

S
1.3:
76/1958



THE DEPARTMENT OF STATE **BULLETIN**

Volume LXXVI • No. 1958 • January 3, 1977

*Index 2 page
1/1/77*

MINISTERIAL MEETING OF NORTH ATLANTIC COUNCIL AT BRUSSELS

*Arrival Statement and News Conferences by Secretary Kissinger
at Brussels and London 1*

*Message From President-Elect Carter Delivered by Secretary Kissinger
and Text of North Atlantic Council Communiqué 9*

THE OFFICIAL WEEKLY RECORD OF UNITED STATES FOREIGN POLICY

For index see inside back cover

THE DEPARTMENT OF STATE BULLETIN

VOL. LXXVI, No. 1958

January 3, 1977

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

The Secretary of State has determined that the publication of this periodical is necessary in the transaction of the public business required by law of this Department. Use of funds for printing this periodical has been approved by the Director of the Office of Management and Budget through January 31, 1981.

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.

Secretary Kissinger Attends NATO Ministerial Meeting at Brussels and Meets With British Officials at London

Secretary Kissinger headed the U.S. delegation to the regular ministerial meeting of the North Atlantic Council at Brussels December 9-10 and visited London December 10-12. Following are the texts of his statement made on arrival at Brussels on December 7, his news conference following the meeting on December 10, and his news conference with Secretary of State for Foreign and Commonwealth Affairs Anthony Crosland at London on December 10.¹

ARRIVAL, BRUSSELS, DECEMBER 7

Press release 589 dated December 8

I am very happy to be back in Brussels for the annual NATO meeting.

Through all changes of Administration the North Atlantic Treaty Organization has been the cardinal commitment of the United States, and I am certain that it will continue to be so in the future.

It will be very pleasant for me to review with my colleagues the state of our alliance, which is historically unique. I do not think any alliance in modern history has lasted so long, grown so much in vitality, and extended the range of its concerns so effectively.

We have many problems before us; but the future of freedom and of democracy and of developing of our nations depends on our cohesiveness, and it is in that spirit that we will conduct our discussions.

NEWS CONFERENCE, BRUSSELS, DECEMBER 10

Press release 600 dated December 11

Secretary Kissinger: I will go right to your questions.

Q. Mr. Secretary, don't you think that the purchase by the Libyan Government of 15 percent of the major Italian industry Fiat could influence in some ways the foreign policy of Italy, which is still a NATO country?

Secretary Kissinger: In the waning days of my public career I dare not take on both the Italian and Libyan public opinion.

Q. Mr. Secretary, during the course of the talks, did the situation in southern Africa come up, and if so, were any proposals made for further action by you or the United States?

Secretary Kissinger: The situation in southern Africa came up in the sense that I gave an account of the situation as I saw it and Mr. Crosland made an English interpretation of my remarks. We substantially agreed in our analysis of the situation. As you know, I am going to meet Mr. Crosland and his associates this afternoon in London and again tomorrow. No recommendations were made by NATO with respect to southern Africa, but there was a discussion of the situation as we saw it.

Q. In which areas did you and the Foreign Secretary not agree in your analysis on Rhodesia?

Secretary Kissinger: I would say that the Foreign Secretary and I agree completely in our analysis of the situation in Rhodesia. We greatly appreciate the role that Britain is

¹ Press releases relating to bilateral meetings during Secretary Kissinger's visit to Brussels are Nos. 590 and 591 of Dec. 8, 592 and 593 of Dec. 9, and 596, 597, and 598 of Dec. 10.

playing under great difficulties at Geneva. It is a complicated negotiation which proceeds through a series of crises and dramatic headlines but in which we believe that progress remains possible.

The United States, as Great Britain, supports majority rule in Rhodesia and supports a transition government in which the African component is in the majority. Now, how to work out the relationship of the various components to each other is the subject of the negotiations. But there is no disagreement whatever between the United States and the British point of view.

Q. Mr. Secretary, do you feel that you can still play any role at all in helping break the deadlock by meeting Mr. Nkomo [Joshua Nkomo, Zimbabwe Africa People's Union] in London or any of the other participants?

Secretary Kissinger: I have no plans to meet Mr. Nkomo—I will not meet Mr. Nkomo—because I know that some of the exegetists here will misinterpret the word that I have no “plans.”

I believe that we can continue to play a useful role in remaining in contact both with the parties in Geneva and with the frontline Presidents, who have such an important responsibility. We are indeed in frequent contact with all of these parties, and we will continue to use our influence in the direction of the basic principles of the transfer of power to the black majority under conditions in which minority rights are protected.

Q. Mr. Secretary, how do you think your policy regarding the Middle East, or let us say American policy regarding the Middle East, will continue after you and with the new Administration. Can you give us a general assessment about the situation as you see it?

Secretary Kissinger: Well, I am sure you know that I am not the spokesman that has been chosen for the new Administration, so I would not want to make pronouncements about their policies. Mr. Vance is an old friend of mine.

I believe that the foreign policy of the United States can never be based on the personal preferences of individuals and to the

extent possible we attempted to analyze the basic realities and the basic interests and purposes of the United States. In that sense, if our conclusions were substantially correct, I would believe that a new Administration would follow a similar course. There might be differences in tactics, differences in personalities.

I believe the main commitment toward a just peace in the Middle East is dictated by American interests and by world interests and finally by the best interests of the parties concerned, and I am convinced that the United States will continue to play a major role in the search for peace in the Middle East.

Q. What is your assessment?

Secretary Kissinger: My assessment, which I have been making for months, both before and after our election, is that the objective conditions that make for peace in the Middle East are better than they have been in perhaps decades.

I believe that all of the parties have come to a realization that there is no military solution to their conflict and that some negotiated peace must be sought. An endless conflict will have profound consequences for the peoples involved and profound global consequences, and therefore I believe that the parties are now more ready and the conditions are now more ripe for a significant effort toward peace than has been the case in a long time.

Q. Mr. Secretary, should the PLO [Palestine Liberation Organization] be represented at those negotiations?

Secretary Kissinger: The United States has stated repeatedly its attitude toward the PLO, which is that until the PLO accepts the existence of the State of Israel and the resolutions on which the present negotiations are being conducted—that the United States cannot address this sort of a question.

Q. Is there any prospect of that acceptance?

Secretary Kissinger: That is for the PLO to answer.

Q. But I take it that you say unless they do they will not be at Geneva, so far as the United States is concerned?

Secretary Kissinger: Until January 20, anyway. [Laughter.]

Q. That is all I could ask.

Q. Do you agree with the idea that your period of service for the American Government has served to reinforce the Atlantic alliance and at the same time to destroy (sic) European political unity?

Secretary Kissinger: I believe that the Atlantic alliance has been greatly strengthened in recent years. I believe that the system of consultation that now exists within NATO and between the countries of NATO, even outside the NATO framework, is intimate and substantial and it reflects the realization by all of the countries that we are united not only for security but as the repositories of freedom in the world today. And I believe that NATO in its political aspect is stronger than it has been and that the political unity of the Western countries has been greatly enhanced.

Q. And Europe?

Secretary Kissinger: And the unity of Europe? The United States is strongly in favor of the unity of Europe. I believe also that in the last eight years significant concrete progress has been made toward the unity of Europe in both its economic and, even more importantly, in its political aspects, and I hope very much that this will continue.

Q. Mr. Secretary, looking back what do you consider to be your most satisfying achievements and your greatest disappointments?

Secretary Kissinger: Well, I have told the NATO Council that it is too early to write obituaries—and having such a distinguished group of people here that have been analyzing my drawbacks and achievements, with emphasis on the former, I would not want to interfere with your work. [Laughter.]

Q. Mr. Secretary, could I pursue this ques-

tion along these lines? You have been asked many times since you have been here for you to volunteer some of your thoughts, and you have handled this usually with humor and with a jocular aside. I wonder, sir, if at this time in your farewell news conference here in Europe, whether you would take a moment and share with us some of your thoughts at the present time, as you prepare to step down.

Secretary Kissinger: I expressed some of these thoughts, in answer to the previous question.

I have always believed that the ultimate test of whatever an American Secretary of State or President does with respect to any other part of the world will be the degree to which it contributes to the unity and vitality and strength of the free peoples, especially the peoples of the North Atlantic area.

Security by itself is not enough. We have to ask: Security for what, and for what purpose? We therefore owe it to our peoples, as we seek security, to make clear that we are also seeking peace; and we also owe it to our peoples that as we develop our cohesion we define the purpose that this cohesion is to serve in terms of a better world.

This I consider the permanent task of American foreign policy, and history will have to judge how any one Administration carried it out. But I am positive that any new Administration will address itself to the same agenda.

Q. Mr. Secretary, under what conditions do you think that one day we can control the current armaments race and enter into a real organization for peace?

Secretary Kissinger: I believe that nuclear weapons have the characteristic that will make the traditional reflections about military power substantially irrelevant and that they impose on all statesmen an obligation to bring the armaments race under control. We have made considerable progress in the control of strategic armaments, and I believe that a further agreement on the limitation of strategic arms is within reach. There are other discussions going on on the limitation of forces in Central Europe.

We have the obligation to conduct our pol-

icy between two extremes: On the one hand not to disarm ourselves either by unilateral actions or by theories that produce a paralysis of will, but on the other hand not to believe that the mere accumulation of armaments is in itself a policy. Therefore there is a necessity to conduct negotiations on the limitation of arms soberly, realistically, but with great dedication.

Q. Mr. Secretary, what role do you anticipate playing in the Carter Administration in formulating foreign policy?

Secretary Kissinger: I do not anticipate playing any role in the Carter Administration in formulating foreign policy. On January 21 I will achieve infallibility [laughter] and will join all of you in my capacity to analyze problems.

I am always prepared to assist in specific circumstances and to offer advice in specific circumstances, because I believe that the foreign policy of the United States is a non-partisan enterprise; but I do not anticipate playing a role in the formulation of the policy of the new Administration.

Q. Mr. Secretary, under which conditions can you foresee a positive contribution of China to the world balance?

Secretary Kissinger: Well, China is a great country and a major power; and by its existence, its strong dedication to its independence, and the talent of its people and leadership, it will always make a contribution to the world balance. Whatever contribution China makes will derive from its own inherent convictions and not the prescriptions of Americans. And our cooperation with China derives from a parallelism of interest and not any formal arrangement.

Q. On Rhodesia, Mr. Secretary, do you consider the proposals that you put to Mr. Ian Smith are still just a basis for negotiations or, as he insists, a program to be accepted or rejected as a package?

Secretary Kissinger: I have always believed that they should serve as a basis for negotiations and that all parties in Geneva have an obligation to take into consideration the

views of the others. This is true of Ian Smith; it is also true, in my judgment, of the black negotiators in Geneva.

Q. There has apparently been a leak from you to the Western delegations at the CIEC [Conference on International Economic Cooperation] talks in Paris. Could you give us your assessment of the possible damage that this leak might incur?

Secretary Kissinger: Well, to tell you the truth, I read an extract of that cable in a newspaper this morning, and it had the sort of bureaucratic obtuseness which would make it sound as plausibly having been developed in the Department of State. [Laughter.] I have been looking for the cable ever since, so I cannot vouch for its accuracy. In the present state of our capacity to guard classified information it is always possible that documents appear out of context. I would not think that this particular document should do any significant damage.

The United States believes—indeed, it was one of the organizers of the North-South dialogue—we believe that an international order can only be built on the cooperation between the developed and the developing nations. We believe that the developed nations have a special obligation to put forward constructive, concrete proposals and that the developing nations have an obligation to proceed in a spirit of discussion rather than a spirit of confrontation.

It is true that we did not think that this was the best moment for the conference. An outgoing Administration would be in the extremely difficult position of having to put forward proposals that would have to be implemented by another Administration. And therefore it did not seem to us to be the right moment to have a conference, because either we would confine ourselves to the period for which we had responsibility and would therefore disappoint the developing countries or we would commit a new Administration to a program which it had no part in shaping.

There were other reasons that other countries had for the postponement, but as far as the United States is concerned, this was the reason why we favored a postponement,

whatever extracts from obtuse documents may appear in newspapers. But I will track down that document if it exists.

Q. If Spain joins NATO have you studied what might be the next response of the Soviet Union to this disequilibrium?

Secretary Kissinger: They might ask Albania to join the Warsaw Pact. [Laughter.]

The United States has favored the participation of Spain in NATO, and the political progress that is being made in Spain, which we welcome, in our view should speed the day when that situation is possible. I do not believe that this will bring about a change in the military balance, because we have already a bilateral arrangement with Spain and clearly it is not a part of any offensive intention against the Soviet Union. So we believe that it is a matter that should not affect Soviet dispositions.

Q. Mr. Secretary, one of the differences that is frequently cited between the kind of foreign policy that you have conducted and the type of foreign policy that President-elect Carter may conduct has to do with morality. Do you believe President-elect Carter may be making a mistake by giving too much emphasis to the subject of morality, or do you feel, in fact, that you have conducted a foreign policy with full regard to that?

Secretary Kissinger: I made a rather extensive speech on that subject before our election. I believe that the relationship between morality and foreign policy is not a simple one.

I agree with what my successor said at a press conference—that it is necessary to have strong moral convictions but it is also necessary to bring into relationship the realities of the situation with moral purposes. It is the essence of moral purposes that they appear absolute; it is the essence of foreign policy that any individual step can only be partial. It is the essence of morality that it is asserted to be universal; it is the essence of foreign policy to take into account the views of others that may also be claimed to be universal.

Now, I do not believe that what I now as-

sert about my conduct of foreign policy will be decisive. I believe that a foreign policy without moral convictions lacks a sense of direction and a sense of purpose, but what balance is struck in each Administration is very hard to predict and very difficult to foretell from abstract statements.

Q. Economic questions have appeared more prominently in your deliberations this week than they have at some previous alliance meetings. Could you give us your thoughts on the extent to which there is a danger that the global economic situation might deteriorate to the point where economic, social, and political stability in the alliance was brought into some question—to what extent that prospect is brought nearer by a substantial increase in oil prices?

Secretary Kissinger: The United States is strongly opposed to any significant increase in oil prices, precisely because it believes that the impact of those on the global economy would be extremely unfortunate and would have consequences which in the long run, or even in the medium run, would affect the very countries that are now raising or thinking of raising the oil prices.

I believe that the last three or four years have made clear that one can no longer compartmentalize foreign policy into security, political, and economic concerns. The social cohesion of all our societies, our capacity to act with conviction internationally, depends on growing and vital economies. And these economies in turn depend on the mutual sense of responsibility for each other of the free countries. This is why these economic summits have been both symbolically and substantively important and why I believe and hope that they will remain a feature of the international scene and why one can no longer separate the security concerns.

Q. An easy question for you, sir. What kind of advice, as we sit here at NATO today and you prepare to step down, do you have for Cyrus Vance?

Secretary Kissinger: We will take one more question after this one, but since you will all stampede out to report the monumen-

tal news that you have been imparted here, I want to take this opportunity to thank you for the relative courtesy with which I have always been treated here and the fairness which you have shown.

As far as advice for Cyrus Vance is concerned, I wish him well. I have repeatedly stated that he is extremely well qualified for his position. I have already made available to him all communications that come to me. He will be given a schedule of all my activities in Washington, and he is free to participate in any of them and at any meetings that I have. I will be spending most of the day with him next Wednesday, and we will be meeting regularly and frequently after that.

I do not think it would be appropriate for me, however, to give public advice to my successor before I have had an opportunity for full discussions with him. But I do want to say that he deserves the confidence of the American people, that he deserves the confidence of all foreign countries who are concerned with the direction of American policy.

Q. Would you like to say something, sir, about the future of East-West relations in the light of the large commercial debts that the Soviets are acquiring toward the West and the continued extension of easy credit and transfer of Western technology to the Soviets?

Secretary Kissinger: Well, let me separate the two questions—one, the extension of credit and transfer of technology; the second, the future of the East-West relations.

With respect to the extension of credit, I advocated last year at the OECD [Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development] meeting, and I repeated it at the NATO meeting, that it is essential for the industrial democracies to develop a common approach and a common concept. It makes no sense for these countries to compete with each other on credit terms without taking a look at the overall picture and the overall consequences of their actions. So I believe on the technical and economic issue that this is an area in which great coherence among the industrial democracies is essential.

As for the future of East-West relations, in

the nuclear age there can be no question that we have a dual responsibility. One is to prevent any temptation on the part of those countries that continue to multiply their armaments to believe that they can achieve political or economic solutions by the use of arms, and we therefore have to see to our security and make the necessary efforts. At the same time, the future of world peace, and indeed perhaps the survival of humanity depend on whether we can, in the relationship between East and West, find solutions to our common problems and a code of restraint, lest we slide again—as has happened so often before in history through a series of miscalculations and the accumulation of marginal advantages—into a perhaps unimaginable catastrophe. So, we have the task of security and the task of construction of peace. And the challenge to the Western societies is whether they can pursue both policies simultaneously or whether they will slight one at the expense of the other.

JOINT NEWS CONFERENCE, LONDON, DECEMBER 10

Press release 601 dated December 13

Foreign Secretary Crosland: Dr. Kissinger is paying a valedictory visit to London, which he has long since planned, following the NATO conference in Brussels. He will be doing a number of important things—going to a football match tomorrow, going to the theater tomorrow night. More importantly, he is being given a farewell dinner—farewell only in his role as Secretary of State—by the Prime Minister this evening at No. 10. And we are very glad to welcome him here.

This, in fact, was arranged—this visit—a long time before we also arranged by coincidence a roundup review of the Rhodesian situation with Mr. Ivor Richard, who has come back from Geneva for this. It has been a very helpful accident that the two have fallen together, because we have been able to exchange views with Ivor Richard as well as with Dr. Kissinger's officials and my officials on Rhodesia. And I think that we approached that problem with a very wide measure of agreement.

We have not taken any decisions this evening—did not intend, in fact, to take any decisions this evening. We shall be meeting again privately and bilaterally for further talks tomorrow morning, and I do not doubt that in any event I shall make a statement to the House before Parliament recesses for Christmas.

Now we are rather pushed for time, so I will not say any more than that at the beginning of the conference and simply answer any questions.

Q. I would like to ask Dr. Kissinger how he sees the Rhodesian situation at the moment.

Secretary Kissinger: Well, I think that the conference has been very ably conducted by Mr. Richard, that in a conference between parties where the distrust is so profound, inevitably many disagreements will emerge.

The United States has supported majority rule in Rhodesia and continues to support this. And I believe that from what I have heard from Mr. Richard and from what I know through our constant contacts during the negotiations that a possibility for progress exists and will be explored to the fullest by the British Government.

Q. Dr. Kissinger, Mr. Smith [Ian D. Smith, of Rhodesia] said in Geneva this afternoon that he had been brought there under false pretenses, that he had understood he was there to implement the solemn, firm, and binding agreement. Do you think he has any reasonable grounds for saying that?

Secretary Kissinger: I think we have gone over this allegation repeatedly. We gave Mr. Smith our best judgment of a framework for negotiations. These negotiations are now going on; and obviously, in any negotiation, the views of all the parties must be considered.

Q. Mr. Crosland, when you say that no decisions have been taken, what kind of decisions might you have taken?

Foreign Secretary Crosland: It is not a question of taking decisions week by week, I do not think. We constantly review the prog-

ress of the conference with Ivor Richard. He comes back here periodically, as you know. And we have to decide to take different decisions according to the period of time. We did take a decision 10 days ago that I would give a parliamentary answer saying that the British Government would be prepared to have the British presence in Rhodesia, for instance.

It is not a question of specific decisions being required, but a question of regular review of how the Geneva conference is going to see whether there is something further which we, the British Government, or the chairman should do in order to bring it more successfully to a conclusion.

Q. Is there any chance that you would ask Dr. Kissinger to once again take an active part in the negotiations?

Foreign Secretary Crosland: Well, I mean, I love Dr. Kissinger deeply—and I would love him to live a full and active life.

But I do not think I have any intention, and I do not think he has any intention, that we should agree together that the United States should resume the critically important role which they pursued—Dr. Kissinger pursued on America's behalf—last summer. No. I think that it is agreed between the two governments, and certainly the two of us, that the American role, which was critical and crucial during those months last summer, should at a certain point give way to a role that could be only exercised by Great Britain as the power that had some sort of legal, constitutional, and even colonial responsibility. And so it has not been a matter of discussion between us.

Q. In view of the many stories that come out about what Mr. Smith has understood or not understood, are you prepared to meet with him again before you retire as Secretary of State to clear this up?

Secretary Kissinger: I do not think there is any need for me to meet Mr. Smith to clear this up. We have repeatedly communicated with him our understanding of what was discussed. I do not think there is any need for a further meeting.

Foreign Secretary Crosland: We do not want too much of a rerun of this. Surely, both Dr. Kissinger and I have answered questions on this subject now for a period of two months, I should think about 500 times.

Q. In reference to your answer before that negotiations are a time for considering the views of all parties, have the black leaders changed their views or their positions since you went to Africa, and do you consider this insincere or inconstant or just a normal course of events in negotiations?

Secretary Kissinger: First of all, when I went to Africa I dealt with, primarily with, two of the frontline states. Because of the agreement we had made with President Nyerere [of Tanzania] we did not deal with the nationalist leaders directly.

Secondly, this is the first time that all of the nationalist leaders have been together in one negotiation, and it is therefore understandable that points of view will evolve and that points of view would be presented that we had not heard previously from parties with which we had not been in contact.

It is not a question of good faith; it is a question of finding a solution to a problem that has existed for a decade or more, that needs the serious concern of all of the parties. This is what I understand Mr. Richard is doing. And, again, I want to compliment him and to make clear that the United States fully supports the British conduct of the negotiations and the actions taken by the Foreign Secretary and Mr. Richard.

Q. Would you say, sir, that Mr. Smith's delegation has also been playing fair as you described the blacks as playing fair?

Secretary Kissinger: I think the Rhodesian delegation has also, within its lights, played fair. I do not think this issue can be settled by accusing each other of fairness or unfairness. Obviously, both parties are approaching this problem from totally different points of view, which produced the dilemmas to begin with. It is now to arrange for the transfer of power from the white minority to the black majority, which is the essence of the prob-

lem, under conditions in which the white minority has an opportunity to adjust to the new, changed conditions. It is obviously an enormously delicate and complicated issue, very painful to some and probably very painful to all, for one side to give up power, for the other to take it in stages.

And I do not think any purpose is served by accusing any of the parties of bad faith, but rather to look, as I understand Mr. Richard is seeking, for some way by which the impasse can be broken. And from what I have heard I believe that possibilities exist which require exploration.

Q. The black nationalist leaders in Geneva are clearly very anxious to have spelled out to them what the direct role Britain might be prepared to take during the transitional government period. Are you yet prepared to reveal anything about that?

Foreign Secretary Crosland: No, I am not at the moment. I stick to what I said when I made the statement about the British presence, which was this: that having expressed our willingness to have a British presence, we wanted to elicit from the black African leaders—we wanted to elicit from them what useful role they thought the British could play. In other words, we want to get a sense of how they see a British role before we commit ourselves to the detail of what kind of a role we will be prepared to play.

Q. [Inaudible]

Foreign Secretary Crosland: No, not as yet; but mind you, some interesting points have come out.

Q. Do you see the recess as a helpful development, or does it mean negotiating from some kind of trouble?

Foreign Secretary Crosland: What recess is this?

Q. From the Geneva conference.

Foreign Secretary Crosland: I have not decided on a recess. I might make a statement about that next week.

Q. You said earlier that you hoped to make a statement on Rhodesia before the Christmas recess. In that statement will you spell out the direct role that you envisage?

Foreign Secretary Crosland: I should wait for the statement. It will be lucid and very interesting.

Thank you very much indeed.

North Atlantic Council Meets at Brussels

Following is the text of a message from President-elect Carter delivered on his behalf by Secretary Kissinger in the ministerial meeting of the North Atlantic Council on December 9, together with the text of a communique issued at the conclusion of the meeting on December 10.

MESSAGE FROM PRESIDENT-ELECT CARTER DELIVERED BY SECRETARY KISSINGER

Press release 595 dated December 10

Our NATO alliance lies at the heart of the partnership between North America and Western Europe. NATO is the essential instrument for enhancing our collective security. The American commitment to maintaining the NATO alliance shall be sustained and strengthened under my Administration.

Over the past month, I discussed a number of challenges that face NATO—that we maintain a common strategy against common threats, that we have efficient and strong military forces, and that we consult closely as we negotiate with others on both European and global issues. I have no doubt that these challenges can be met.

I take the opportunity of this message to reaffirm that belief. I am convinced that NATO's mission and the North Atlantic alliance are no less important today than when NATO was originally established. I look forward to working closely with all the governments represented at this meeting.

NORTH ATLANTIC COUNCIL COMMUNIQUE

Press release 602 dated December 13

The North Atlantic Council met in Ministerial session in Brussels on 9th and 10th December. Ministers recognized the indispensable role of a strong alliance in ensuring the security of member countries, and in providing the foundation for their efforts to establish a more constructive and stable relationship with the Warsaw Pact countries. They expressed their determination to maintain and enhance the cohesion and strength of the Alliance.

2. Ministers stressed the need for East-West relations to develop at a more satisfactory pace. They recognized nonetheless that progressive improvement of these relations may be slow and sometimes difficult, and that it calls for perseverance and steadiness over the years. They emphasized that their governments would continue to seek realistic opportunities to resolve points of difference with the East and to build on mutual interest, and look for corresponding efforts by the Warsaw Pact countries.

Ministers stressed, however, that if détente is to progress, with the necessary public support, and not to falter, there must be real improvements across the entire range of international relations. It should not be assumed that heightened tensions in one area of relations would not have repercussions on other areas. In all parts of the world, confrontation can and should be avoided by respect for the accepted principles of international behavior.

Ministers also emphasized the cardinal importance they attached to reducing the risks of confrontation in the military sphere. They viewed with concern the high level of military expenditure in the Soviet Union and the continued disquieting expansion of the military power of the Warsaw Pact on land, air and sea, which are difficult to reconcile with the avowed desire of the Soviet Union to improve East-West relations. Faced with this persistent growth in military might, Ministers reiterated their determination to take the measures necessary to maintain and im-

prove their own defensive military forces, in order to ensure credible deterrence and to safeguard their countries from any risk of military aggression or political pressure.

3. At the same time, Ministers expressed their concern that the continued expansion of armaments would increasingly endanger not only world security but also the economic well-being of all nations. They stressed that these dangers could only be averted if all countries concerned joined in realistic efforts to achieve genuine and controlled measures of disarmament and arms control.

Ministers confirmed that the countries of the Alliance, in the event of an attack on them, cannot renounce the use, as may be required for defense, of any of the means available to them. Ministers also stated their view that all States which participated in the CSCE should respect strictly the renunciation of the threat or use of force as laid down in the Charter of the United Nations and reaffirmed in the Final Act of Helsinki.¹ This renunciation must apply to all types of weapons. It is essential for the strengthening of peace that there should be no build-up of armaments of any type beyond the needs of defense, a policy which has always been followed by the Alliance. Ministers also stated their position that the Alliance will remain a free association open to all European states devoted to the defense of the freedom, common heritage and civilization of their peoples. Furthermore, Ministers recalled that the right of states to belong or not to belong to treaties of alliance was confirmed in the Final Act of Helsinki. It is in light of these considerations that they have concluded that the recently published Warsaw Pact proposals could not be accepted.

4. Ministers stated again the determination of their governments to continue to comply with all the principles and provisions of the Final Act of the CSCE and expected that all other signatories would take steps to fully implement them. They noted that some progress had been made in implementation.

¹For text of the Final Act of the Conference on Security and Cooperation in Europe, signed at Helsinki on Aug. 1, 1975, see BULLETIN of Sept. 1, 1975, p. 323.

However, much remains to be done before the benefits of the Final Act become significantly apparent in tangible improvements, not only in relations between states, but also in the lives of peoples and individuals. Ministers recalled that the Final Act acknowledges that wider human contacts and dissemination of information would contribute to the strengthening of peace and expressed the hope that the Warsaw Pact countries would take measures leading to significant progress in the pace of implementation of the Final Act in the months to come.

Ministers also noted that Allied governments had fully and scrupulously implemented the provisions of the Final Act dealing with confidence-building measures. They noted that the practice of notifying major maneuvers was beginning to be established; however, unlike Allied countries, Warsaw Pact countries had still not notified maneuvers involving less than 25,000 men. They regretted that the Warsaw Pact countries had failed up to now to accept invitations to send observers to Western maneuvers.

Ministers looked forward with interest to the follow-up meeting to be held in Belgrade during 1977. The meeting provides an opportunity for a thorough and objective review of the situation prevailing in all the signatory countries as regards all the areas covered by the Final Act, and also for considering the further progress that could be made towards the objective agreed in Helsinki. Allied governments intend to play their full part in seeking positive results, with the aim of furthering the cause of peace and cooperation in Europe.

5. Ministers heard a report from the United States Secretary of State on the progress and prospects of the United States-USSR Strategic Arms Limitation Talks and discussed the relationship between the SALT negotiations and Allied security interests. Ministers found the report on SALT both useful and informative and welcomed continued United States efforts towards achievement of a satisfactory SALT agreement which takes into account Allied interests and concerns.

6. Ministers of the participating countries reviewed the state of negotiations in Vienna on Mutual and Balanced Force Reductions (MBFR). They expressed their conviction that these negotiations would achieve their agreed aim of contributing to a more stable relationship and to the strengthening of peace and security in Europe only if they were to result in eliminating the existing ground force manpower disparity in Central Europe and in mitigating the disparity in main battle tanks.

These Ministers reaffirmed their position that these objectives would be achieved by their proposal to establish, in the area of reductions, approximate parity in ground forces in the form of a common collective ceiling for ground force manpower on each side and to reduce the disparity in main battle tanks. These Ministers stressed that agreement to the goal of a common collective ceiling and reductions of United States and Soviet ground forces in the first phase would be an important and practical first step leading to the common collective ceiling which would be reached through additional reductions in the second phase.

These Ministers noted with regret that the important specific additional offer they made one year ago had thus far not met with an adequate response. They reaffirmed their conviction that the Western proposals provided a reasonable foundation for a just and equitable MBFR agreement. They re-emphasized their continuing resolve to press for the achievement of the objectives of the Western participants which would ensure undiminished security for all countries concerned. They expressed satisfaction with their governments' continuing solidarity, and reaffirmed the principle that NATO forces should not be reduced except in the context of Mutual and Balanced Force Reduction agreements.

7. In connection with Germany and Berlin, Ministers reviewed the developments which had occurred since their last meeting in May 1976.

Ministers expressed themselves satisfied with the progress which has been possible in matters relating to Berlin on the basis of the

Quadripartite Agreement during the five years since its signature. In particular, the agreement had significantly alleviated the lives of many Germans.

Ministers confirmed the continued commitment of their countries to the security and viability of Berlin. These remain essential elements of Western policy, and of détente between East and West. They noted the need for Berlin fully to benefit from any improvement in East-West relations, in particular through its ties to the Federal Republic of Germany as they are confirmed in the Quadripartite Agreement.

Ministers emphasized that the Quadripartite Agreement was part of a greater balance of interests which had, to a very great degree, made possible and contributed to the development of better relations between East and West in Europe. They noted that this process would be placed in serious jeopardy if any of the signatories failed fully to observe the commitments which it undertook in the Quadripartite Agreement.

8. Ministers reviewed developments in the Mediterranean area since their last meeting. They welcomed the end of hostilities in the Lebanon and expressed the hope that there would be continued progress towards stability and reconstruction in that country. They considered, nonetheless, that the continuing instability in the Middle East still gave cause for serious concern and could have dangerous consequences. They underlined the urgency of continuing efforts designed to achieve an overall settlement resulting in a just and durable peace in the Middle East.

Ministers took note of the report on the situation in the Mediterranean prepared on their instructions. They emphasized the need to preserve the balance of forces throughout the Mediterranean area. They requested the Council in Permanent Session to continue its consultations on these questions and report to them again at their next meeting.

In this context, Ministers reaffirmed their view that the coming into operation of defense cooperation agreements between Allied countries will strengthen the Allied defenses in the Mediterranean.

The Ministers voiced their satisfaction on

the agreement between Greece and Turkey on the procedure to be followed for the delimitation of the continental shelf and expressed their hope for the successful solution of this issue and the Aegean air space matters.

9. In the context of improving the military capability of the Alliance and making more effective use of available resources, Ministers discussed various aspects of standardization and interoperability of equipment and procedures. They approved the second report by the *ad hoc* Committee on Equipment Interoperability and agreed to take a number of actions, particularly in respect to tactical area communications, rearming of tactical aircraft and the implementation of NATO standardization agreements. They authorized the Committee to continue its efforts for the time being, both in specific areas and in the elaboration of procedures for ensuring the interoperability of future equipment. They also noted the progress in standardization achieved by the Conference of National Armaments Directors in promoting cooperation among member nations in selected equipment areas.

10. Ministers took note of the progress achieved by the Committee on the Challenges of Modern Society (CCMS), and its contribution to effective international cooperation in dealing with environmental problems confronting our societies. They took note of the completion of the pilot studies on advanced health care and urban transportation, and of the Committee's continuing emphasis on implementation by member countries of action resolutions. Ministers noted and endorsed the initiation of two new pilot studies, one to assist in world-wide efforts to clean the marine environment and the other to permit environmentally acceptable utilization of high-sulfur coal and oil. Ministers noted too that the Committee's discussions focused attention on global issues such as the effect of fluorocarbons on the stratosphere and long-range transport of air pollutants.

11. Ministers recognized that the basic problems in East-West relations were unlikely to be resolved quickly and that the Alliance must respond with a long-term effort commensurate to the challenges confronting

it. The Allies could rely not only on their material resources, but also on the creative power demonstrated in all fields by their free and democratic societies. Ministers were confident that, with the mutual support and solidarity provided by the Alliance, their governments and peoples would be able to overcome the problems which faced them.

12. The next Ministerial session of the North Atlantic Council will be held in London on 10th and 11th May, 1977.

Prime Minister Andreotti of Italy Visits Washington

Prime Minister Giulio Andreotti of the Italian Republic made an official visit to Washington December 5-8; during which he met with President Ford and other government officials. Following is an exchange of remarks between President Ford and Prime Minister Andreotti at a welcoming ceremony on the South Lawn of the White House on December 6.¹

Weekly Compilation of Presidential Documents dated December 13

PRESIDENT FORD

Prime Minister Andreotti, I am delighted to welcome you and your party to Washington, D.C., our National Capital.

Mr. Prime Minister, I have long looked forward to this meeting—since July, when you took office as President of the Council of Ministers.

Since that time, you have worked intensely and with great courage and determination on the difficult issues facing your nation and your government. I am extremely pleased that you have found time for this visit and for consultations on the broad range of interests shared by our two governments.

During the last two years, the United

¹ For an exchange of toasts between President Ford and Prime Minister Andreotti at a dinner at the White House on Dec. 6, see Weekly Compilation of Presidential Documents dated Dec. 13, 1976, p. 1700.

States and Italy have consulted at the highest levels with greater frequency than ever before. President Leone's state visit to the United States in 1974 was the first state visit of this Administration. Our leaders have met at NATO summits and economic summits and at the European Security Conference. I remember with great warmth my own trip to your country a year and a half ago and the friendship extended to me on behalf of the American people by the Italian people and by your government.

We are friends. We are allies. We have worked together and solved problems together. We will do so in the future.

Few countries have so special a place in the hearts of the American people. The United States and Italy are committed to freedom and share a firm dedication to democracy. We are both committed to the strength of the North Atlantic alliance and to the reduction of tensions which threaten international peace and stability.

Americans value the constructive role of Italy in the world today and in the past. We deeply appreciate Italy's contribution to NATO, your contribution to a stronger Europe—working together with the United States—your contribution to the dialogue with the developing nations, and your dedication to peace and international understanding.

Mr. Prime Minister, our two governments have made it a priority task to strengthen the North Atlantic alliance. The alliance has made progress in strengthening its defenses, standardizing equipment, and coordination of strategies and planning. Nevertheless, much more needs to be done.

All of us know that the defensive strength and the cohesion of our alliance are crucial to the balance of power in Europe that is so critical to European freedom and international security.

Our alliance, of course, has a purpose beyond military defense. The United States and Italy both recognize that Western Europe unity is a pillar of world peace. We must reduce tensions and reduce the possibility of confrontation in Central Europe, where almost 2 million armed men face one another.

We must promote mutually beneficial cooperation between Western and Eastern Europe.

The industrial democracies, if we are to be the masters of our own destiny, must work together, for we share basic, common interests on global issues—from defense to energy, the environment, trade, and relations with the developing countries of the world.

Mr. Prime Minister, our discussions on these many issues will be of great value to the United States not only in practical terms, but to reaffirm our profound friendship. Few nations are linked as strongly as the United States of America and the Republic of Italy by history, culture, economies, and the emigration of peoples. Our friendship has deep roots that insure its preservation.

Italy's contribution was one of the highlights of America's Bicentennial celebration. We especially welcomed, Mr. Prime Minister, the visit of Mrs. Vittoria Leone, the First Lady of Italy, when the La Scala Opera came here for its spectacular performance. The American people thank you for this wonderful presentation.

I look forward with great anticipation, Mr. Prime Minister, to our discussions today and tonight. As two democratic allies, we have a large area of common ground and many common concerns.

I bid you and your party, on behalf of the American people, a hearty welcome to the United States of America.

PRIME MINISTER ANDREOTTI²

Mr. President, I am deeply grateful for the invitation you were kind enough to extend to me at a particularly challenging time for my country.

Two years after the visit of President Leone—whom you kindly mentioned—your invitation confirms, through the frequency of our meetings, the spirit of close and sincere friendship between the United States and Italy. And I equally thank you for the warm

² Prime Minister Andreotti spoke in Italian.

words you just expressed about my country and myself.

The United States and Italy are bound by ties of alliance and cooperation, by harmonious ideals of democracy, and by choices of peace, freedom, and development. The Atlantic alliance, which binds our two nations in a common objective of defense, represents a guarantee of security for the Western World, to which we belong for historical vocation and on account of political choice, which proves to be an essential element of the international strategic balance, basic condition for a détente policy which will create the basis of a long-lasting peace.

With the same objectives of peace and progress, Italy is engaged, together with its partners of the European Community, in a policy of unity which will permit Europe to contribute to the creation of a more just and stable world.

Many elements unite us: the interest in social and cultural progress; in the advancement of science; in respect of men; in the choice of a style of life which guarantees and protects, to the greatest extent, the development of capabilities and potential for initiative of the individual; the awareness, both political and moral, of a necessary interrelationship and solidarity among all nations; the search for international order, which emphasizes at the same time the rights of men and those of nations; a vision of international relations which aim, to quote the unforgettable words of George Washington's farewell speech, to observe good faith and justice toward nations and cultivate peace and harmony with everybody.

But beyond these common ideals, our two countries are joined by the presence in this hospitable country of America of a large community of Italian-Americans who, through their work and human qualities, honored their land of origin and contributed to the increased prosperity and greatness of their new country.

The Bicentennial of the Declaration of Independence of the United States reminds us of the ideals of the Founding Fathers who are both yours and ours, founders of the United States and those of major instruments of an era of Western history which

brought man and his freedom to the center of our civilization.

The American Revolution is an element of the continuity of Western history and also renews it. It allows the Western World to accept the challenges of science, technology, industry, and to carry out a social transformation which is of paramount importance within the framework of a humanistic society, inspired in the values rediscovered by the Renaissance men. This era of the Western World's history cannot be considered complete. Its motivations and hopes are still alive. The ideal thrust must renew itself through a constant critical search for the most adequate objectives in order to accept present and future challenges. To this purpose, we are stimulated by the commitment and the concerns of the new generation.

Mr. President, during the scheduled meetings we will deal with many issues, because the present circumstances present many problems and they require an effort of imagination and understanding. But the guarantee of their success is given by the spirit of openness and sincerity which always characterized the Italian-American relationships during the past 30 years.

Mr. President, on behalf of the President of the Italian Republic, of the Italian Government, and conveying the feelings of the Italian people, I bring you warm and friendly greetings which I extend to Mrs. Ford and to your entire family.

Congressional Documents Relating to Foreign Policy

94th Congress, 2d Session

International Banking Act of 1976. Hearing before the Subcommittee on Financial Institutions of the Senate Committee on Banking, Housing and Urban Affairs on H.R. 13876, To Provide for Federal Regulation of Participation by Foreign Banks in Domestic Financial Markets. August 31, 1976. 399 pp.

U.S. Honey Industry. Communication from the President of the United States transmitting a report on his determination that import relief recommended by the U.S. International Trade Commission for the U.S. honey industry is not in the national economic interest, pursuant to section 203(b)(2) of the Trade Act of 1974. H. Doc. 94-596. August 31, 1976. 2 pp.

TREATY INFORMATION

United States and Romania Sign New Fisheries Agreement

Joint Statement

Press release 581 dated November 23

On November 23, 1976, representatives of the United States and the Socialist Republic of Romania signed a new agreement relating to fishing activities of Romania off the coasts of the United States. The agreement sets out the arrangements between the countries which will govern fishing by Romanian vessels within the fishery conservation zone of the United States beginning March 1, 1977. The agreement will come into force after the completion of internal procedures by both governments. The signing of this agreement took place at Bucharest. Minister of Transportation and Telecommunications, Traian Dudas, signed for the Socialist Republic of Romania. Harry G. Barnes, Jr., U.S. Ambassador to Romania, signed for the United States. Both delegations expressed their satisfaction with the new accord.

Current Actions

MULTILATERAL

Coffee

International coffee agreement 1976, with annexes. Done at London December 3, 1975. Entered into force provisionally October 1, 1976.

Ratifications deposited: Panama, December 13, 1976; Spain, December 9, 1976; Togo, December 8, 1976.

Acceptance deposited: Japan, December 10, 1976.

Economic Cooperation

Agreement establishing a Financial Support Fund of the Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development. Done at Paris April 9, 1975.¹

Ratification deposited: Spain, December 3, 1976.

Finance

Agreement establishing the African Development

Fund, with schedules. Done at Abidjan November 29, 1972. Entered into force June 30, 1973.

Acceptance deposited: United States, November 18, 1976.

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: Portugal, November 26, 1976.

Postal

Additional protocol to the constitution of the Postal Union of the Americas and Spain, general regulations, regulations governing the International Office and Transfer Office, and convention with final protocol and detailed regulations. Done at Lima March 18, 1976. Entered into force October 1, 1976, provisionally, except for art. 107, par. 1 of the general regulations which entered into force March 18, 1976, provisionally.

Signatures: Argentina, Bolivia, Brazil, Canada, Chile, Colombia, Costa Rica, Cuba,³ Dominican Republic, Ecuador, El Salvador, Guatemala, Honduras, Mexico, Nicaragua, Panama,³ Paraguay, Peru, Spain, United States,³ Uruguay, Venezuela, March 18, 1976.

Money order agreement and final protocol of the Postal Union of the Americas and Spain. Done at Lima March 18, 1976. Entered into force October 1, 1976, provisionally.

Signatures: Argentina, Bolivia, Chile, Colombia, Costa Rica, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, El Salvador, Guatemala, Honduras, Mexico, Nicaragua, Panama,³ Peru, Spain, United States,³ Uruguay, Venezuela, March 18, 1976.

Parcel post agreement, final protocol and detailed regulations of the Postal Union of the Americas and Spain. Done at Lima March 18, 1976. Entered into force October 1, 1976, provisionally.

Signatures: Argentina, Bolivia, Brazil, Canada, Chile, Colombia, Costa Rica, Cuba,³ Dominican Republic, Ecuador, El Salvador, Guatemala, Honduras, Mexico, Nicaragua, Panama,³ Paraguay, Peru, Spain, United States,³ Uruguay, Venezuela, March 18, 1976.

Safety at Sea

Convention on the international regulations for preventing collisions at sea, 1972. Done at London October 20, 1972. Enters into force July 15, 1977.

Ratification deposited: New Zealand, November 26, 1976.

Tin

Fifth international tin agreement, with annexes. Done at Geneva June 21, 1975. Entered into force provisionally July 1, 1976.

Ratification deposited: Spain, December 9, 1976.

Wheat

Protocol modifying and further extending the wheat trade convention (part of the international wheat agreement) 1971. Done at Washington March 17, 1976. Entered into force June 19, 1976, with respect

¹ Not in force.

² Not in force for the United States.

³ With declarations.

to certain provisions and July 1, 1976, with respect to other provisions.

Acceptance deposited: Japan, December 10, 1976.

Protocol modifying and further extending the food aid convention (part of the international wheat agreement) 1971. Done at Washington March 17, 1976. Entered into force June 19, 1976, with respect to certain provisions and July 1, 1976, with respect to other provisions.

Acceptance deposited: Japan, December 10, 1976.⁴

World Heritage

Convention concerning the protection of the world cultural and natural heritage. Done at Paris November 23, 1972. Entered into force December 17, 1975. TIAS 8226.

Acceptance deposited: Canada, July 23, 1976.

Ratification deposited: Pakistan, July 23, 1976.

BILATERAL

Brazil

Interim agreement relating to air transport services. Effect by exchange of notes at Brasilia October 27 and November 1, 1976. Entered into force November 1, 1976.

Cape Verde

Agreement relating to the provision of site test, commissioning and/or periodic flight checks of air navigation aids by the Federal Aviation Administration. Signed at Washington and Praia October 13 and November 19, 1976. Entered into force November 19, 1976.

Indonesia

Loan agreement for rural sanitation manpower development training program. Signed at Jakarta October 28, 1976. Entered into force October 28, 1976.

Loan agreement relating to Citanduy River Basin development. Signed at Jakarta October 28, 1976. Entered into force October 28, 1976.

Agreement amending the loan agreement of June 30, 1975, relating to irrigation systems and land development. Signed at Jakarta October 28, 1976. Entered into force October 28, 1976.

Iran

Cooperative agreement relating to environmental protection and improvement, with annex. Signed at Tehran November 10, 1976. Enters into force as from the date of the last notification by either party to the other that it has complied with its domestic legal requirements for entry into force.

Israel

Loan agreement to promote the economic and political stability of Israel, with exhibits. Signed at Washington November 23, 1976. Entered into force November 23, 1976.

Program assistance grant agreement to promote the economic and political stability of Israel, with exhibits. Signed at Washington November 23, 1976. Entered into force November 23, 1976.

Cash grant agreement to support the economic requirements of Israel. Signed at Washington November 23, 1976. Entered into force November 23, 1976.

Mexico

Treaty on the execution of penal sentences. Signed at Mexico November 25, 1976. Enters into force 30 days after the exchange of ratifications.

Romania

Agreement extending the agreement of December 4, 1973, relating to civil air transport (TIAS 7901). Effect by exchange of notes at Bucharest October 28 and 30, 1976. Entered into force October 30, 1976.

PUBLICATIONS

1950 "Foreign Relations" Volume on the U.N.; Western Hemisphere

Press release 564 dated November 18 (for release November 27)

The Department of State on November 27 released "Foreign Relations of the United States," 1950, volume II, "The United Nations; The Western Hemisphere." The "Foreign Relations" series has been published continuously since 1861 as the official record of U.S. foreign policy. The volume released on November 27 is the first of seven volumes for the year 1950.

This volume of 1,049 pages presents high-level documentation (nearly all of which is newly declassified) on the policies of the United States in the United Nations on such major issues as the Chinese representation question, the "uniting for peace" resolution, the Southwest Africa question, and the drafting of the first international covenant on human rights. The volume also includes the record of U.S. relations with the American republics and Canada. Of particular note are those papers concerned with the action taken by the United States toward the ratification of the Charter of the Organization of American States, the attitude of the United States over Communist activity in Guatemala, the negotiations of a petroleum credit to Mexico, the recognition of the military junta government of Haiti, and the political and economic relations with Argentina, Colombia, Panama, Peru, and Venezuela.

"Foreign Relations," 1950, volume II, was prepared by the Office of the Historian, Bureau of Public Affairs, Department of State. Listed as Department of State publication 8853 (GPO cat. no. S1.1:950/v. II), this volume may be obtained for \$13.00. Checks or money orders should be made out to the Superintendent of Documents and should be sent to the U.S. Government Book Store, Department of State, Washington, D.C. 20520.

⁴ With reservation.

Arms Control and Disarmament. Secretary Kissinger Attends NATO Ministerial Meeting at Brussels and Meets With British Officials at London (Kissinger, Crosland)

	<i>Name Index</i>
1	Andreotti, Giulio
1	Carter, President-elect
1	Crosland, Anthony
1	Ford, President
1	Kissinger, Secretary

China. Secretary Kissinger Attends NATO Ministerial Meeting at Brussels and Meets With British Officials at London (Kissinger, Crosland)

1

Congress. Congressional Documents Relating to Foreign Policy

14

Economic Affairs

Secretary Kissinger Attends NATO Ministerial Meeting at Brussels and Meets With British Officials at London (Kissinger, Crosland)

1

United States and Romania Sign New Fisheries Agreement (joint statement)

15

Europe. Secretary Kissinger Attends NATO Ministerial Meeting at Brussels and Meets With British Officials at London (Kissinger, Crosland)

1

Italy. Prime Minister Andreotti of Italy Visits Washington (Ford, Andreotti)

12

Middle East. Secretary Kissinger Attends NATO Ministerial Meeting at Brussels and Meets With British Officials at London (Kissinger, Crosland)

1

North Atlantic Treaty Organization

North Atlantic Council Meets at Brussels (message from President-elect Carter delivered by Secretary Kissinger, text of communique)

9

Secretary Kissinger Attends NATO Ministerial Meeting at Brussels and Meets With British Officials at London (Kissinger, Crosland)

1

Presidential Documents. Prime Minister Andreotti of Italy Visits Washington

12

Publications. 1950 "Foreign Relations" Volume on the U.N.; Western Hemisphere

16

Romania. United States and Romania Sign New Fisheries Agreement (joint statement)

15

Southern Rhodesia. Secretary Kissinger Attends NATO Ministerial Meeting at Brussels and Meets With British Officials at London (Kissinger, Crosland)

1

Treaty Information

Current Actions

15

United States and Romania Sign New Fisheries Agreement (joint statement)

15

**Checklist of Department of State
Press Releases: December 13-19**

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

No.	Date	Subject
601	12/13	Kissinger, British Foreign Secretary Crosland: news conference, London, Dec. 10.
602	12/13	North Atlantic Council ministerial meeting, Brussels, Dec. 9-10: communique.
*603	12/13	L. Bruce Laingen sworn in as Ambassador to Malta (biographic data).
*604	12/13	U.S. consulate at Barranquilla, Colombia, to be reestablished Dec. 14.
†605	12/15	Meat import negotiations held.
*606	12/15	Study Group 5 of the U.S. National Committee of the International Telegraph and Telephone Committee, Jan. 13.
*607	12/17	Waldheim, Kissinger: remarks following meeting, New York, Dec. 16.
†608	12/17	U.S. and Bulgaria sign new fisheries agreement.
*609	12/17	Advisory Panel on Academic Music, Jan. 17.
*610	12/17	Advisory Committee on Transnational Enterprises, working group on transfer of technology, Jan. 7.
*611	12/17	Advisory Committee on Transnational Enterprises, working group on illicit payments, Jan. 5

* Not printed.

† Held for a later issue of the BULLETIN.