

GOV

3:
4/1909



THE DEPARTMENT OF STATE BULLETIN

Volume LXXIV • No. 1909 • January 26, 1976

PRESIDENT FORD ADDRESSES AMERICAN FARM BUREAU FEDERATION
Excerpt From Address 97

PRESIDENT FORD INTERVIEWED FOR NBC TELEVISION 100

DEPARTMENT OUTLINES DEVELOPMENT OF U.S. RELATIONSHIP
WITH PEOPLE'S REPUBLIC OF CHINA
Statement by Assistant Secretary Habib 106

UNITED STATES DISCUSSES FULFILLMENT OF GOALS
OF INTERNATIONAL WOMEN'S YEAR IN THE U.N.
Statements by Carmen R. Maymi and Text of Resolution 110

THE OFFICIAL WEEKLY RECORD OF UNITED STATES FOREIGN POLICY

For index see inside back cover

THE DEPARTMENT OF STATE BULLETIN

Vol. LXXIV, No. 1909

January 26, 1976

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 \$42.50, foreign \$53.15
Single copy 85 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.

President Ford Addresses American Farm Bureau Federation

Following is an excerpt from an address by President Ford made before the convention of the American Farm Bureau Federation at St. Louis, Mo., on January 5.¹

Today, I want to remind those who would minimize our national strength that over one-half of the grain moving across international boundaries throughout the world is grown by you, the American farmer. And we are proud of your efforts and your results.

But if we want dependable export markets for our food, the United States must be a reliable supplier. On two occasions since I became President, the government was forced to temporarily restrain farm exports. I recognize that these actions resulted in confusion and concern among some of our farmers.

The first government interruption came in October of 1974 when the Soviet Union suddenly, and without any notice whatsoever, entered our markets to buy at a time when we had a short crop in some areas. The government was forced to intervene to learn Soviet intentions. This was in the interest of our livestock producers and our regular grain-buying customers overseas and the American public. Accordingly, contracts with the Soviet Union were renegotiated to change the proportion of corn and wheat for export.

These actions headed off the danger of even more severe legislative restrictions by the Congress.

Last summer, the Soviets suffered another extremely short crop. They again turned to the U.S. farmers for supplementary grain

supplies. A temporary hold on new sales to the Soviets was made only after they had become our largest foreign customer by purchasing 9.8 million metric tons of grain—375 million bushels.

There was, as you know, deep concern at that time about our own corn crop. Although the wheat harvest was nearly completed by July, our feed grain crop was still somewhat uncertain. Dry weather had already damaged corn in the western corn belt. There was no way of knowing if we would have a repeat of the drought or an early freeze which hit the corn crop the previous year.

Again, a temporary hold on new grain sales to the Soviets and, later, to Poland was taken, I can assure you, with extreme reluctance. Pressures in the Congress were increasing to halt all private grain sales and put agricultural exports in the hands of a government management and control board. I did not, and do not, want the government running your business 365 days a year, year in and year out.

It was a unique situation that required corrective action and long-term solution. The temporary hold on the new sales permitted us to work out a five-year agreement with the Russians. Since then—since then, in the open market we have made substantial new sales to the Soviet Union and to Poland. Right now, ships filled with U.S. grain are now backed up at foreign ports waiting to be unloaded. There is every likelihood that we may sell even more this year to the Soviet Union.

This new agreement now assures that the Russians will purchase at least 6 million metric tons of U.S. corn and wheat each year for the next five years. This is more than a bushel a person in terms of the en-

¹ For the complete text, see Weekly Compilation of Presidential Documents dated Jan. 12, 1975.

tire U.S. population. Poland has also indicated it will buy about 100 million bushels of U.S. grain annually for the next five years.

In addition to the annual Russian purchase commitment of 228 million bushels of wheat and corn, this agreement provides an option to purchase an additional 76 million bushels annually. All purchases will be at market prices through the private sector. If the Russians wish to purchase more than 304 million bushels in any year, it is possible under the agreement. There is no arbitrary and inflexible ceiling. For example, we have already sold them more than 500 million bushels out of the current 1975 crop.

This agreement is in the interest of both the American farmer and the American consumer. It prevents the Soviets from disrupting our markets. As we have seen over the years, disruptive and unpredictable purchases led to such problems as congressional demands for export control and the refusal of unions to handle grain shipments.

We have now assured American grain producers that at planting time they will have a much more reliable indication of how large an export market there will be at harvest time, and that is good for all of us. The American livestock producer will have a better idea of his feed supply. The American consumer will know that grain will be moving overseas in a regular flow and be assured there will be adequate food at home.

We have transformed occasional and erratic customers into regular customers. We have averted an outcry every year that the Russians are coming to make secret purchases in our markets. The private marketing system has been preserved. Record exports are moving right now.

The alternatives were and are intolerable. The prospects of massive pileups at docks with crops backed up all the way to local elevators is totally unacceptable.

I ask you: Should we run an obstacle course through Congress and other roadblocks each year on whether to sell any grain to the Soviet Union? I say no, and I

hope you do, too. Should we turn our crop over to a government control board to manage and sell overseas? I emphatically say no, and I hope you do, too.

Some in Congress and elsewhere are now questioning the wisdom of grain sales to the Soviet Union because the Soviets are intervening militarily in the newly independent African country of Angola. Our commitment to work with all nations, including the Soviet Union, to lessen the risk of war and to achieve greater stability is a sincere and constructive undertaking, but it is a commitment which must be honored by both sides. There cannot be a lessening of world tension if the Soviet Union, by military support and other means, attempts to expand its sphere of influence thousands and thousands of miles from its borders.

The United States will not cease its efforts, diplomatic and otherwise, to stabilize the military situation in Angola and promote a quick and peaceful settlement. We favor an immediate cease-fire and an end to all, all, all outside intervention and a government of national unity, permitting the solution of the Angolan problem by the Angolans themselves. We are working closely with many other African countries to bring this about—countries that realize, perhaps better than the U.S. Congress, that our continued effort to counter Soviet and Cuban action is crucial to any hope of a fair solution.

The Soviet Union must realize that the Soviet attempt to take unilateral advantage of the Angolan problem is inconsistent with the basic principles of U.S.-Soviet relations. If it continues, damage to our broader relations will be unavoidable.

You, the farmers of America, understand the importance of America's relations with the rest of the world. You know we cannot abdicate our responsibilities for maintaining peace and progress.

I emphasize, however, that it is a serious mistake to assume that linking our export of grain to the situation in Angola would serve any useful purpose whatsoever. In fact, withholding grain already under contract,

already sold, would produce no immediate gain in diplomatic leverage. American grain, while important to the U.S.S.R., is not vital to them. The Soviet Union has survived for nearly 60 years, including years of total Western economic embargo, without American grain. The impact of a grain cutoff would be felt only after a long, long period. It would not produce the needed short-term results.

There is not the slightest doubt that if we tried to use grain for leverage, the Soviets could get along without American grain and ignore our views. This was emphatically and quite dramatically demonstrated by their attitude toward the U.S. Trade Act provisions of 1972 on emigration from the Soviet Union.

The linkage of grain [with] diplomacy would mean disruption and hardship for you, the farmer, a serious increase in tensions between the world's two superpowers, and no effect whatsoever in Angola.

U.S.-Soviet rivalry in some areas around the world has unfortunately not ceased. The answer is to take other appropriate limited measures necessary to block and stop Soviet actions that we find unacceptable. And we will.

Now, in these complicated and controversial times, it is imperative that you maintain the freedom to market crops and to find customers wherever you can. Strong agricultural exports are basic to America's farm policy and the freedom of every farmer to manage his own farm. You should be rewarded, not punished, for producing each year much more than we consume at home.

You must—and I emphasize must—export two-thirds of each year's wheat crop or cut back production. You must export 50 percent of your soybeans or cut back production. You must be able to export more than 55 percent of your rice crop or cut back production. You must be able to export 40 percent of your cotton or cut back production. You must export at least one-fourth of your feed grain or cut back production.

In short, you must export to keep farming

profitable in America. You must export if we are to keep a favorable balance of U.S. international trade. You must export if you are to prosper and the world is to eat. This is the farm policy that is bringing new life to our rural countryside.

Food, as all of you know, is now our number-one source of foreign exchange. Farm exports last year totaled nearly \$22 billion. Our favorable \$12 billion balance in international agricultural trade offsets deficits in nonagricultural trade. It strengthens the American dollar abroad. This helps to pay for the petroleum and other imports that are vitally essential to maintain America's high standard of living.

We have heard much in the 1970's of "petropower," the power of those nations with vast exportable petroleum resources. Today, let us consider a different kind of power—agripower, the power to grow. Agripower is the power to maintain and to improve the quality of life in a new world where our fate is interdependent with the fate of others in this globe.

People throughout the world can reduce the consumption of petroleum with some sacrifice, but they cannot reduce the consumption of food without widespread starvation. Indeed, the world's population will nearly double by the year 2000. By coping with hunger, we can assure a better future for all the peoples of the world.

Gen. George C. Marshall, in outlining his European recovery plan at Harvard University in 1947, said that "Our policy is directed not against any country or doctrine but against hunger, poverty, desperation, and chaos." General Marshall's words are today reflected in our foreign policy.

The credibility of the United States—our credibility around the world—rests upon our vast resources as much as our defenses. As we assess our strength for peace, America's farming families stand shoulder to shoulder with our men and women in uniform as they do the job for all of us. And we thank you for your contribution.

.

President Ford Interviewed for NBC Television

Following is the transcript of an interview with President Ford by John Chancellor and Tom Brokaw of NBC News which was recorded at the White House on January 3 for the NBC News special program on foreign policy broadcast on January 5.

Weekly Compilation of Presidential Documents dated January 12

Mr. Brokaw: Mr. President, do you think that it is possible for you to make decisions in the name of national security if those decisions do not reflect the popular will of the people?

President Ford: It does make it somewhat difficult, Tom, but I think it is the responsibility of a President to fully inform the American people and convince them that what we are seeking to do in foreign policy is in our best interests, and if a President carries out that responsibility, then he can and will have the support of the American people.

Mr. Brokaw: Is that the situation now in Angola? Do you have to convince the American people of what you consider to be the national security of the United States there?

President Ford: I believe there is a need and necessity for that. I don't believe that enough Americans understand the great responsibilities we have as a nation on a worldwide basis, and that includes, of course, Africa as a whole. What we really want and what we are seeking to do in Angola is to get an African solution to an African problem. And through bilateral negotiations, through working with the Organization of African Unity, through relations with the Soviet Union and others, we are trying to achieve that African solution to an African problem.

Mr. Brokaw: Mr. President, the Soviet

Union quite clearly has signaled in a Tass article that it wants all major powers to withdraw militarily from Angola. Has Moscow privately communicated that to you as well?

President Ford: We are working with all powers, including the Soviet Union, to try and permit the Angolan people, the three different groups there at the present time, to get a decision or solution that will reflect a majority view of the Angolan people. And we are doing it, as I indicated, with a number of major powers, including the Soviet Union, as well as the many, many African countries that are a part of the Organization of African Unity.

Mr. Brokaw: But as a result of this Tass article, is it your understanding now that Russia is prepared to break off its military support and to have Cuba quit sending troops as well to Angola?

President Ford: I don't believe we can say categorically that that is their intention. We are simply working with them because a continuation of that confrontation is destabilizing; it is, I think, inconsistent with the aims and objectives of détente. And we are making some headway, but I can't say categorically that the end result is what we want it to be at the present time.

Mr. Brokaw: Mr. President, in a recent speech, Secretary Kissinger said there is a gray area between foreign policy and national security which, he said, we deny ourselves at great risk to our national security. I suppose that training foreign mercenaries for use in Angola might be called part of that gray area. Are we training foreign mercenaries for use in Angola?

President Ford: The United States is not

training foreign mercenaries in Angola. We do expend some Federal funds—or U.S. funds—in trying to be helpful, but we are not training foreign mercenaries.

Mr. Brokaw: Are we financing the training of foreign mercenaries?

President Ford: We are working with other countries that feel they have an interest in giving the Angolans an opportunity to make the decision for themselves, and I think this is a proper responsibility of the Federal Government.

Mr. Brokaw: Mr. President, while you may disagree with the results of the Senate vote on Angola, do you agree that it probably represents the will of the American people?

President Ford: It may at this time. But I will repeat, as I said a few moments ago, the American people, I think, if told and fully informed as to the role and responsibility and the aims and objectives of the American Government in trying to let the Angolans and the Africans come to a solution, I think in time the American people will support what we have been trying to do in Angola.

Mr. Brokaw: Mr. President, in the past the congressional role in foreign policy has been largely confined to a few chairmen and senior members. Now the process has been broadened considerably. You are formerly a man of Congress. Do you think that is a healthy sign?

President Ford: I think Congress, under the Constitution, does have a proper role in foreign policy, but I don't think our forefathers who drafted that Constitution ever envisioned that 535 Members of the House and Senate could execute foreign policy on a day-to-day basis. I think the drafters of the Constitution felt that a President had to have the opportunity for decisiveness, for flexibility, for continuity in the execution of foreign policy and somehow we have to mesh the role and responsibility of the Congress, which is proper, with the opportunity for the President to carry out that foreign policy in the best interests of the United States.

Now, there have been some instances in recent months where I think the actions of the Congress have hampered, interfered with, the execution of foreign policy, and let me cite one or two examples.

The action of the Congress about a year ago has harmed the opportunity of many to emigrate from the Soviet Union. I noticed just the other day that the emigration from the Soviet Union is down this year, including many reductions in the emigration of Soviet Jews from Russia. I think the action of the Congress was harmful in that regard.

It is my judgment that in the case of congressional action on Turkish aid, they have slowed down the potential solution to the Cyprus problem.

In some respects, and I emphasize "some," the action of the Congress has hurt our efforts in the intelligence field, although the Congress in some respects in this area has illuminated what were—and I think we all recognize—some abuses in the intelligence field.

But overall, there has to be a better understanding of the role of the Congress and the role of the President, and they have to be meshed if we are going to be successful.

Mr. Chancellor: Mr. President, is it because of Viet-Nam and the fact that President Johnson and, to some degree, President Nixon had a lot of control over Viet-Nam, and the Congress had very little control of it that you are in this fix?

President Ford: I believe some of the instances that I have cited, John, are an aftermath of the trauma of Viet-Nam. Congress really asserted itself in the latter days of the Viet-Nam war. We all understand why; and Congress, having whetted its appetite, so to speak, I think in the last few months has continued to do some things that have been harmful in the execution on a day-to-day basis of our foreign policy.

Mr. Brokaw: Mr. President, as a result of the Soviet role in Angola, the fact that the SALT talks [Strategic Arms Limitation Talks] now have bogged down somewhat, the fact that the spirit and the letter of the

Helsinki agreement have not been fully carried out by Russia, are you now less enthusiastic about the prospects for détente?

President Ford: I am not at all, and I think it would be very unwise for a President—me or anyone else—to abandon détente. I think détente is in the best interest of this country. It is in the best interest of world stability, world peace.

We have to recognize there are deep ideological differences between the United States and the Soviet Union. We have to recognize they are a superpower militarily and industrially just as we are. And when you have two superpowers that have such great influence, it is in the best interests of those two countries to work together to ease tensions, to avoid confrontation where possible, to improve relations on a worldwide basis.

And for us to abandon this working relationship and to go back to a cold war, in my opinion, would be very unwise for we in the United States and the world as a whole.

Mr. Brokaw: *But won't you be under a lot of domestic political pressure in this election year to change your attitude about détente?*

President Ford: I think it would be just the reverse; because when we look at détente—with the Berlin agreement of 1971, with SALT One, which put to some extent a limitation on nuclear development, et cetera—and when I look at the benefits that can come from the Vladivostok agreement of 1974, it is my opinion that we must continue rather than stop.

And if the American people take a good calculated look at the benefits from détente, I think they will support it rather than oppose it; and politically, I think any candidate who says “abandon détente” will be the loser in the long run.

Mr. Brokaw: *Mr. President, the historian Will Durant has said that a statesman can't afford to be a moralist as well. Briefly, do you agree with that statement?*

President Ford: I don't believe there is any necessary conflict between the two. We have to be pragmatic at the same time. We have to be practical as we meet these specific

problems. But if you lose your moral value, then I think you have destroyed your capability to carry out things in a practical way.

Mr. Chancellor: *Mr. President, I wonder if I could ask you a question about the United Nations, which seems to have less utility in the world these days than it did when it began, and also about some of the pressure groups that we find both within the United Nations and as you see these pressure groups in foreign affairs—I am thinking, for example, of the influence of American Jews, of the growing influence of Arabs, of various groups. Aren't those groups kind of closing in on you, or do you feel that sometimes, sir?*

President Ford: I believe that substantial progress, John, was made in the United Nations in the seventh special session late in 1975. That was a very constructive session of the United Nations which sought to bring together the developing, as well as the developed, nations.

This was constructive. Now, it is true that subsequent to that there were some very vitriolic debates, there were some very serious differences that developed in the United Nations from various pressure groups.

I would hope that in the future some of this conflict would subside and there would be a more constructive effort made to solve the problems, and since I am always an optimist—and I think it is important and necessary for a President to be that—I think that as we move in the United Nations in the future that we can calm some of the voices and get to some of the answers.

And so this country's foreign policy in the United Nations will be aimed in that direction, and if we follow what we did in the seventh special session and what we are trying to do now, I think these pressure groups will recognize that words are not the answer but solutions will be to the benefit of all parties concerned.

Mr. Chancellor: *In your history of public life, as a Member of Congress, Mr. President, and now as the President, do you find that organized groups play a greater role now in terms of our foreign affairs, or trying to*

influence them, than they did when you began?

President Ford: To some degree, yes. I think highly organized, very articulate pressure groups can, on occasion, tend to distort the circumstances and can hamper rather than help in the solution.

I don't believe those pressure groups necessarily represent the American people as a whole. So a President, myself included, has to look at the broad perspective and not necessarily in every instance respond to the pressure groups that are well intentioned but who have a limited perspective, or scope.

And as we move ahead, we are going to try and predicate our foreign policy on the best interests of all the people in this country, as well as our allies and our adversaries, rather than to respond to a highly articulate, a very tightly organized pressure group of any kind.

We cannot let America's policies be predicated on a limited part of our population or our society.

President Ford's Year-End Meeting With Reporters

Following are excerpts relating to foreign policy from the transcript of President Ford's question-and-answer session with 23 reporters in the Oval Office at the White House on December 31.

Weekly Compilation of Presidential Documents dated January 5

In foreign policy, we had, of course, a setback in Southeast Asia. But if you take a look at what has been accomplished elsewhere, whether it is in NATO, where we have convinced our allies that the American people are going to stand strong in that area—they absolutely believe that the United States is going to be a firm partner. And I think the personal relationship with leaders in Western Europe is as good, if not better, than any time in the last 20 or 30 years.

If you look to the Pacific, despite the problems in Viet-Nam, our relationship with Japan is the best in the history of this country. We have kept faith with other countries in the whole Pacific area, and they believe that the United States will stand in the future firmly for the freedom that they have and the opportunities for a better life for all of their people.

Q. Mr. President, in 1972, we and the Russians signed a pledge in Moscow—

President Ford: What year was that?

Q. In 1972, we signed a pledge with the Russians, both sides agreeing not to raise tensions anywhere in the world—détente. The Russians say that détente does not mean that the status quo around the world stays the same. We know it isn't the same in Angola. Aren't they breaking the rules on détente there, and how do we stand?

President Ford: Both Secretary Kissinger and I have spoken out very strongly against the Soviet activity in Angola, and I reaffirm it today. I think what is being done in Angola by the Soviet Union in conjunction with the Cubans is not constructive from the point of view of détente.

We couldn't be any firmer publicly than we have been in that regard. But I think we have an obligation to continue to work within the framework of détente because there are some other benefits that have accrued. I think SALT One was a step forward, and if SALT Two can be negotiated on a mutual basis, it will be constructive within the framework of détente. But, I reaffirm, Angola is an example of where I think détente has not worked the way it should work, and we strongly object to it.

Q. Is it possible, sir, that détente may simply end up being agreements on nuclear weapons and nothing else?

President Ford: I hope not. I think it ought to have a far broader implication. I think détente can be helpful, just as an example, in the longrun solution in the Middle East. And there are some good signs

that it is helping to moderate certain influences in the Middle East.

Q. Mr. President, your predecessor sat in this office and, in May of 1970, warned against the United States of America becoming a pitiful, helpless giant. In a sense, our speaking out on Angola is about all we can do. The United States, seemingly operating within the framework of détente, seems to be powerless to do anything else other than speak out in offering statements by the President and by the Secretary of State. Have we, therefore, in effect, reached a kind of status in the world where we are a pitiful, helpless giant in the continent of Africa?

President Ford: I don't think we are a pitiful, helpless giant in Africa. We have a great many countries that look to us and work with us and, I think, are sympathetic to what we are trying to do in conjunction with them. There are some African states that obviously don't look toward us, but look toward the Soviet Union.

I think we would have been in a stronger position to find a compromise in Angola if the Senate had not taken the action that it took. Nevertheless, despite that setback, we are maximizing the utilization of funds that are available, small as they are. And we are moving as strongly as possible in the area of diplomatic initiatives with the OAU [Organization of African Unity], on a bilateral basis with African states, with other countries throughout the world that have an interest in Africa.

I certainly think, despite the handicap of the Senate action, we are going to do everything we possibly can. And we certainly are not a pitiful giant in this process.

Q. Mr. President, can I follow that one up?

President Ford: Surely.

Q. You said you would do everything we possibly can. Would this include the use of—rethinking of the sales of grain as a political weapon or as a diplomatic tool?

President Ford: I think the grain sale with the Soviet Union, the five-year agreement, is a very constructive part of the policy of

détente. It certainly is constructive from the point of view of American agriculture. We have a guarantee of 6 million tons a year with a top limit of some 8 million tons. It, I think, over the long haul will be looked upon as a very successful negotiation. I see no reason at this time, certainly under the circumstances existing today, for any revision of that negotiated agreement.

Q. Mr. President, why is it necessary for you to rule out any improvement in our relations with Cuba, when what they are doing in Angola is essentially no different than what the Soviet Union is doing or South Africa is doing. But especially what evil have the Cubans done?

President Ford: It is pretty hard for me to see what legitimate interest Cuba has in sending some 6,000 well-equipped, well-trained military personnel to Angola. I just don't see what their interest is. And it certainly doesn't help our relations with Cuba when they know that we think it is in the best interests of the three parties in that country to settle their differences themselves.

Q. You say it is not standing in the way of détente with the Soviet Union; it has not broken off our relations with South Africa and what they are doing there. Why is Cuba singled out for apparently a more strict treatment?

President Ford: I think that is very simple. We have had a period of what, 13 years of very few, if any, contacts with the Government of Cuba and many, many differences, and there were some prospects—I say were some prospects—for gradual improvement. But when we are trying to resolve differences in Angola, they are seeking to expand the conflict there with active military personnel. It just is such a different view from our own. I don't see how, under those circumstances, we can feel that we can work with them in the future in this hemisphere or elsewhere.

Q. Mr. President, have you hinted at some progress with the Russians on Angola. Is

that true? I mean, do you have some undercurrents?

President Ford: I can only say that we have presented very forcefully our view that what is being done there is contrary to détente. I think there is a better solution. As I said yesterday—and I will repeat today—we are maximizing our effort diplomatically, broadly as well as bilaterally.

Q. Mr. President, you mentioned Viet-Nam at the beginning. I wonder whether we could have one more look back at that war. I am sure history is going to be asking this question. I think it will. Whatever happened to the domino theory, which I think you once espoused? Looking back, did it really ever have any validity, or does it continue to have a validity?

President Ford: I think it can have validity, and the situation that developed in Laos, as you well know, the coalition government there has dissolved, been overcome. I know that there are countries in Southeast Asia that were fearful that it might be a reality. We were able to reaffirm our presence at the present time as well as in the future in the Pacific, or Southeast Asia. And thus far we have been able to preclude what I honestly felt might have taken place.

Outside of some weakening in some countries, the domino theory has not taken place, and we are fortunate. I am glad that that theory has been disproven, but it took some strong action and I think some leadership by this country to handle the matter.

United States Official Killed in Athens

Following are texts of a statement read to news correspondents on December 23 by Robert L. Funseth, Director, Office of Press Relations, and a statement by President Ford issued at Vail, Colo., that day.

DEPARTMENT STATEMENT

Richard S. Welch, a Special Assistant to the Ambassador and First Secretary at the U.S. Embassy in Athens, was shot to death by three unidentified assailants this afternoon, December 23, 1975.

Secretary Kissinger has sent a message of condolence to Mr. Welch's widow, who resided with him in Athens.

The Greek Government has conveyed to us its outrage at this barbaric act and has given us its assurances that all possible means are being taken to apprehend the criminals responsible.

STATEMENT BY PRESIDENT FORD

White House press release (Vail, Colo.) dated December 23

I was shocked and horrified by the terrorist murder of Mr. Richard Welch outside his home in Athens, Greece. Mr. Welch has long been a dedicated official of the U.S. Government, and the hearts of all Americans go out to his family in sympathy and in gratitude for a life given in devoted service to his country.

Department Outlines Development of U.S. Relationship With the People's Republic of China

Statement by Philip C. Habib

*Assistant Secretary for East Asian and Pacific Affairs*¹

Before discussing the President's recent trip to Peking, I believe it will be useful to outline in general terms our relationship with the People's Republic of China.

A fundamental goal of U.S. foreign policy is to promote an international order of peace, justice, and prosperity for all. In pursuing this objective, our approach proceeds from the premise that peace depends on a stable global equilibrium. Nowhere is this more important than in the Pacific, where the security concerns of four great powers—the United States, the Soviet Union, China, and Japan—intersect, and where the United States has important interests and responsibilities.

The normalization of U.S. relations with the People's Republic of China is a crucial element in preserving this equilibrium. For over two decades our relations with this country, which represents nearly one-quarter of mankind, were based on hostility and mutual suspicion. Gradually leaders on both sides came to realize that this posture served the interests of neither country and was incompatible with the changes that had taken place in the world over the last 25 years.

Since 1971, we have managed through our joint efforts to overcome the legacy of the past and to work out a relationship of mutual respect between the United States and China. As Secretary Kissinger stated in his speech to the U.N. General Assembly on September 22, 1975:

There is no relationship to which the United States assigns greater significance than its new ties with the People's Republic of China. We believe that the well-being and progress of a quarter of humanity is an important element in global stability.

Although this is not the occasion for a review of the entire history of U.S.-P.R.C. relations, it is important to remember that the Communist victory in China, the emergence of a seemingly monolithic Sino-Soviet bloc, and the outbreak of the Korean war in 1950 served to freeze our relationship with the People's Republic of China into the basic form it was to retain for over 20 years.

Throughout this period the Taiwan issue remained the overriding problem between Peking and Washington. While there was a gradual evolution in official Washington thinking in favor of seeking an accommodation with the People's Republic of China, hopes for progress were frustrated by the sharply divergent views between the two sides, by our involvement in the Viet-Nam conflict, and by the outbreak of the cultural revolution in China, which for a time complicated Peking's relations with the outside world in general. Throughout this period we maintained contact with the People's

¹ Made before the Special Subcommittee on Investigations of the House Committee on International Relations on Dec. 17. The complete transcript of the hearings will be published by the committee and will be available from the Superintendent of Documents, U.S. Government Printing Office, Washington, D.C. 20402.

Republic of China through the ambassadorial-level talks that began in Geneva in 1955 and were later moved to Warsaw, but the exchanges in this forum failed to narrow the differences between the two sides.

In the late 1960's, however, the U.S. Government undertook a number of steps designed to relax tension between the United States and the People's Republic of China in areas such as trade and travel. In the spring of 1971 these moves were reciprocated by Peking's invitation to an American table tennis team to visit the People's Republic of China, a step that was followed shortly by Dr. Kissinger's first visit to Peking in July 1971 and President Nixon's announcement that he would visit China in 1972.

To understand why, after two decades of confrontation and isolation, the United States and the People's Republic of China were finally able to agree to move toward normalization, we should recall the global context in which the move took place.

There had been basic changes in the international environment—and our understanding of that environment—since 1950. The U.S.S.R. had risen to a position of global power. There had been a shift in the nuclear balance between the United States and the Soviet Union in the direction of parity, and China itself had developed a nuclear capability.

Of no less importance was the fact that the close Sino-Soviet relationship of the 1950's had dissolved, and the schism between Peking and Moscow had reached the point of open military clashes on the Sino-Soviet border by the spring of 1969. These clashes came shortly after the Soviet intervention in Czechoslovakia in 1968, which Moscow justified in terms of a universalist formula that made such intervention a duty to prevent backsliding from Soviet-approved Socialist norms. These developments clearly contributed to Peking's preoccupation with its own security.

The United States, for its part, was ending its involvement in the Viet-Nam war. Our troop presence in Indochina was beginning to decline, and as we looked to the post-

war future in Asia, it was increasingly clear that we should try to involve the People's Republic of China in a new structure of peace in Asia characterized by mutual restraint of the great powers. Not only was the freedom of action of U.S. diplomacy severely constrained by the absence of relations with the People's Republic of China, but growing urgency was attached to the task of preventing dangerous miscalculations by the new and emerging nuclear power in China.

These changes in the international environment enabled the United States and the People's Republic of China to arrive at a new appreciation of their relationship in which common elements were seen to predominate over the differences flowing from our varying societies, philosophies, and positions in the world.

In essence there are three aspects of our relations with the People's Republic of China. The first is the geopolitical aspect, reflected in our common recognition that the overall security of the international order would be better maintained if the United States and China had a relationship of dialogue with each other than if they were in a position of permanent hostility. The second aspect concerns those factors affecting the full normalization of our relations, the most important of which is the question of Taiwan. The third concerns the mutually beneficial bilateral ties we have established in areas such as trade and scientific and cultural exchanges.

President Nixon's visit to the People's Republic of China in February 1972 dealt with all three of these aspects. The results of his visit were set forth in the Shanghai communique, a document which continues to form the basis for the new and durable relationship that has emerged between our two countries. The communique was an unusual document, since it outlined the differences between the two countries. More importantly, however, the communique recorded certain broad principles of international relations to which both subscribed.

Both sides agreed that despite differences in social systems and foreign policies, coun-

tries should conduct their relations on the basis of respect for the sovereignty and territorial integrity of all states, nonaggression against other states, equality and mutual benefit, and peaceful coexistence. They agreed that international disputes should be settled on this basis without resorting to the use or threat of force.

With these principles in mind, the United States and the People's Republic of China jointly stated that:

—Progress toward the normalization of relations between China and the United States is in the interest of all countries.

—Both wish to reduce the danger of international military conflict.

—Neither should seek hegemony in the Asia-Pacific region and each is opposed to efforts by any other country or group of countries to establish such hegemony. (During Secretary Kissinger's visit to the People's Republic of China in November 1973, the two sides reiterated this point and expanded it to include opposition to efforts to establish hegemony in any part of the world.)

—Neither is prepared to negotiate on behalf of any third party or to enter into agreements or understandings with the other directed at other states.

On the crucial question of Taiwan, both sides stated their positions clearly. The United States acknowledged that all Chinese on either side of the Taiwan Strait maintain there is but one China of which Taiwan is a part. The U.S. Government did not challenge this position. It reaffirmed its interest in a peaceful settlement of the Taiwan issue by the Chinese themselves, and with this prospect in mind, it affirmed the ultimate objective of the withdrawal of all U.S. forces and military installations from Taiwan. In the meantime, the United States stated that it would progressively reduce its military presence on Taiwan as tension in the area diminished.

Finally, the Shanghai communique laid the foundation for tangible improvement in U.S.-P.R.C. relations. It was agreed that the two sides would facilitate bilateral ex-

changes in such fields as science, technology, culture, sports, and journalism. They undertook to facilitate the progressive development of trade and agreed that the two governments would maintain contact through various channels, including sending a senior U.S. representative to Peking periodically to exchange views on issues of common concern.

Developments since the Shanghai communique was signed have confirmed that our relationship with the People's Republic of China is on a sound basis. There have been extensive exchanges of scientific and technological delegations, of sports teams and performing arts groups. In February of 1973, we agreed with the Chinese on the reciprocal exchange of Liaison Offices, which provides us with a means for conducting our day-to-day bilateral relations. Trade rose from a base of zero in 1970 to nearly a billion dollars in 1974. Members of Congress, State Governors, and other representative Americans have visited the People's Republic of China. And Secretary Kissinger has had important conversations with Chinese leaders in New York as well as China, on many occasions.

There are, of course, a number of unresolved bilateral issues, including the problem of Taiwan. It will take time to resolve these, although the direction of our policy is clear. We have approached normalization of our bilateral relations with the People's Republic of China in accordance with the position we stated in the Shanghai communique that the ultimate resolution of the Taiwan question is for the Chinese themselves to decide and that the resolution should be by peaceful means. For our part, we have progressively reduced our forces in the Taiwan area as tensions in Asia have diminished.

We have continuing disagreements with the People's Republic of China in ideology and varying national interests which lead to differences in our respective foreign policies. We make no attempt to hide these. This is only natural, and each side will inevitably determine its own policies according to its own situation and perception of its national

interest. At the same time, the fundamental geopolitical considerations that caused us to work out the present relationship remain valid and lend it a degree of stability it might otherwise lack.

President Ford's recent visit to the People's Republic of China should be viewed in this context. Extensive changes had occurred in both countries and the world since President Nixon's visit in 1972. Both sides recognized the importance of sustaining the dialogue between the top leaders of the two countries and reviewing our respective perceptions of the international situation which contributed so much to bringing our two countries closer together.

The President's visit confirmed that while U.S.-P.R.C. relations are not yet normalized, they are good and will be gradually improved. The discussions naturally centered on the international aspects of the relationship, to which both sides attach primary significance. The talks demonstrated the existence of important points in common, although there were of course some differences in view.

President Ford reaffirmed the determination of the United States to complete the normalization of relations with the People's Republic of China on the basis of the Shanghai communique, which P.R.C. Vice Premier Teng Hsiao-p'ing described as remaining "full of vitality today." Overall, the discussions significantly promoted the objectives which the United States and the People's Republic of China share with regard to both our bilateral relations and the international scene.

The United States is confident that we can continue to build a relationship with the People's Republic of China which advances the national interests of both countries. This relationship must be founded on mutuality as well as realism, which is a firmer basis than sentiment for sound and durable ties. As President Ford said in his speech in

Hawaii on December 7 this year, our relationship with the People's Republic of China "is becoming a permanent feature of the international political landscape. It benefits not only our two peoples but all peoples of the region and the entire world."

Congressional Documents Relating to Foreign Policy

93d Congress, 2d Session

Multinational Corporations and United States Foreign Policy. Hearings before the Subcommittee on Multinational Corporations of the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations on investments by multinational companies in the Communist bloc countries. Part 10. June 17-July 22, 1974. 405 pp.

94th Congress, 1st Session

Increased U.S. Participation in the Inter-American Development Bank. Report of the House Committee on Banking, Currency and Housing, together with supplemental views, to accompany H.R. 9721. H. Rept. 94-541. October 8, 1975. 49 pp.

Report by Congressional Advisers to the Seventh Special Session of the United Nations. Submitted to the House Committee on International Relations and the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations. October 13, 1975. 67 pp.

International Labor Organization Convention and Recommendation Concerning the Prevention and Control of Occupational Hazards Caused by Carcinogenic Substances and Agents. Communication from the Assistant Secretary of State for Congressional Relations transmitting the texts of International Labor Organization convention no. 139 and recommendation no. 147. H. Doc. 94-280. October 9, 1975. 16 pp.

International Labor Organization Convention and Recommendation Concerning Paid Educational Leave. Communication from the Assistant Secretary of State for Congressional Relations transmitting the texts of International Labor Organization convention no. 140 and recommendation no. 148. H. Doc. 94-281. October 9, 1975. 18 pp.

The Convention on the International Regulations for Preventing Collisions at Sea, 1972. Report of the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations to accompany Ex. W, 93-1. S. Ex. Rept. 94-8. October 22, 1975. 10 pp.

United States Discusses Fulfillment of Goals of International Women's Year in the U.N.

Following are statements made in Committee III (Social, Humanitarian and Cultural) of the U.N. General Assembly by U.S. Representative Carmen R. Maymi on December 3 and December 5, together with the text of a resolution adopted by the committee on December 5 and by the Assembly on December 15.

STATEMENTS BY MS. MAYMI, COMMITTEE III

Statement of December 3

USUN press release 170 dated December 3

My delegation has looked forward to the day when the General Assembly would begin work on the item for the World Conference of the International Women's Year.¹ For too long the world community has failed to perceive sexual discrimination as one of the most widespread deprivations of human rights.

From its inception, the United Nations under article 1 of the charter has held a mandate to encourage respect for human rights and fundamental freedoms for all, without distinction as to sex. Yet during this period the United Nations has not

exerted the leadership nor have its members availed themselves of the opportunities to move as rapidly as possible to end discrimination against women at all levels, social and economic levels, in law and in practice, even in the U.N. system itself, which has continued discriminatory practices in the international civil service despite pleas for equal opportunities.

As a result of this discrimination women have been repeatedly denied the opportunity to make their full contribution to our societies. The result has been that all people have suffered. Adequate solutions to problems have not been reached, nor has the genius of women been channeled into society.

It is not an overstatement to say that women of countries at every stage of development and at every social and economic level looked forward to the World Women's Conference as an instrument that would help to change and improve their lives. Women have awaited the day when this session of the General Assembly will put its weight behind a call for action.

At the Mexico City Conference there was full agreement that discrimination against women is incompatible with human dignity and with the welfare of the family, that it prevents women's participation on equal terms with men in all aspects of the life of their countries, and that it is an obstacle to the full development of women's potentialities in service to humanity as well as to their self-fulfillment as human persons.

The world conference reminded us of the

¹ For U.S. statements at the World Conference of the International Women's Year at Mexico City on June 20 and July 2, texts of resolutions sponsored or cosponsored by the United States, and text of the World Plan of Action for the Implementation of the Objectives of the International Women's Year, see BULLETIN of Aug. 18, 1975, p. 233.

great contribution made by women in social, political, economic, and cultural life and of the part they play, along with men, in the rearing of children. But it also reminded us of the U.N.'s commitment to the attainment of human rights for women as well as men. It reminded us of the necessity to insure the universal recognition, in law and in fact, of the principle of the equality of men and women. It noted further that it is the primary responsibility of governments and peoples of individual countries to insure the advancement of women within the process of national development.

The conference stressed that only through a sustained international commitment to improving standards of living of the poorest in each community can women, who constitute a disproportionately high number of this group, live in dignity and justice free from hunger and poverty. Significantly, it noted that changes in the social and economic structures of societies cannot, of themselves, insure the elimination of discrimination against women or their full integration into their society.

Nevertheless, despite very full deliberations and recommendations of the World Conference of the International Women's Year, we still hear in these halls the question: "What is it that women want?"

Madam Chairperson, what women want has been highlighted in every member country during this significant year; and we, as women, have found a new understanding among ourselves in expressing these needs. We hope that it has helped men to understand as well.

Women want to be treated as full, equal, and responsible members of society. They want the underutilization of half of the world's human resources to cease.

Women want the right to make their contribution to economic and social development on an equal basis with men with human dignity. They want to share equally in its rewards. Their full participation in the various economic, political, social, and cultural sectors is an important indication of the

dynamic progress of peoples and their development.

Women want equal access to education and to vocational guidance and training in order to widen their choice of employment opportunities.

Women want removal of the age-old stereotyped concepts of their role; they want freedom of choice to enter the occupations from which they have been excluded in the past.

Women want the same opportunities as men for promotion to decisionmaking and policymaking positions within all spheres of economic, social, and political activity.

Women want a narrowing of the wide gap in earnings between women and men, and they want equal pay for work of equal value.

Women want all elements of the U.N. system to support projects that will reduce the heavy burden placed on women in the developing countries. This will enable them to enter more productive activities at levels commensurate with their skills, and it will increase their earning power.

Women want assurances that their child-bearing capacity will not be used as an excuse to limit their role in society and force on them alone child-rearing responsibilities. They want men to share actively in the responsibilities of child rearing and in family life.

Women want the right to develop their potentialities and to exercise options in life without discrimination as equal partners with men in fulfilling national economic and social needs. They ask member governments and the United Nations to take those rights fully into account and to make adequate provision for the improvement of their situation.

Madam Chairperson, we see no mystery in what women want. Nor was this a mystery to the men and women who gathered at the World Conference. Although they spoke different languages, embraced various faiths, represented different degrees of development and different economic levels, they were united by a broad mutuality of inter-

ests in their common determination to assert their rights, to assist each other, and to exercise solidarity by urging appropriate action from governments, the U.N. system, nongovernmental organizations, and other groups working toward the achievement of these goals.

These are the goals toward which the plan of action and most of the resolutions are directed.

The role of women in development was one of the principal concerns of the conference, not only because justice and equal rights demand their full participation, but also because the development process requires it. Indeed, this process cannot succeed if any nation ignores one-half of its human potential. The goals of equality for women and their integration into the development process are inextricably interrelated. Each is indispensable to the other.

In our own bilateral AID [Agency for International Development] programs we have sought to give tangible form to this conviction. By statute and by administrative regulations, our AID programs are now required to give priority to programs which integrate women into the national economies of their countries. Our AID missions are required to submit impact statements indicating the effects of proposed programs on women.

Another important initiative of the conference concerned the practices of the United Nations itself as an employer. The United States was pleased to cosponsor Resolution 8, "The Situation of Women in the Employ of the United Nations and Specialized Agencies."

Everyone in this committee knows that the United Nations still falls short of the ideals it proclaims on equality for women; surely this is the year for launching the needed steps so that the United Nations as an employer will set standards of which all can be proud. A resolution adopted this week in the Fifth Committee should provide an important impetus to needed action.²

We also wish to note the valuable work of

the Standing Committee on the Employment of Women in the Secretariat, a group reporting to the Joint Advisory Committee on Personnel. The standing committee, created in response to a recommendation of the Fifth Committee during the 29th General Assembly, began work last spring and has since produced two reports. We urge both the Secretariat and member states to give priority attention to its recommendations.

Resolutions and plans of action do not of themselves change the world. Implementation and the call for implementation are not the same thing. Ultimately, the significance of what we are doing here today will depend upon our ability to retain the consensus evident at Mexico City that the U.N. system should become an effective instrument for sustained action to improve the condition of women worldwide. It will depend even more on what governments and organizations and individuals, both men and women, around the world do to carry out commitments that have been made.

Madam Chairperson, I have spoken up to now about the excellent work of the conference. Unfortunately, it is necessary also to refer to other than constructive aspects.

The United States objected strongly to the efforts of some to politicize the conference, and we have no wish to politicize the question here. I will only remark how deeply the people of the United States objected to the references to Zionism in the Declaration of Mexico and to the wording of a few of the resolutions of the conference.³ The injection of divisive issues was disruptive, was not germane to the substance of the conference itself, and weakened the very positive achievements and impact of the conference.

² A resolution on employment of women in the Secretariat of the United Nations was adopted by Committee V (Administrative and Budgetary) on Dec. 1 and by the Assembly on Dec. 8 (A/RES/3416 (XXX)).

³ For text of the declaration, plans of action, resolutions, decisions, and recommendation adopted by the conference, see U.N. doc. E/5725, Report of the World Conference of the International Women's Year.

It does no credit to our work that some delegations persistently raise divisive issues that only divert us from the job at hand. Confrontation, not positive action, seems their objective. We deeply want to concentrate on our common goals and objectives and work together to achieve them. However, as necessary, we will not shrink from our responsibility to oppose those resolutions or provisions of resolutions which we cannot accept—some of which even violate the very principles on which the United Nations was founded.

The World Plan of Action was recognized from the start as the single most important document of the conference. And we wish to commend Mrs. Helvi Sipilä, Secretary General of the conference and Mrs. Margaret Bruce, Deputy Secretary General, as well as the U.N. Commission on the Status of Women for the excellent preparatory work done on the World Plan of Action. The plan of action was amended by minor modifications and adopted by consensus in Committee I and in plenary. We see this consensus as extremely significant. Effectiveness will of course depend upon the extent to which it is translated into action.

Fortunately, we are now on the verge of declaring a "Decade for Women: Equality, Development and Peace." We intend to devote this Decade to the implementation of the programs and projects which will bring about the fulfillment of the goals of International Women's Year and the World Plan of Action. This will not occur on its own; the Decade will need strong and enduring supporters. Like the plan itself, the Decade's success will depend upon cooperation and determination by all.

Finally, let me say a few words about what is being done in the United States. Individuals and organizations representing labor unions, women's groups, the educational community, and private industry have worked intensively and jointly to plan for the national observance of the Year.

Women throughout our country joined women throughout the world in the plan-

ning for a nongovernmental conference in sessions running concurrently with the world conference. Six thousand persons came to Mexico from all over the world to express their views on the need to eliminate discrimination against women.

President Ford appointed a National Commission for the Observance of International Women's Year and has given the Commission a mandate to plan "An Agenda for the Future." The Commission has organized a series of working groups to review the status of women in these relevant areas: international interdependence, women in power, enforcement of the laws, child development, reproductive freedom, the mass media, the arts and humanities, the concerns of homemakers, and women in employment. The Commission is already submitting recommendations and will submit its report to him early in 1976 to indicate the need for necessary action or appropriate legislation.

In the case of the Women's Bureau, of which I am the Director, our concern will be for a forceful enforcement of the antidiscrimination laws and Executive orders that now exist in order to eliminate sex discrimination in employment, to promote employment opportunities for women especially in the areas from which they have been excluded in the past, and to take action to recognize the contribution of all women workers to the economy of our country.

Other Federal agencies have established machinery to monitor and implement non-discrimination on the basis of sex. Some of these include a Special Assistant to the President of the United States for Women and an Office of Women's Programs in the White House; the Women's Bureau in our Department of Labor, established in 1920; a Women's Action Program in the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare; and a Federal Women's Program Coordinator to monitor employment practices in every governmental body. We also have citizens actively involved in this machinery, including a President's Advisory Council on the Status of Women, Advisory Councils to the Secre-

taries of Labor, Defense, and Health, Education, and Welfare.

On the nongovernmental level, women's groups and other organizations have been tremendously motivated by the World Plan of Action. These organizations are developing their own agendas for action. In recent months they have independently produced and distributed thousands of copies to women throughout the country. Special shipments have gone to opinionmakers and decisionmakers in American organizational life and will soon reach a wider distribution throughout the country.

Ultimately, it is actions such as these, taken by individuals and groups determined to improve the condition of women, that represent the greatest strength of the international women's movement. It is our hope that the activities of the U.N. system to implement the World Plan of Action will spur these efforts in each country throughout the world.

Statements of December 5

USUN press release 177 dated December 5

Explanation of Vote on Draft Resolution A/C.3/L.2195

My delegation will abstain on resolution A/C.3/L.2195.⁴ The United States strongly supports steps to implement the World Plan of Action through a Decade of sustained national, regional, and international action. Some of the wording in what is an otherwise workmanlike resolution is, however, unacceptable to us.

Counterproductive and divisive issues, detracting from the needed consensus to advance equality for women, have once again been introduced.

In operative paragraph 1, we had requested the deletion of the final clause. The positions taken by my government in Mexico City remain firm. We object to any suggestion of giving blanket endorsement to all

⁴The resolution was adopted by the committee on Dec. 5 by a rollcall vote of 97 to 2, with 22 abstentions (U.S.) after separate votes on operative paragraphs 1 and 2, which the U.S. voted against.

resolutions which resulted from the conference or to the Declaration of Mexico.

We will vote against operative paragraph 2 because of an undesirable ambiguity in its call for action to implement not only the World Plan of Action but also, and I quote, "related resolutions." Indeed, this phrase, "related resolutions," appears in a number of places in the text.

The United States interprets the phrase "related resolutions" to refer to those resolutions adopted at the Mexico City Conference which have a direct and relevant bearing on the World Plan of Action. We do not consider as related to the plan, or to the work to be accomplished during the Decade, the political resolutions that were adopted at Mexico City, including those with provisions on Palestinian women, elimination of Zionism, alleged human rights violations by Israel, the Panama Canal, natural resources and right of nationalization (without qualification), general and complete disarmament (without adequate controls), the Charter of Economic Rights and Duties of States, and the new international economic order.

Since certain other delegations may not make the same interpretation, it is our intention to make clear the strength of our views by voting against the ambiguity of the last phrase in the second operative paragraph.

I must record one comment on the World Plan of Action, which the United States strongly supports. At the time the plan was adopted at Mexico City, the United States wholeheartedly favored the Decade To Combat Racial Discrimination, which is endorsed in paragraph 186 of the plan. Since that time, as is well known in this committee, the U.N. General Assembly has tragically and falsely equated Zionism with racism. Accordingly, the United States no longer supports that Decade. Of this there should not be the slightest doubt. Needless to say, we remain committed to the elimination of racial discrimination as that term was understood prior to this General Assembly.

In conclusion, I would like to say that my delegation recognizes and applauds the efforts of all who have worked long and hard

to produce reasonable and concrete programs which will have a significant impact on achieving the goals of the Decade for Women.

*Explanation of Vote on Draft Resolution
A/C.3/L.2196*

My delegation voted "no" on resolutions A/C.3/L.2194 and 2196.⁵ There is language in both resolutions which we are unable to accept.

The United States deplores the growing tendency to introduce a corrupted language of political morality which has become totally devoid of meaning. This trend is evident in both resolutions, but we most emphatically object to the repeated calls for the "elimination of racism." The elimination of racism, and the original moral imperative it once implied, have been turned into a mockery.

We are not deceived by what has happened in these resolutions. It has happened before, not only in the United Nations but in every international forum where totalitarian regimes have banded together to press their vision upon the world. They do so by preying on the self-critical nature of liberal society and its continuous quest for improvement. They do so by insuring that every time we set out to condemn some failing in our societies we end by having to condemn what is good about them as well. They do so by confusing and corrupting the language of political morality; and by doing so, they erode our capacity to defend those things that bear defending.

⁵ Draft resolution A/C.3/L.2194/Rev.1, entitled "Women's participation in the strengthening of international peace and security and in the struggle against colonialism, racism, racial discrimination, foreign aggression, occupation and all forms of foreign domination," was adopted by the committee on Dec. 5 by a vote of 73 to 27 (U.S.), with 22 abstentions, and by the Assembly on Dec. 15 by a recorded vote of 90 to 21 (U.S.), with 22 abstentions (A/RES/3519 (XXX)). Draft resolution A/C.3/L.2196, entitled "Equality between men and women and the elimination of discrimination against women," was adopted by the committee on Dec. 5 by a vote of 88 to 2 (U.S.), with 26 abstentions, and by the Assembly on Dec. 15 by a vote of 102 to 3 (U.S.), with 26 abstentions (A/RES/3521 (XXX)).

But we are aware of this. We know it when we see it, we know of its long past, and we will speak out when it appears. We are not going to permit our best impulses to be turned into tools of our detraction.

TEXT OF RESOLUTION⁶

World Conference of the International Women's Year

The General Assembly,

Recalling its resolution 3010 (XXVII) of 18 December 1972 in which it proclaimed the year 1975 International Women's Year,

Recalling also Economic and Social Council resolutions 1849 (LVI) and 1851 (LVI) of 16 May 1974 convening an international conference during the International Women's Year as a focal point of the international observance of the Year,

Recalling further its resolutions 3276 (XXIX) and 3277 (XXIX) of 10 December 1974 as well as Economic and Social Council resolution 1959 (LIX) of 28 July 1975 concerning the World Conference of the International Women's Year,

Recalling the importance of the participation of women in the implementation of the decisions of the General Assembly at its sixth and seventh special sessions as well as in the implementation of the Programme of Action on the Establishment of the New International Economic Order,

Having considered the report of the Conference,

Having considered also the note by the Secretary-General on the establishment of an international research and training institute for the advancement of women,⁷

Convinced that the Conference, through the adoption of the Declaration of Mexico on the Equality of Women and their Contribution to Development and Peace, 1975, the World Plan of Action for the Implementation of the Objectives of the International Women's Year and other resolutions, has made a valuable and constructive contribution towards the achievement of the threefold objectives of the Year,

⁶ A/RES/3520 (XXX) (A/C.3/L.2195) (text from U.N. doc. A/10474, report of the Third Committee on agenda items 75, International Women's Year, and 76, Status and role of women in society); adopted by the Assembly on Dec. 15 by a rollcall vote of 107 to 1, with 26 abstentions (U.S.), after separate votes on operative paragraphs 1 and 2, which the U.S. voted against. The U.S. supported resolutions entitled "Improvement of the economic status of women for their effective and speedy participation in the development of their countries" (A/RES/3522 (XXX)); "Women in rural areas" (A/RES/3523 (XXX)); and "Measures for the integration of women in development" (A/RES/3524 (XXX)).

⁷ U.N. doc. A/10340.

namely the promotion of equality between men and women, ensuring the full integration of women in the total development effort, the promotion of women's contribution to the development of friendly relations and co-operation among States and the promotion of their contribution to the strengthening of world peace,

Considering the valuable and constructive contributions towards the implementation of the threefold objectives of the International Women's Year made by conferences and seminars held during the Year,

Convinced also that the promotion of development objectives and the solution of crucial world economic and social problems should contribute significantly to the improvement in the situation of women, in particular that of women in rural areas and in low-income groups,

Convinced further that women must play an important role in the promotion, achievement and maintenance of international peace,

Considering that the decisions and recommendations of the Conference should be translated into concrete action without delay by States, organizations of the United Nations system and intergovernmental and non-governmental organizations,

Recalling that the Conference stressed the important role of regional commissions in the implementation of the World Plan of Action and related resolutions,

Convinced that periodic and comprehensive reviews and appraisals of progress made in meeting the goals of the World Plan of Action and related resolutions endorsed by the Conference are of crucial importance for their effective implementation and should be undertaken at regular intervals by Governments and by the organizations of the United Nations system within an agreed time frame,

Noting that the Conference recommended the continuing operation of the Commission on the Status of Women or some other representative body, within the structure of the United Nations, designed specifically to deal with matters relating to the status of women, so as to ensure the implementation of continuing projects designed to carry out the programmes set forth in the World Plan of Action,

1. *Takes note* of the report of the World Conference of the International Women's Year, including the Declaration of Mexico on the Equality of Women and their Contribution to Development and Peace, 1975, the World Plan of Action for the Implementation of the Objectives of the International Women's Year, the regional plans of action, and the resolutions and other recommendations adopted by the Conference, and endorses the action proposals contained in these documents;

2. *Proclaims* the period 1976-1985 United Nations Decade for Women: Equality, Development and

Peace, to be devoted to effective and sustained national, regional and international action to implement the World Plan of Action and related resolutions;

3. *Calls upon* Governments, as a matter of urgency, to examine the recommendations contained in the World Plan of Action and related resolutions, including action to be taken at the national level, such as:

(a) The establishment of short-term, medium-term and long-term targets, and priorities to this end, taking into account the guidelines set forth in chapters I and II of the World Plan of Action, including the minimum objectives recommended for achievement by 1980;

(b) The adoption of national strategies, plans and programmes for the implementation of the recommendations within the framework of over-all development plans, policies and programmes;

(c) The undertaking of regular reviews and appraisals of progress made at the national and local levels in achieving the goals and objectives of the World Plan of Action within the framework of over-all development plans, policies and programmes;

4. *Requests* the Secretary-General to transmit to the relevant organs of the United Nations and to the organizations of the United Nations system the decisions and recommendations of the Conference;

5. *Invites* all relevant organizations of the United Nations system concerned:

(a) To submit, within the framework of the Administrative Committee on Co-ordination their proposals and suggestions to the Economic and Social Council at its sixth-second session for implementing the World Plan of Action and related resolutions during the United Nations Decade for Women: Equality, Development and Peace;

(b) To develop and implement, during the first half of the decade 1976-1985, under the auspices of the Administrative Committee on Co-ordination, a joint interagency medium-term programme for the integration of women in development, which should co-ordinate and integrate activities undertaken in accordance with subparagraph (a) above, with special emphasis on technical co-operation in programmes relating to women and development;

(c) To render, in accordance with requests of Governments, sustained assistance in the formulation, design, implementation and evaluation of projects and programmes which would enable women to be integrated in national and international development;

6. *Calls upon* the regional commissions to develop and implement, as a matter of priority, effective strategies to further the objectives of the World Plan of Action at the regional and subregional levels,

bearing in mind their respective regional plans of action;

7. *Urges* all financial institutions and all international, regional and subregional development banks and bilateral funding agencies to accord high priority in their development assistance, in accordance with requests of Governments, to projects that would promote the integration of women in the development process, in particular women in the rural areas, as well as the achievement of equality of women and men, priority being given to countries with limited financial means;

8. *Urges* non-governmental organizations, at the national and international levels, to take all possible measures to assist in the implementation of the World Plan of Action and related resolutions within their particular areas of interest and competence;

9. *Decides* in principle, in accordance with resolution 26 adopted by the Conference, to establish, under the auspices of the United Nations, an International Institute on Research and Training for the Advancement of Women, which would be financed through voluntary contributions and would collaborate with appropriate national, regional and international economic and social research institutes;

10. *Invites* the Secretary-General therefore to appoint, with due consideration to the principle of equitable geographical distribution, a group of five to ten experts to draw up, in consultation with the representatives of existing regional centres and/or institutes for research and training which have similar objectives and goals, the terms of reference and structural organization of the Institute, giving special consideration to the needs of women of developing countries, and requests the Secretary-General to report to the Economic and Social Council at its sixtieth session on the basis of the recommendations of the group of experts;

11. *Affirms* that a system-wide review and appraisal of the World Plan of Action should be undertaken biennially, and that such reviews and appraisals should constitute an input to the process of review and appraisal of progress made under the International Development Strategy for the Second United Nations Development Decade, taking into account the Programme of Action on the Establishment of a New International Economic Order and the decisions resulting from the sixth and seventh special sessions of the General Assembly;

12. *Affirms* that the General Assembly and other relevant bodies should also consider biennially the progress achieved in the promotion of the full equality of women with men in all spheres of life in accordance with international standards and, in particular, the participation of women in political life and in international co-operation and the strengthening of international peace;

13. *Expresses the hope* that the *Ad Hoc* Committee

on the Restructuring of the Economic and Social Sectors of the United Nations System, which will consider the report of the Group of Experts on the Structure of the United Nations System (E/AC.62/9), will take full account of the need to implement the World Plan of Action and related resolutions of the World Conference of the International Women's Year as well as the requirements of the United Nations Decade for Women: Equality, Development and Peace, and appeals to the *Ad Hoc* Committee to ensure that the machinery designed to deal with questions relating to women should be strengthened, taking into account, in particular, the role of the Commission on the Status of Women and the procedures established for system-wide review and appraisal of the World Plan of Action;

14. *Decides* to include in the provisional agenda of its thirty-first session an item entitled "United Nations Decade for Women: Equality, Development and Peace";

15. *Invites* the Secretary-General to submit a progress report to the General Assembly at its thirty-first session on the measures taken to implement the World Plan of Action and related resolutions, and on the progress achieved in initiating the procedures for the Plan's review and appraisal by Member States, the United Nations organs, the regional commissions, the specialized agencies and other intergovernmental organizations concerned;

16. *Requests* the Secretary-General to ensure, if possible within existing resources, that the Secretariat unit responsible for women's questions possesses adequate personnel and budgetary resources in order to discharge its functions under the World Plan of Action in co-operation with all organizations of the United Nations system;

17. *Requests further* the Secretary-General, in the light of paragraph 16 above, to take into account the requirements of the World Plan of Action and related resolutions of the Conference in preparing revised estimates for 1977 and the medium-term plan for 1978-1981 and to report thereon to the General Assembly at its thirty-first session, in accordance with established procedures;

18. *Urges* all States, the organizations of the United Nations system and intergovernmental and non-governmental organizations concerned, as well as the mass communications media, to give widespread publicity to the achievements and significance of the Conference at the national, regional and international levels;

19. *Requests* the Secretary-General, as a matter of high priority, to issue, within existing resources, in the official languages of the United Nations, a simplified version of the World Plan of Action as a booklet, which would highlight the targets, goals and main recommendations for action by Governments, the United Nations system and non-governmental

organizations, and which would explain the relevance of the implementation of the World Plan of Action to the daily lives of men and women throughout the world;

20. *Decides* to convene, at the mid-term of the United Nations Decade for Women: Equality, Development and Peace, in 1980, a world conference of all States to review and evaluate the progress made in implementing the objectives of the International Women's Year as recommended by the World Conference of the International Women's Year and, where necessary, to readjust existing programmes in the light of new data and research available.

U.S. Gives Views on Question of Review of U.N. Charter

Following is a statement made in Committee VI (Legal) of the U.N. General Assembly on November 14 by U.S. Representative Monroe Leigh, who is Legal Adviser of the Department of State.

USUN press release 148 dated November 14

My delegation believes that the items currently before us on charter review and strengthening the role of the United Nations are the most important ones before the Legal Committee this year. The views we expressed on this item last year were carefully considered.¹ Since then we have reviewed our position more than once. We reviewed it in connection with our reply to the Secretary General's request for comments on charter review² and in connection with our preparations for the meeting of the Ad Hoc Committee on the Charter of the United Nations. We have reflected further on these issues in light of the session of the ad hoc committee which was held last summer.

Our further reflections have reinforced our original views. We continue to view the question of charter review with both skepticism and concern.

Our skepticism as to the utility of review

¹ For a U.S. statement made in Committee VI on Dec. 5, 1974, see BULLETIN of Jan. 27, 1975, p. 120.

² U.N. doc. A/10113.

of the charter is not based on any belief that the United Nations is functioning perfectly or in the manner hoped for in 1945. Far from it. The United Nations, for all its successes in the field of peace and security and somewhat more sustained successes in certain economic and social fields, can and must do a far better job to meet the urgent and immediate needs of the world. To accomplish that goal, however, we must avoid hasty and ill-considered actions which serve no useful purpose.

Impediments to greater effectiveness of this organization do not lie in any restrictions or limitations imposed by the charter. Those impediments are found in the political will of states which interpret and apply the charter's provisions. Common sense, good will, and a sense of responsiveness to the common interests of mankind are not to be legislated. They will not be evoked by modification of the charter; on the contrary, the present text of the U.N. Charter both allows and encourages those elusive qualities as much or more than any modifications we have heard discussed.

Our doubts about this charter review exercise are based on a concern that the United Nations will lose even that degree of consensus which we now share. We do not seek to maintain the status quo of 1945, or 1975. The charter was conceived as a document which could stand the test of time by growing with evolving needs. It was conceived not merely as a constitutive treaty, but as a constitutional instrument.

It has evolved, moreover, in central fields such as the effective functioning of the Security Council, peacekeeping, and human rights, including self-determination.

The reopening of questions on matters to which we have all freely agreed on various occasions in the past is hardly likely to widen areas of agreement among us. It is far more likely to lead to a hardening of positions and thus become the enemy of that evolutionary development which has been one of the strengths of the institution.

For example, although article 27 provides

that decisions of the Security Council on nonprocedural matters require the concurring votes of the permanent members, in practice that requirement has significantly evolved to permit Security Council decisions notwithstanding permanent-member abstentions or declarations of nonparticipation as alternatives to the veto. If article 27 were construed, as it reasonably might have been, to require the affirmative vote of each of the permanent members, the results of the work of the Security Council would certainly have been far different today.

We view this evolution both as a positive contribution to the work of the Council, and hence to members of the United Nations in general, and as an excellent example of how the language of the charter permits important evolutionary changes without requiring textual changes.

Attempts to meet particular problems of our moment in history by charter amendment are likely to restrict the charter's ability to continue flexibly to meet the needs of the future. If we attempt to develop specific and detailed proposals for today, we could undo the genius of the accomplishment of 1945. That accomplishment was not simply to provide a charter to deal with the contingencies of 1946; it was farsighted enough to provide our basic guidelines for the future by allowing scope for historical change. We would remind those who say that if revisions of the charter made in 1975 prove inappropriate in 1980 we can make further changes, that constant tinkering with a constitutional document can serve to destroy that institutional stability which is the sine qua non of the healthy growth and development of a parliamentary institution.

Finally and perhaps most immediately, it is our concern that preoccupation with constant tinkering with the constitutional structure of the institution runs the great risk of diverting attentions and concerns from the urgent problems with which the institution can and must deal.

The United States has repeatedly expressed its willingness to consider measures

for the improvement of the functioning of the United Nations and of its ability to perform its charter responsibilities. It is, however, our firm conviction that an exercise of introspection or examination of possible improvements can usefully be undertaken only with the broad agreement of all concerned, principally because any improvements, by definition, will require that broad agreement if they are to be at all effective. The complete lack of success of the ad hoc committee last summer demonstrates, in our view, that circumstances were not then ripe for serious work. There was in that instance not even agreement on whether some effort should be undertaken, much less on what should be done. In those circumstances no amount of good will or hard work could have produced a productive session of the ad hoc committee. I need not detail the unproductive nature of the exercise, since the committee's report³ demonstrates that conclusion. No useful purpose can be served by repeating that experience.

Therefore we are not convinced this is the appropriate time to convene a committee, particularly in light of the extraordinarily busy schedule in the international legal field, including among others the many informal and formal meetings in connection with the law of the sea and the ongoing work in connection with the Diplomatic Conference on Reaffirmation and Development of International Humanitarian Law Applicable in Armed Conflicts. We could see some utility in a committee which would follow up on the work of the committee on rationalization of the procedure of the Assembly and examine the wealth of governmental comments already submitted in the context of strengthening the role of the United Nations. In this connection, Mr. Chairman, we believe that it is not necessary to agree with all of the proposals put forward by Romania⁴ in order to acknowledge that we all owe them a debt of appreciation for having

³ U.N. doc. A/10033.

⁴ U.N. doc. A/C.6/437.

initiated the item and provided us with much food for thought.

In this context, a major area of concern to all members of the United Nations, and an area where we might constructively concentrate our energies, is strengthening and development of measures for the peaceful settlement of disputes. There is, moreover, no doubt this can be done wholly within the existing language of the U.N. Charter and the Statute of the International Court of Justice. No area is more critical, and certainly few areas contain more promise if we are able to demonstrate a basic positive political will.

This committee has in the past looked at the functioning and role of the International Court of Justice. The Court itself recently modified its own rules of procedure in potentially significant ways. We should look very closely at the numerous and varied opportunities which the Court machinery provides for peaceful settlement of disputes, and we should insure that all states in the international community are fully aware of those possibilities. In this connection, we call the attention of the international community to the fact that the Court in its most recent advisory opinion appears to have given the *Eastern Carelia* precedent⁵ a richly deserved final burial, thus clearly opening up vast new areas for treatment via the advisory-opinion route.

We recognize that some states are not yet prepared fully to accept the Court as a means of dispute settlement. To those who have hesitated to have recourse to the Court for fear it would apply a form of law created by another era, I would merely urge a careful reading of the recent jurisprudence of the Court.

We also recognize that there are some disputes which can best be solved, or at least initially ameliorated, by other means. We must consequently also examine fully the many other existing and potential facilities

⁵ *Status of Eastern Carelia*, P.C.I.J., Series B, No. 5, 23 July 1923.

for dispute settlement, including the reasons why they are too infrequently used and possible steps we might take to encourage the willingness and ease with which states might regularly resort to them as a customary and attractive means of resolving disputes peacefully.

At what might be regarded as the opposite end of the spectrum from judicial settlement is negotiation between the parties. It seems to us that even this seemingly simple and direct method might benefit from an exploration in terms of modern approaches to problem solving.

Certainly we should take another look at the various approaches pursuant to which the participation of a third party is invited not with a view to deciding the dispute but with a view to inducing the parties to decide as among themselves. This approach would involve good offices and mediation. Good offices normally implies merely bringing the parties together and urging them to try harder, while mediation is suggestive of a more active participation by the third party. Clearly the Secretary General has made recent important contributions in this field. Are there other devices that can be used? Are there special techniques that can be examined?

There are also possibilities in the form of factfinding and inquiry. This can be envisaged in terms of bilateral inquiry or in the classical sense envisioned in the Hague Conventions of 1899 and 1907 or pursuant to factfinding as discussed in various General Assembly resolutions.

Conciliation is another step in the process of third-party involvement. Is the conciliation mechanism set forth in the Vienna Convention on the Law of Treaties something we should include in all treaties; is it something which should be established as an independent institution of general application? Do the existing institutions provide a useful resource, or are changes required?

Are there untapped possibilities in the field of arbitration? Certainly an increasing number of purely commercial disputes are

settled in this way. Is there some reason why states in our interdependent and potentially self-destructive world should not take another in-depth look at the possibilities of this technique of dispute settlement?

There is clearly much to be done in the field of dispute settlement and prevention and much to be done in terms of making the U.N. system more effective. We must seek to accomplish as much as is humanly possible within the existing charter before distracting ourselves with more ambitious and less likely schemes involving amendments to the charter.⁶

U.S. Gives Views on U.N. Resolution on Transnational Corporations

Following is a statement made in Committee II (Economic and Financial) of the U.N. General Assembly by U.S. Representative Jacob M. Myerson on December 4, together with the text of a resolution adopted by the committee on December 4 and by the Assembly on December 15.

STATEMENT BY AMBASSADOR MYERSON

USUN press release 172 dated December 4

In the course of his statement before the seventh special session, Secretary Kissinger set forth in some detail the views of my government regarding transnational corporations. I would only quote now one short part of that statement:

For our part, the United States is prepared to meet the proper concerns of governments in whose

⁶ In a resolution adopted by consensus by the committee on Dec. 2 and by the Assembly on Dec. 15 (A/RES/3499 XXX), it was decided that the Ad Hoc Committee on the Charter of the United Nations "should be reconvened as a Special Committee on the Charter of the United Nations and on the Strengthening of the Role of the Organization" and that its membership should be enlarged by five states.

territories transnational enterprises operate. We affirm that enterprises must act in full accordance with the sovereignty of host governments and take full account of their public policy. Countries are entitled to regulate the operations of transnational enterprises within their borders. But countries wishing the benefits of these enterprises should foster the conditions that attract and maintain their productive operation.

One such area of concern—of deep concern to my government as well as to others—arises from reports of corrupt practices involving multinational enterprises and foreign officials or private parties. We condemn corrupt practices in the strongest terms. They are contrary to and tend to erode the best values of our respective societies. They may also have adverse effects on relations among states.

Accordingly, the U.S. Government is prepared to cooperate closely with other governments to deal with this problem effectively and fairly. However, we wish to emphasize our view that no international action can substitute for the basic responsibility of each country to establish clear standards of behavior and to enforce them evenly and fairly against foreign nationals and its own citizens alike. Those governments which are prepared to take such effective and evenhanded measures will find that they have the sympathy and cooperation of the U.S. Government.

I would like on this occasion to make clear that in the view of my government, private enterprise—and this includes transnational enterprises—has a vital role to play in the expansion of the world economy and in the development of all countries. We believe that most corporations are performing these functions very well. Thus, while some companies have been involved in practices which must be condemned, we must be careful not to respond in such a way as to destroy the vast benefits private companies bring to the international economy.

It was with these considerations in mind that my delegation submitted for consideration by this committee the draft resolution dealing with transnational corporations con-

tained in L.1435.¹ We had no reason to doubt that it was a similar concern which prompted the cosponsors of the resolution contained in L.1437 to act. This assumption proved to be true as in the ensuing negotiations we were able to reach agreement on a single text.

Under these circumstances, Mr. Chairman, the draft resolution sponsored by my government—contained in L.1435—may be withdrawn from consideration. Our purposes have been achieved by the achievement of consensus on the resolution contained in L.1437/Rev.1.

I would like to make some comments on the latter document, not by way of reservation, but to make explicit our understanding of the text:

—I think that we all agree on the condemnation of corrupt practices, including bribery. The blame for such acts must be shared equally by all who participate. Thus, we interpret the reference to bribery wherever it appears in the text to cover all aspects—the offering, the payment, the solicitation, the acceptance of illegal payments.

—As I indicated earlier, we believe that states have not only the right but also the responsibility to enact legislation against corrupt practices and to enforce such measures through legal action. It is important that such legislation clearly define the offenses and establish specific measured penalties appropriate to particular offenses and that offenders should be prosecuted through the courts on the basis of evidence and due process of law. The United States will co-

¹ Draft resolution A/C.2/L.1435, submitted by the United States and later withdrawn, contained the following operative paragraphs:

1. *Condemns* the offering or solicitation of bribes and other corrupt practices by enterprises, or their encouragement by government officials or individuals;

2. *Requests* the Economic and Social Council to instruct the Commission on Transnational Corporations to include this issue in its programme of work to be submitted to the Council at its sixtieth session;

3. *Calls upon* relevant governmental and non-governmental organizations to co-operate with efforts to resolve this problem.

operate with legitimate law enforcement activities of host governments, but we will oppose arbitrary acts of economic reprisal on the basis of uncorroborated charges.

—The question of the appropriate role of home governments in cooperating with host governments to eradicate corrupt practices is a complex one. For example, we have strong reservations about the feasibility or propriety of home countries enacting extra-territorial legislation to deal with this problem. As is suggested in the resolution, we do believe that this is an area for cooperative action between governments and pledge our support to such efforts. We also believe that these issues need to be carefully examined in the U.N. Commission on Transnational Corporations. In this forum, as elsewhere, the United States will work for a constructive and effective solution to these problems.

—Finally, Mr. Chairman, my delegation fully supports the concept of information exchange in particular cases within the context of established legal procedures. We do have doubts, however, about the efficacy and appropriateness of a blanket multilateral approach to information exchange.

If I could quote once more from Secretary Kissinger's statement at the special session:

The United States believes that just solutions are achievable—and necessary The capacity of the international community to deal with this issue constructively will be an important test of whether the search for solutions or the clash of ideologies will dominate our economic future.

Mr. Chairman, my delegation joined in the consensus approval of this resolution because we believe that it does represent an example of dealing constructively with the issue.

I cannot close, Mr. Chairman, without expressing my delegation's appreciation to the cosponsors of the resolution which has now been approved and in particular to their principal negotiator, Mr. Parsi [Farrokh Parsi, of Iran], for their cooperation in facilitating development of a consensus text on this important subject.

TEXT OF RESOLUTION²

Measures against corrupt practices of transnational and other corporations, their intermediaries and others involved

The General Assembly,

Concerned by the corrupt practices of certain transnational and other corporations, their intermediaries and others involved,

Recalling paragraph 4 (g) of the Declaration on the Establishment of a New International Economic Order which provides for the regulation and supervision of the activities of transnational corporations,

Recalling also the provisions of section V of the Programme of Action on the Establishment of a New International Economic Order emphasizing, *inter alia*, the need to formulate, adopt and implement the code of conduct referred to in the report of the Commission on Transnational Corporations on its first session,

Recalling further the provisions of the Charter of Economic Rights and Duties of States according to which such corporations should not operate in a manner that violates the laws and regulations of the host countries,

Recalling Economic and Social Council resolutions 1721 (LIII) of 28 July 1972, 1908 (LVII) of 2 August 1974 and 1913 (LVII) of 5 December 1974,

Recalling the report of the United Nations Commission on Transnational Corporations on its first session,

1. *Condemns* all corrupt practices, including bribery, by transnational and other corporations, their intermediaries and others involved in violation of the laws and regulations of the host countries;

2. *Reaffirms* the right of any State to adopt legislation and to investigate and take appropriate legal action, in accordance with its national laws and regulations, against transnational and other corporations, their intermediaries and others involved for such corrupt practices;

3. *Calls upon* both home and host Governments to take, within their respective national jurisdictions, all necessary measures which they deem appropriate, including legislative measures, to prevent such corrupt practices and to take consequent measures against the violators;

4. *Calls upon* Governments to collect information on such corrupt practices, as well as on measures taken against such practices, and to exchange in-

² A/RES/3514 (XXX) (A/C.2/L.1437/Rev.1) (text from U.N. doc. A/10467, report of the Second Committee on agenda item 12, Report of the Economic and Social Council); adopted by the committee on Dec. 4 and by the Assembly on Dec. 15 without a vote.

formation bilaterally and, as appropriate, multilaterally, particularly through the United Nations Centre on Transnational Corporations;

5. *Calls upon* home Governments to co-operate with Governments of the host countries to prevent such corrupt practices, including bribery, and to prosecute, within their national jurisdictions, those who engage in such acts;

6. *Requests* the Economic and Social Council to direct the Commission on Transnational Corporations to include in its programme of work the question of corrupt practices of transnational corporations and to make recommendations on ways and means whereby such corrupt practices can be effectively prevented;

7. *Requests* the Secretary-General to submit a report to the General Assembly at its thirty-first session, through the Economic and Social Council, on the implementation of the present resolution.

TREATY INFORMATION

Current Actions

MULTILATERAL

Atomic Energy

Statute of the International Atomic Energy Agency, as amended. Done at New York October 26, 1956. Entered into force July 29, 1957. TIAS 3873, 5284, 7668.

Acceptance deposited: Tanzania, January 6, 1976.

Containers

International convention for safe containers (CSC), with annexes. Done at Geneva December 2, 1972.¹

Ratification deposited: Romania (with statement), November 26, 1975.

Energy

Agreement on an international energy program. Done at Paris November 18, 1974.¹

Notifications of consent to be bound deposited: Canada, December 17, 1975; Sweden, December 18, 1975.

Health

Constitution of the World Health Organization, as amended. Done at New York July 22, 1946. Entered

¹ Not in force.

into force April 7, 1948; for the United States June 21, 1948. TIAS 1808, 4643, 8086.
Acceptance deposited: Comoros, December 9, 1975.

Narcotic Drugs

Protocol amending the single convention on narcotic drugs, 1961. Done at Geneva March 25, 1972. Entered into force August 8, 1975. TIAS 8118.
Ratification deposited: Chile, December 19, 1975.

Oil Pollution

International convention on civil liability for oil pollution damage. Done at Brussels November 29, 1969. Entered into force June 19, 1975.²
Ratification deposited: Spain, December 8, 1975.

Space

Convention on registration of objects launched into outer space. Opened for signature at New York January 14, 1975.¹
Signature: Mexico, December 19, 1975.

Telecommunications

International telecommunications convention, with annexes and protocols. Done at Malaga-Torremolinos October 25, 1973. Entered into force January 1, 1975.²

Ratifications deposited: Liberia, Yugoslavia, September 22, 1975; Thailand, October 8, 1975.³

Partial revision of the radio regulations, Geneva, 1959, as amended (TIAS 4893, 5603, 6332, 6590, 7435), to establish a new frequency allotment plan for high-frequency radiotelephone coast stations, with annexes and final protocol. Done at Geneva June 8, 1974. Entered into force January 1, 1976.²
Notifications of approval: Fiji, September 25, 1975; German Democratic Republic, September 22, 1975.

Trade

Arrangement regarding international trade in textiles, with annexes. Done at Geneva December 20, 1973. Entered into force January 1, 1974, except for article 2, paragraphs 2, 3, and 4 which entered into force April 1, 1974. TIAS 7840.

Acceptance deposited: Trinidad and Tobago, December 10, 1975.

United Nations Charter

Charter of the United Nations and Statute of the International Court of Justice. Signed at San Francisco June 26, 1945. Entered into force October 24, 1945. 59 Stat. 1031.

Admission to membership: Comoros, November 12, 1975.

Wheat

Protocol modifying and further extending the wheat trade convention (part of the international wheat agreement) 1971 (TIAS 7144, 7988). Done at Washington March 25, 1975. Entered into force June 19, 1975, with respect to certain provisions and July 1, 1975, with respect to other provisions.

Instrument of ratification signed by the President: December 22, 1975.

Accessions deposited: El Salvador, January 7, 1976; Luxembourg, January 5, 1976.

Ratification deposited: United States, January 5, 1976.

Protocol modifying and further extending the food aid convention (part of the international wheat agreement) 1971 (TIAS 7144, 7988). Done at Washington March 25, 1975. Entered into force June 19, 1975, with respect to certain provisions, and July 1, 1975, with respect to other provisions.
Instrument of ratification signed by the President: December 22, 1975.

Accession deposited: Luxembourg, January 5, 1976.

Ratification deposited: United States, January 5, 1976.

BILATERAL

China, Republic of

Agreement modifying the agreement of May 21, 1975 (TIAS 8033), relating to trade in cotton, wool, and man-made fiber textiles and apparel products. Effected by exchange of notes at Washington December 31, 1975. Entered into force December 31, 1975.

Italy

Agreement for exchanges in the fields of education and culture. Signed at Rome December 15, 1975. Enters into force at such time as Italy has notified the United States that the formalities required by Italian law have been fulfilled.

Norway

Agreement amending annex C of the mutual defense assistance agreement of January 27, 1950 (TIAS 2016). Effected by exchange of notes at Oslo November 21 and December 1, 1975. Entered into force December 1, 1975.

Union of Soviet Socialist Republics

Agreement amending the civil air transport agreement of November 4, 1966, as amended (TIAS 6135, 7658, 8058). Effected by exchange of notes at Moscow December 4 and 22, 1975. Entered into force December 22, 1975.

United Kingdom

Convention for the avoidance of double taxation and the prevention of fiscal evasion with respect to taxes on income and capital gains. Signed at London December 31, 1975. Enters into force after the expiration of 30 days following the date on which instruments of ratification are exchanged.

¹ Not in force.

² Not in force for the United States.

³ With reservations made at time of signing.

Agriculture. President Ford Addresses American Farm Bureau Federation (excerpt) . . . 97

Angola
 President Ford Addresses American Farm Bureau Federation (excerpt) . . . 97
 President Ford Interviewed for NBC Television . . . 100
 President Ford's Year-End Meeting With Reporters (excerpts from transcript of question-and-answer session) . . . 103

China. Department Outlines Development of U.S. Relationships With the People's Republic of China (Habib) . . . 106

Congress
 Congressional Documents Relating to Foreign Policy . . . 109
 Department Outlines Development of U.S. Relationships With the People's Republic of China (Habib) . . . 106

Cuba. President Ford's Year-End Meeting With Reporters (excerpts from transcript of question-and-answer session) . . . 103

Economic Affairs. U.S. Gives Views on U.N. Resolution on Transnational Corporations (Myerson, text of resolution) . . . 121

Greece. United States Official Killed in Athens (Ford, Department statement) . . . 105

Human Rights. United States Discusses Fulfillment of Goals of International Women's Year in the U.N. (Maymi, text of resolution) . . . 110

Presidential Documents
 President Ford Addresses American Farm Bureau Federation (excerpt) . . . 97
 President Ford Interviewed for NBC Television . . . 100
 President Ford's Year-End Meeting With Reporters (excerpts) . . . 103
 United States Official Killed in Athens . . . 105

Treaty Information. Current Actions . . . 123

U.S.S.R.
 President Ford Addresses American Farm Bureau Federation (excerpt) . . . 97
 President Ford Interviewed for NBC Television . . . 100
 President Ford's Year-End Meeting With Reporters (excerpts from transcript of question-and-answer session) . . . 103

United Nations
 President Ford Interviewed for NBC Television . . . 100
 United States Discusses Fulfillment of Goals of International Women's Year in the U.N. (Maymi, text of resolution) . . . 110

U.S. Gives Views on Question of Review of U.N. Charter (Leigh) . . . 118
 U.S. Gives Views on U.N. Resolution on Transnational Corporations (Myerson, text of resolution) . . . 121

Name Index

Ford, President . . . 97, 100, 103, 105
 Habib, Philip C . . . 106
 Leigh, Monroe . . . 118
 Maymi, Carmen R . . . 110
 Myerson, Jacob M . . . 121

**Checklist of Department of State
 Press Releases: January 5-11**

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

No.	Date	Subject
*1	1/5	U.S.-Republic of China textile agreement.
*2	1/5	Robert L. Funseth named Special Assistant for Press Relations and spokesman of the Department (biographic data).
*3	1/6	William J. Porter sworn in as Ambassador to Saudi Arabia (biographic data).
*4	1/7	U.S. Advisory Commission on International Educational and Cultural Affairs, Los Angeles, Calif., Feb. 2.
*5	1/7	Study Group 7 of the U.S. National Committee for the International Radio Consultative Committee, Feb. 3-4.
*6	1/7	Ocean Affairs Advisory Committee, Feb. 10.
†7	1/8	Kissinger: death of Premier Chou En-lai.
*8	1/9	Mary Olmsted sworn in as Ambassador to Papua New Guinea (biographic data).

* Not printed.

† Held for a later issue of the BULLETIN.