening of the Suez Canal and the rehabilitation of the principal cities along the canal: Suez City, Ismailia, and Port Said. The two sides examined Egyptian priorities in this respect, and a tentative understanding was reached as regards the desirability of dealing primarily with telecommunications, electric power distribution, equipment for canal operations, road-building equipment, building material and infrastructure requirements. It was agreed that a number of projects will require further studies in working group meetings scheduled for October. Egyptian plans for the further development of the Suez Canal were discussed. The Egyptian delegation would welcome the participation of American firms in this field.

Commodity Imports

—Detailed discussions were held and agreement in principle was reached on a list of commodities the United States might provide under a projected commodity import program, as well as on the machinery for dealing with Egyptian needs promptly once Congress has authorized and appropriated funds under this AID program.

Agriculture

—Particularly rewarding discussions between Egyptian and United States officials took place with regard to Egypt's vitally important agricultural sector in order to establish and improve communication between the two countries on agricultural development. Ideas for introducing new technologies and promoting agro-business opportunities were examined at length. The discussions emphasized the importance of technical cooperation between the two countries for the modernization of Egyptian agriculture.

—It was agreed that the re-initiation of the grain silos project should receive high priority attention.

—The United States extended an invitation to the Egyptian Minister of Agriculture, Mohamed Moheb Zaki, to visit the United States in the fall for further discussions on these matters.

—Another important topic, examined in depth by the working group and the Commission as a whole, concerned Egypt's requirements for certain agricultural commodities. These needs were examined in light of current American crop projections and worldwide requirements for American foodstuffs. These requirements are now under active consideration by the United States Government. A decision will be communicated to the Egyptian Government as soon as possible.

In the meantime, meetings of United States and Egyptian representatives on other areas of cooperation proceeded. Specifically:

Representatives of the two governments carried on mutually beneficial discussions on cooperation in science and technology. Promising cooperative activities that were discussed included support to research and development facilities in Egyptian universities and research centers, as well as possible joint research and development projects in the fields of water economy, agricultural and industrial development, and certain important environmental problems.

Agreement was reached that there would be a meeting of the Working Group on Technology, Research and Development in Cairo during the week of October 7, 1974, to cover the following principal items:

(a) Completion of the text of an intergovernmental agreement to promote and facilitate science and technology cooperation between governmental agencies, universities and research centers of the two countries.

(b) Consideration of initial specific projects proposed for cooperation.

(c) Review of ongoing cooperative science and technology programs and activities.

Culture and Education

Agreement was reached that there would be a meeting of the Working Group in Cairo October 24-25-26, 1974, at which the principal items to be considered would be:

(a) Review of the 1962 Agreement between Egypt and the United States with a view to strengthening the cultural and educational relations between the two countries.

(b) The expansion of exchange visits by prominent Egyptians and Americans in fields of mutual interest, and general augmentation of cultural and educational exchanges.

(c) Arrangements for exhibitions of art treasures and visits by performing arts groups.

(d) Planning for the reconstruction of the Cairo Opera House.

(e) Discussion of the possibilities of United States technical assistance and support for Egyptian cultural and education institutions.

(f) Discussion of additional ways in which exchanges can contribute to deepening mutual understanding and promoting cooperation between the peoples of the two countries.

The Egyptian Delegation conveyed with great pleasure the decision of the Egyptian Government to place the "treasures of Tutankhamen" on exhibit in the United States on the historic occasion of the Bicentennial Festivities as a further expression of

the friendship of the people of Egypt for the people of the United States.

Medical Cooperation

United States and Egyptian delegates examined specific proposals for medical cooperation, and reached general agreement on the broad priority objectives in areas in which initial cooperative efforts will be concentrated. These areas are health, manpower development, joint research, and the production of pharmaceuticals and health-related supplies and equipment. They also examined ways of developing a long-term program of cooperation in these areas, through such mechanisms as strengthening cooperation with the Nasser Institute for Research and Medical Care. Dr. Edwards, Assistant Secretary of Health of the Department of Health, Education and Welfare, will lead a delegation to meetings of the Working Group on Medical Cooperation in Cairo, September 23-26.

Future Activities of the Joint Commission

Throughout the Commission meetings, United States delegation members paid especially close attention to Egyptian explanations of their economic and social development priorities and objectives over the coming several years and declared that they would make special efforts to ensure that United States cooperative programs were in harmony with Egyptian aspirations for a stronger and more diversified economy. With this end in mind, it was agreed by the two delegations that specific plans should be drawn up by November for establishing a joint business chamber composed of business representatives from both countries. Such an organization could be a practical instrument for expanding the flow of trade between the two countries and joining business in mutually advantageous ventures.

Secretary of State Kissinger and Foreign Minister Fahmy, on behalf of their respective delegations, reached a common judgment that the discussions this week, which ranged over a broad landscape of cooperation, had lent substance to the spirit of friendship and respect that has been developing between the two countries. The meetings were characterized by growing momentum and a sense of anticipation among those concerned with the Commission's activities. The two chairmen concluded that, the necessary preliminaries and organizational preparations now having been completed, the work of the Commission can proceed in earnest.

The Secretary of State and the Foreign Minister intend to hold a third session of the Joint Cooperation Commission before the end of this year during the visit to the United States of President al-Sadat. It is anticipated by that time that additional concrete programs of cooperation in a variety of fields will be reviewed and put into operation.

U.S. Contributes \$10 Million to UNRWA

USUN press release 110 dated August 22

John Scali, U.S. Permanent Representative to the United Nations, on August 22 delivered a check for \$10 million as an early partial payment of the U.S. contribution to the United Nations Relief and Works Agency for Palestine Refugees in the Near East (UNRWA) for fiscal year 1975. The early payment was made in response to an appeal from the Secretary General for urgent assistance in overcoming the major financial crisis facing UNRWA. Following is a statement made by Ambassador Scali.

It gives me great pleasure to present this check for \$10 million as part of the regular U.S. contribution to UNRWA's budget. Only three weeks ago we made a special contribution of \$4.2 million to help alleviate UNRWA's immediate financial problem. The European Economic Community also made a special contribution of \$7.9 million in late July. With these two contributions, the \$12 million deficit faced by UNRWA this year has now been underwritten.

The United States regularly has been the largest single contributor to UNRWA. This year we will give \$23.2 million as our regular contribution. Regrettably, such contributions from the United States and other members of the United Nations have not been enough, and emergency funding measures have been necessary.

The Agency was faced with the prospect of severely curtailing essential services such as the closing of schools and the reduction of rations. It now appears that UNRWA's financial crisis has been averted for this year. UNRWA is a vitally important U.N. Agency, and all U.N. members should feel an obligation to contribute to this support. We hope,

however, that those members who do not contribute, or who contribute inadequately, will reconsider their position and decide now to support the Agency. UNRWA's financial house must be set in order so that it can continue successfully to fulfill its U.N.-mandated role in the Middle East.

While UNRWA's financial plight is a matter of deep concern to us, we are reminded of the far larger, increasingly serious, financial situation of the entire United Nations resulting from the refusal of some member states to pay for some U.N. activities. While our payment today will help meet UNRWA's pressing financial requirements for a brief period, urgent action also is needed to place all U.N. activities on a sound financial footing.

Congressional Documents Relating to Foreign Policy

93d Congress, 2d Session

- Amending the United Nations Participation Act of 1945. Report, together with additional and minority views, to accompany S. 1868, to amend the United Nations Participation Act of 1945 to halt the importation of Rhodesian chrome. H. Rept. 93-1181. July 9, 1974. 12 pp.
- Endorsing Lake Placid, N.Y., as the Site of the 1980 Winter Olympic Games. Report to accompany S. Con. Res. 72. H. Rept. 93-1182. July 9, 1974. 4 pp.
- Audit of Financial Statements of the Saint Lawrence Seaway Development Corporation. Communication from Comptroller General of the United States transmitting a report of the audit for the year ended December 31, 1973 (Department of Transportation). H. Doc. 93-323. July 10, 1974. 15 pp.
- Vietnam—A Changing Crucible. Report of a study mission conducted by Representative Peter H. B. Frelinghuysen, February 25-28. House Rept. 93-1196. July 15, 1974. 46 pp.
- Export Administration Act Amendments of 1974. Report to accompany S. 3792. S. Rept. 93-1024. July 22, 1974. 23 pp.

U.S. Reviews Work of 1974 Session of Disarmament Committee

Statement by Joseph Martin, Jr.¹

As we conclude our 1974 session, it may be useful to recall some important developments affecting the Committee's work on its two principal areas of concern: chemical weapons (CW) and a nuclear test ban.

In our 1974 session, the Japanese delegation advanced our work in CW by submitting its draft treaty on chemical weapons, a document which has provided us all with substance for further thought on restraints on chemical weapons, and which is an important contribution to the work of the Committee on this subject. The further information on this draft submitted to the Committee by the delegation of Japan and the comments on it by members of the Committee have been of great interest to my government and will be carefully considered.

Many of these comments came in the informal meetings with chemical experts held in this Committee between July 17 and 22. My delegation was favorably impressed by the fact that 22 experts from 13 countries attended the sessions and also by the technical competence and constructive spirit they brought to these meetings.

Members of the Committee will recall that the principal topics discussed during the four days of informal meetings were the defining of chemical warfare agents, determining the scope of CW limitations, finding useful criteria for defining the scope of prohibitions, and devising an effective CW verification system. We believe these informal meetings advanced the Committee's collective techni-

cal understanding of each of these important issues. Previously expressed points of view were further refined at the sessions. Some novel and potentially promising approaches were introduced. In some areas, such as the question of finding suitable means of expressing the scope of limitations, there was an encouraging degree of similarity in the views put forward by experts. My delegation feels that these technical discussions should provide a better basis for all our governments to make informed judgments on CW questions.

There is another important value in holding these meetings. It is related to the view, expressed from time to time in this Committee, that the only serious obstacle to progress in arms control and disarmament is the lack of sufficient political will. According to this view, once there exists the necessary political will, all remaining technical impediments to a solution will quickly dissolve and agreement will soon be reached. Implicit in this characterization of the problem is the notion that technical issues do not, and should not, have a major influence on political judgments. My delegation does not share this view.

It is clear the resolution of some types of technical issues obviously amounts to little more than filling in the fine details of an agreement whose outlines are already clear. Yet a satisfactory solution of more fundamental technical problems is usually a prerequisite to determining that a particular proposal is politically acceptable or to defining what the agreement concerns. This is true in the case of possible limitations on chemical weapons, where effective verification remains important in determining the scope of a possible CW measure and in evaluating the political and military effects of an agreement. This is why my delegation believes that serious technical discussions such as those which took place at the informal

¹ Made before the Conference of the Committee on Disarmament (CCD) on Aug. 22. Ambassador Martin is U.S. Representative to the conference.

CW meetings make a necessary contribution to the work of the Committee.

In this connection, I would like to note the particular difficulty of verifying the destruction of CW stockpiles. There are two aspects to this problem. The more difficult one is the possible retention of undeclared or hidden stockpiles. This seems to us to be the primary obstacle in considering an agreement which calls for the complete elimination of CW stockpiles. The second aspect of this problem is to insure that declared stockpiles are in fact destroyed. This is an easier problem to solve, provided there is good will on all sides.

We have noted with interest the provision in the draft CW convention submitted by the Japanese delegation which envisages observation of stockpile destruction. We hope that the paper submitted by the U.S. delegation on agent destruction, which suggests that technical inspections at the disposal site could help to deter noncompliance in the destruction stage, will be seriously considered by all parties. We know of no way to verify the destruction of declared stockpiles except by the observation of destruction. Observation of destruction could be carried out at a site selected by the state destroying the agents which, as the U.S. paper suggests, could be well removed from any other military or civilian installations. Destruction could be accomplished by known chemical and physical processes. We therefore are convinced that it would be possible to devise procedures for CW destruction so that neither industrial nor military secrets would be revealed.

I realize that the prolonged and hard work of this Committee on the question of chemical weapons has demanded from all of us a great deal of dedication and perseverance. It lies in the nature of chemical warfare agents that their production is similar in many respects to normal, peaceful operations in the chemical industry and that CW stockpiles are particularly easy to conceal. Given these enormous obstacles, it seems reasonable for us to proceed with our discussions of verifiable prohibitions of chemical weapons by dealing with each aspect seriously and con-

verging on solutions of those aspects for which solutions can most readily be found. As I mentioned earlier, it is much easier to envisage a solution for the verification of destruction of declared CW stockpiles than it is to solve the problem of verifying that the declaration of stockpiles is in fact complete.

In reviewing the events of this session, I wish to refer again briefly to the Treaty and Protocol on the Limitation of Underground Nuclear Weapon Tests concluded by the United States and the U.S.S.R. July 3. Since the conclusion of this treaty, there has been some speculation that, because it provides for a separate agreement on underground explosions for peaceful purposes, the treaty recognizes some distinction in the technology for weapons tests and explosions for peaceful purposes. This is not the case. As Secretary of State Kissinger pointed out July 24 before the United States Senate [Subcommittee on Foreign Operations, Committee on Appropriations]:

... it is unrealistic to make a distinction at the early stages of nuclear development between peaceful uses and potential military applications because any capacity to produce an explosion has obvious military application, no matter what purpose the country concerned asserts it is attempting to serve.

The purpose of this separate bilateral agreement on nuclear explosions for peaceful purposes would be to make sure that further advances in weapons development or other military testing is not being carried out in the course of or under the guise of explosions for peaceful purposes. The procedures of the proposed peaceful nuclear explosion agreement would not be applicable to states in the early stages of the development of nuclear technology.

The Secretary of State made the statement I quoted to indicate why we take the problem of nuclear proliferation so seriously. My government has undertaken a wide-ranging review of this problem. In this review, the necessity of vigorous international effort to defend and strengthen nonproliferation and the Nonproliferation Treaty (NPT) was perfectly clear. The close of our session will shortly be followed by the second meeting of the preparatory committee for the 1975 re-

view conference of the NPT. In that meeting, and in the months ahead, we intend to work to strengthen nonproliferation and the NPT.

We continue to believe that the overwhelming endorsement of the NPT by the General Assembly, and the subsequent adherence to the treaty by more than 80 countries, represents the collective judgment that it is in the best interest of the entire world community to limit the spread of nuclear explosive devices and technology. We therefore earnestly hope that all states, particularly those in this Committee, will join us in working toward that goal.

Let me now turn to the question of membership in this Committee. As we end our 1974 meetings, it gives me great satisfaction that, as the result of consultation between the cochairmen and other members of the Committee, a consensus has been reached to enlarge the Committee by the admission of five more states, the Federal Republic of Germany, German Democratic Republic, Iran, Peru, and Zaïre. We believe these new members will make a significant contribution to the work of the Committee, continuing its tradition of careful and serious study of the complex issues of arms control and disarmament. My delegation looks forward, as I am sure do all of you, to welcoming our new colleagues at our next session.

United Nations Documents:

A Selected Bibliography

Mimeographed or processed documents (such as those listed below) may be consulted at depository libraries in the United States. U.N. printed publications may be purchased from the Sales Section of the United Nations, United Nations Plaza, N.Y. 10017.

Economic and Social Council

Second United Nations Development Decade. Special measures in favor of the least developed among the developing countries. Report of the Secretary General on measures taken and contemplated by organizations of the United Nations system and the regional development banks. E/5467. April 30, 1974. 71 pp.

TREATY INFORMATION

Current Actions

MULTILATERAL

Consular Relations

Vienna convention on consular relations. Done at Vienna April 24, 1963. Entered into force March 19, 1967; for the United States December 24, 1969. TIAS 6820.

Accession deposited: Canada, July 18, 1974.

Genocide

Convention on the prevention and punishment of the crime of genocide. Done at Paris December 9, 1948. Entered into force January 12, 1951.¹

Accession deposited: Mali, July 16, 1974.

Judicial Procedure

Convention on the taking of evidence abroad in civil or commercial matters. Done at The Hague March 18, 1970. Entered into force October 7, 1972. TIAS 7444.

Ratification deposited: France, August 7, 1974.²

Racial Discrimination

International convention on the elimination of all forms of racial discrimination. Done at New York December 21, 1965. Entered into force January 4, 1969.³

Accession deposited: Mali, July 16, 1974.

Safety at Sea

Convention on the international regulations for preventing collisions at sea, 1972. Done at London October 20, 1972.³

Ratification deposited: Norway, August 13, 1974.

Tourism

Statutes of the World Tourism Organization. Done at Mexico City September 27, 1970.

Declarations of approval deposited: Brazil, June 11, 1974; Chile, April 9, 1974; Lebanon, June 18, 1974; Mali, June 17, 1974; Peru, May 30, 1974; Spain (with a declaration), July 4, 1974; Venezuela, June 20, 1974.

Entry into force: November 1, 1974.

Treaties

Vienna convention on the law of treaties, with annex. Done at Vienna May 23, 1969.³

Ratification deposited: Italy, July 25, 1974.

¹ Not in force for the United States.

² With declarations; applicable to all of the Territory of the French Republic.

³ Not in force.

Wheat

Protocol modifying and extending the wheat trade convention (part of the international wheat agreement) 1971. Done at Washington April 2, 1974. Entered into force June 19, 1974, with respect to certain provisions; July 1, 1974, with respect to other provisions.

Ratification deposited: United States, August 23, 1974.

Protocol modifying and extending the food aid convention (part of the international wheat agreement) 1971. Done at Washington April 2, 1974. Entered into force June 19, 1974, with respect to certain provisions; July 1, 1974, with respect to other provisions.

Ratification deposited: United States, August 23, 1974.

Women—Political Rights

Convention on the political rights of women. Done at New York March 31, 1953. Entered into force July 7, 1954.¹

Accession deposited: Mali, July 16, 1974.

BILATERAL

Tunisia

Agreement relating to payment to United States of the net proceeds from the sale of defense articles by Tunisia. Effected by exchange of notes at Tunis May 21 and June 29, 1974. Entered into force July 1, 1974.

United Kingdom

Arrangement relating to the status of United States forces using the British Sovereign Base areas in Cyprus in connection with Suez Canal clearance operations. Effected by exchange of notes at London June 24 and July 4, 1974. Entered into force July 4, 1974.

¹ Not in force for the United States.

PUBLICATIONS

First Annual Digest of U.S. Practice in International Law Released

Press release 330 dated August 20

The Department of State released on August 20 the "Digest of United States Practice in International Law, 1973," edited by Arthur W. Rovine of the Office of the Legal Adviser.

This first annual digest, which covers the calendar year 1973, includes all significant U.S. practice for the year in each area of international law. The digest contains chapters on the law of the sea, legal regulation of the use of force, the law of treaties, the position of the individual in international law, environmental affairs, and many other subjects.

The chapter devoted to the legal regulation of the use of force includes material on the 1973 Viet-Nam peace agreements, the Middle East conflict, the laws of war, United Nations peacekeeping, arms control and disarmament, war powers of the President and the Congress, and other topics of international legal significance. The section on international economic law contains items dealing with international monetary law, trade, economic assistance and development, foreign investment, intellectual property, economic sanctions, and other subjects. The chapter on the individual in international law deals with such topics as nationality, aliens, refugees, extradition, and protection of human rights.

The 1973 Digest (Department of State publication 8756) may be purchased from the Superintendent of Documents, U.S. Government Printing Office, Washington, D.C. 20402, for \$7.50.

American Principles. America's Strength and America's Purposes (Kissinger) 373

Congress. Congressional Documents Relating to Foreign Policy 384

Cuba. President Ford's News Conference of August 28 (excerpts) 378

Cyprus. U.S. Humanitarian Assistance to Cyprus (Department statement) 379

Disarmament
 President Ford's News Conference of August 28 (excerpts) 378

U.S. Reviews Work of 1974 Session of Disarmament Committee (Martin) 385

Egypt. U.S.-Egyptian Joint Cooperation Commission Meets at Washington (Fahmy, Kissinger, joint communique) 380

Energy. President Ford's News Conference of August 28 (excerpts) 378

Foreign Aid. U.S. Humanitarian Assistance to Cyprus (Department statement) 379

International Organizations and Conferences. U.S. Reviews Work of 1974 Session of Disarmament Committee (Martin) 385

Middle East
 President Ford's News Conference of August 28 (excerpts) 378

U.S. Contributes \$10 Million to UNRWA (Scali) 384

Military Affairs. America's Strength and America's Purposes (Kissinger) 373

Presidential Documents. President Ford's News Conference of August 28 (excerpts) 378

Publications. First Annual Digest of U.S. Practice in International Law Released 388

Treaty Information. Current Actions 387

U.S.S.R. President Ford's News Conference of August 28 (excerpts) 378

United Nations
 United Nations Documents 387

U.S. Contributes \$10 Million to UNRWA (Scali) 384

Name Index

Fahmy, Ismail 380

Ford, President 378

Kissinger, Secretary 373, 380

Martin, Joseph, Jr 385

Scali, John 384

**Check List of Department of State
 Press Releases: August 26-September 1**

Press releases may be obtained from the Office of Press Relations, Department of State, Washington, D.C. 20520.

Releases issued prior to August 26 which appear in this issue of the BULLETIN are Nos. 330 and 335 of August 20 and 334 and 334A of August 19.

No.	Date	Subject
*341	8/26	Crawford sworn in as Ambassador to Cyprus (biographic data).
*342	8/26	Shipping Coordinating Committee, Sept. 25.
*343	8/28	Secretary's Advisory Committee on Private International Law, Sept. 27.
*344	8/28	Advisory Committee to U.S. Section, International North Pacific Fisheries Commission, Seattle, Wash., Sept. 24.
*345	8/28	Advisory Committee on the Law of the Sea, Sept. 19-21.
*346	8/29	U.S. Advisory Commission on International Educational and Cultural Affairs, Sept. 24.
*347	8/30	806 Fulbright-Hays scholars named.
*348	8/30	National Review Board for the Center for Cultural and Technical Interchange Between East and West, Sept. 30.
*349	8/30	Nongovernmental organizations to discuss World Food Conference, Sept. 4.
†350	8/30	Kissinger, Saqqaf: remarks following meeting, Aug. 29.
†351	8/30	Kissinger, Saqqaf: exchange of toasts at dinner, Aug. 29.
†352	8/30	Kissinger, Saqqaf: remarks made following meeting, Aug. 30.

* Not printed.

† Held for a later issue of the BULLETIN.