

**The original documents are located in Box 11, folder “Foreign Policy Briefing Book (1)” of the Ron Nessen Papers at the Gerald R. Ford Presidential Library.**

### **Copyright Notice**


The copyright law of the United States (Title 17, United States Code) governs the making of photocopies or other reproductions of copyrighted material. Ron Nessen donated to the United States of America his copyrights in all of his unpublished writings in National Archives collections. Works prepared by U.S. Government employees as part of their official duties are in the public domain. The copyrights to materials written by other individuals or organizations are presumed to remain with them. If you think any of the information displayed in the PDF is subject to a valid copyright claim, please contact the Gerald R. Ford Presidential Library.

Mr. Nessen's

Foreign Policy Briefing  
Book

WHITE HOUSE  
WASHINGTON

September 21, 1974

MEMORANDUM FOR:      RON NESSEN  
FROM:                    LES JANKA   
SUBJECT:                Foreign Policy Briefing Book

The attached materials should give you a broad and concise review of the current foreign policy issues we face today.

In each section, the Q's and A's generally run from the general to the specific with the first question often being a general philosophical statement of our position in that area.

From time to time I will give you more detailed briefing papers on specific areas or topics, and each time we do a Q and A book for a Presidential press conference, I will insert the new items in your book.

You should also keep in mind, however, that while these items are as current as possible and represent approved Administration positions, you will still want to check before using the lines here when they relate to fast moving and sensitive issues since there will be times when we will want to withhold comment or give a specific tone to our response.

## INDEX

- A. Near Eastern and South Asian Affairs
- B. European Affairs
- C. East Asian and Pacific Affairs
- D. Latin American Affairs
- E. African Affairs
- F. International Economic Affairs
- G. General Questions

## FOREIGN TRAVEL

Q: What plans do you have for foreign travel and meetings with foreign leaders?

I have been in frequent contact with foreign leaders since August 9 and, as you know, I met with King Hussein here in mid-August and with Prime Minister Rabin this week. I plan a very active program of meetings with world leaders. For example, I will meet with President Leone of Italy later this month and with First Secretary Gierak of Poland in early October. I also plan to visit Japan in November and will be considering other future travel as well.

FYI: The visit to Korea should not be mentioned yet.



## MIDDLE EAST

QUESTION: Now that you have talked to the Arab leaders and with Israeli Prime Minister Rabin, where do we stand in the Middle East peace negotiations?

ADVISORY: Last Friday the White House press secretary said there had been progress, in the meetings with Rabin, in moving toward an understanding of how the negotiations might proceed. Later Rabin said in his press conference that there was an understanding on preferences on the next stage of negotiations. The following is a comprehensive answer aimed at all questions about whether Israel and the United States now have a plan on how to proceed.

SUGGESTED RESPONSE: We have had intensive consultations over the past six weeks with leaders of all the governments which are parties to the Middle East peace negotiations. I would say today we have made progress in several important respects:

-- First, there is general agreement that the diplomatic process should continue and that the next stage of negotiations should begin as soon as possible.

-- Second, we have identified more clearly alternative ways in which the negotiations might proceed.

-- Third, there is general agreement that, however one begins the next stage -- for example, with Egypt and Israel, or Jordan and Israel -- that stage is part of a process which must ultimately involve all parties to the conflict.

Thus, we are still in the process of evolving a consensus about the next stage. In any process it is natural that pieces fall into place as that process continues. Therefore, it is not possible to point to any particular meeting and say all the questions have been answered. But this summer's consultations have sharpened the choices and the focus for everyone concerned. I am encouraged by the progress made.

Now the consultations will continue between Secretary Kissinger and Foreign Ministers of the governments concerned when the United Nations General Assembly convenes in New York. The important thing is that movement continues in a process whose aim is to reach step-by-step agreements which create irreversible momentum toward a final just and lasting peace in the Middle East.

## MIDDLE EAST

Q: Are you sending Secretary of State Kissinger to the Middle East to open another round of negotiations?

A: It is very likely that the Secretary may make another visit to the Middle East in the first part of next month. Now that we have had talks in depth with Israel Prime Minister Rabin, following our earlier meetings with Arab leaders and the Israeli Foreign Minister, Secretary Kissinger will be consulting further with representatives of Middle Eastern countries at the United Nations General Assembly on possible next steps in the negotiations. After those meetings the Secretary will probably make a short trip to the area. I want to repeat: I am determined to do everything necessary to maintain the momentum toward peace begun with the disengagement agreements between Israel and Egypt, and Israel and Syria.



## PALESTINIANS

Q: What is your position on the Palestinians in a Middle East peace settlement? Should they have a separate state? Are we in touch with Palestinian representatives?

A: The position of our Government has always been that a just and lasting peace settlement in the Middle East should take into account the legitimate interests of all peoples in the Middle East, including the Palestinian people, as well as the right to existence of all states in the area. This issue, however, is subject to the negotiations between the parties, and I am not going to make comments which would prejudice the outcome of those negotiations. [If asked:] As for US contacts with Palestinian organizations, the State Department has indicated that there have not been any high-level contacts nor are any presently planned.

MIDDLE EAST - ISRAELI AID

Q: Prime Minister Rabin is reportedly asking for \$1.5 billion a year in military assistance for the next several years. How did you respond to Israel's new military requests and was your response tied to Israeli concessions in the negotiations?

A: I discussed all aspects of our relations with the Prime Minister. Military assistance is only one aspect of the long-standing close U.S. -Israeli relationship and is an expression of our commitment to the security and well-being of the State of Israel. Israel's ability to defend itself is essential to stability and to achieving peace in the Middle East and I assured the Prime Minister that we will not bargain with the security of our friends. As for the precise financial implications, they remain under continuing review.

I also believe that a negotiated peace is essential to the stability and security of all nations in the Middle East. We are committed to maintaining and extending the progress that has been made.

## SUPPORT TO ISRAEL

Q: Israel is facing a grave threat from Arab States armed with large quantities of the latest weapons by the Soviet Union. Don't you believe that the U.S. should provide Israel immediately the weapons including the most advanced ones to defend itself from this threat?

A: The U.S. Government has rightly and consistently supported Israel's right to exist and its ability to defend itself successfully against attack. Since the October War the U.S. has provided Israel with \$2.5 billion in security assistance. This has included advanced equipment and weapons. Within the context of our on-going military relationship -- which we do not discuss in public -- we will continue to assure Israel's survival and security. I believe that U.S. support should be continued consistent with the need to maintain a military balance which is essential to negotiations. These are essential ingredients in pursuit of a just and more enduring peace in the area.

FYI: Since the October War (10 months ago) the U.S. has provided \$2.5 billion in security assistance to Israel (\$2.2 in emergency security assistance plus \$300 million in credit assistance under the Foreign Military Sales Act). A major emergency resupply effort including a large scale airlift was undertaken during the war. Some of the material and munitions provided to Israel were taken from U.S. units, war reserves and prepositioned stocks in Europe. Israel has submitted substantial requests for further assistance both in the near and long term, and the Foreign Assistance Act has \$300 million in new FMS credits and \$250 million in budget support grants (supporting assistance). We do not discuss the details of new aid or our military aid relationship in public. END FYI.

## ASSISTANCE FOR EGYPT

BACKGROUND: Our request for economic assistance for the Middle East originally totaled \$477.5 million dollars: \$250 million for Egypt, \$77.5 million for Jordan, \$50 million for Israel and \$100 million for a Special Requirements Fund. The House Foreign Affairs Committee has increased the amount for Israel to match that for Egypt, \$250 million. The request for economic assistance for certain key Arab countries followed Congressional approval late last year of a supplementary appropriation of \$2.2 billion in military assistance for Israel.

Q: Why are we coming to Egypt's assistance with \$250 million? Why don't the Egyptians get the support they need from their wealthy Arab friends?

A: Our aid, first of all, will be used to support Egyptian efforts to restore a peacetime economy, which is in everybody's interest, including Israel's. The US is making this contribution also as a symbolic act, demonstrating the new US-Egyptian relationship which is an important new development and also in everybody's interest.

Q: Has the U.S. agreed to give military aid to Egypt? Does it intend to?

A: As I told Egyptian Foreign Minister Fahmi earlier this month, we are prepared to be helpful in a wide range of economic and cultural areas on which the U.S.-Egyptian Joint Commission will focus. With regard to military assistance, there are no plans for this.

## MIDDLE EAST - NUCLEAR ASSISTANCE

Q: In the light of the recent Indian detonation of a nuclear explosion, do you feel it is wise to provide nuclear assistance to Middle Eastern States, i. e., Egypt and Israel? Doesn't the supply of nuclear technology run the risk of contributing to a nuclear proliferation?

A: As you know, our proposals to cooperate with Egypt and Israel in the field of nuclear power include safeguards stricter than the international ones designed to prevent the misuse of U.S. -supplied assistance. Nuclear technology can make an important contribution to economic progress in the area and contribute in that way to the stability of the area. I can assure you that the United States opposes nuclear proliferation and is determined that our cooperation in the supply of nuclear power should not be diverted to any unintended uses. We must also keep in mind that the United States is not the only country in a position to supply nuclear technology and that other countries may not insist on equally vigorous safeguards.

MIDDLE EAST

Q: Do you support the proposed economic aid to the Middle East -- \$250 million for Egypt and \$100 million Special Requirement Fund (Syria) -- presently under Congressional consideration?

A: I strongly support the proposed legislation authorizing the extension of economic assistance in the Middle East. My Administration considers that the \$250 million for aid to Egypt and \$100 million for a Special Requirement Fund are important to our continued encouragement of closer more cooperative ties with the Arab world. We believe this can be an important contribution in stimulating economic development which will bring benefits to the people of the area and encourage them in following a path of negotiation to reduce the tensions in the area.

## INDIA'S APPEAL FOR FOOD

Q: Have the Indians asked us for food assistance and particularly PL 480 food? How will we respond?

A: India has not specifically asked for food aid under PL 480.

However, in the context of a UN appeal for food for the most seriously affected countries, India has inquired about food contributions and described to us India's overall food requirements. We are reviewing the food situation in India and other countries against our own available supplies.

FYI: The Indians have their own political problems with asking directly for U.S. PL 480 food. Thus there is no formal request in that context but they have talked to us about their food needs, in the framework of the UNGA special appeal, and it is preferred that we acknowledge their interest in that framework as well.

## SOUTH ASIA ARMS SUPPLY

BACKGROUND: In March 1973, the United States modified the total embargo on sales of military equipment to India and Pakistan which had been imposed when hostilities threatened in 1971. We now permit sales, on a cash basis only, of non-lethal end items as well as spare parts and ammunition for previously supplied lethal equipment on a case-by-case basis. Pakistan is pushing hard for a liberalization. The policy is under continuing review.

Q: Would you favor a change in the US arms supply towards South Asia?

A: I have been gratified by the progress towards the accommodation among the nations of South Asia over the past two years. I would think that any steps that we take in the arms supply area should be judged in terms of their impact on the stability of the region and our interests there. Of course, there are many arguments on both sides of this question and I understand that the issue is under continuing review within the Administration. I would not want to make any judgment on such a detailed matter until I have had a better chance to study the complicated factors involved.



## NUCLEAR FUEL FOR INDIA

Q: The New York Times reported that we are withholding the nuclear fuel for reactors the U.S. installed in India (at Tarapur). Does this represent our reaction to the Indian nuclear explosion?

A: We are not withholding fuel from Indian reactors. We are discussing with India an understanding to eliminate any possible uncertainty as to what are permissible uses of U.S. supplied nuclear technology.

Our support of the Non-Proliferation Treaty and the system of international safeguards for nuclear technology and materials is firm. We oppose the development by non-nuclear weapons states of nuclear weapons or any nuclear explosive devices, since the two are not distinguishable.

FYI: Although it is understood by all countries with which we cooperate that U.S. nuclear technology cannot be used for the development of weapons, there has not been as explicit an understanding regarding use for development of so-called peaceful nuclear explosives. We are negotiating this updated understanding with India and will address other countries as appropriate.

**B**

## US-EUROPEAN RELATIONS

Q: How do you assess the current state of U. S. -European relations, especially in light of the Greek threat to withdraw from NATO?

A: Since I entered the Congress in 1949, I have believed that it is important for the United States to have a strong alliance with NATO and Western Europe. This policy has paid -- and continues to pay-- sizable dividends to all members of the Alliance. I am pleased by the progress made in U. S. - European relations in the last few months. The Atlantic Declaration signed in June marks a renewed spirit of unity and common purpose for the Alliance, and I will continue efforts to broaden and strengthen the partnership that document symbolizes. Further, I will continue the United States' whole hearted efforts to consult and to work with our European friends and allies to guarantee the best possible U. S. -European relationship. This relationship remains fundamental to U.S. foreign policy. We continue to support European unity.

We regret, of course, the Greek announcement of plans to withdraw from NATO Joint Commands. We assume that each ally's relation to the rest is based on its conception of its national interest.

CSCE AND POSSIBLE SUMMIT MEETING

Q: Do you envisage travelling to Europe this fall for a European summit meeting, perhaps in connection with a final meeting of the CSCE?

A: I have no current plans to visit Europe. The CSCE has just reconvened. The United States and its allies have taken the position that the level at which the final meeting will take place will depend on the results achieved in the current stage of the conference.

## U.S. TROOPS IN EUROPE

BACKGROUND: There has been and continues to be public and Congressional criticism of the large number of US forces in Europe in support of our NATO commitment. For the last five years, US troop levels have been at the 300,000 level. This is over 100,000 less than the Berlin buildup level in 1961 of 416,000. Since the troop withdrawals from Vietnam, Europe has been the main target of those wishing to reduce US troop commitments overseas.

Q: Why should the US keep over 300,000 troops in Europe almost 30 years after World War II?

A: Our troops in Europe are there because of our needs today, not those of 30 years ago. Our troops are a key element in shielding Europe from military attacks or pressures. Present force levels are necessary to maintain a satisfactory conventional military balance between the Alliance and the Warsaw Pact nations. Unilateral US reductions would upset that balance and constitute a major political change. The US has agreed with our Allies that there will be no unilateral troop reductions except through MBFR negotiations.

Our troop levels there are not an obstacle to improved East-West relations in Europe. On the contrary, the stable military balance has been the starting point for hopeful new diplomacy.

For their part, the Europeans contribute the largest part to the conventional defense of the Alliance, and I believe

unilateral U.S. reductions would undercut their efforts, and  
would undermine confidence in U.S. support for the Alliance.

## MUTUAL AND BALANCED FORCE REDUCTIONS (MBFR)

BACKGROUND: There has been continuing pressure in Congress to reduce the level of US forces in Europe, which now stands at about 300,000 men. The fact that MBFR negotiations are underway has been instrumental in containing this pressure. Negotiations began on October 30, 1973, and our negotiators have been at the table for about seven months. Congress may, however, insist on tangible results in MBFR within the next year or take action to impose a unilateral US reduction.

Q: How important are the MBFR negotiations in the overall scheme of US national security policy? How soon should we expect tangible results from these negotiations? Could some reductions be made while negotiations are underway?

A: Our objective in these talks is to achieve a more stable military balance at lower levels of forces with undiminished security for all. The issues involved are obviously quite complex. The negotiation involves our Allies as well as ourselves. And the range of questions involved goes to the heart of the structure of European security.

The US has taken the position that, given a similar approach by our Allies, we would maintain and improve our forces in Europe and not reduce them except in the context of MBFR. In my opinion unilateral reductions would undercut the Alliance position in these negotiations and would not serve to stimulate reductions on the Soviet side. Rather, the East would probably sit back and wait for the unraveling of Alliance forces.

## DETENTE

Q: What is your feeling about detente? Do you agree with the proposition that the Soviets have been making real gains under detente while we have gotten little of value in return?

A: I believe that we have negotiated carefully and that the agreements reached with the Soviet Union have fully safeguarded and advanced our national interests. And I believe that any balance sheet would show that the Soviets have not gained at our expense.

At the more general level, I see no alternative to detente as we have been pursuing it. Striking progress has been made in the relaxation of international tensions -- in Berlin, in Indochina, in the Middle East. The objective of our policy is, as it should be, not appeasement of the Soviet Union but engaging the Soviet Union in new habits of conduct and specific solutions to problems.

Equally imperative of course is the need to maintain a strong defense posture and close ties with our traditional friends. The President has clearly stated his recognition of this full range of imperatives, and I fully support the position he has taken. The task before all of us is to manage US-Soviet relations in a way that will protect our own security and other interests, benefit other nations of the world, and progressively deepen the commitment of the USSR to mutual restraint and accommodation.



## U. S. -SOVIET RELATIONS

Q: Some say detente is stalled. How do you see future U. S. - Soviet relations?

A: I believe that the prospects for major progress are good insofar as they depend on our actions. I have informed the Soviet leaders that it is my intention to continue the course of Soviet-American relations charted in summit meetings in Moscow and Washington, in agreements reached by our two governments, and in the general spirit of cooperation that has been established. I am firmly committed to that course. My Administration will approach the many negotiations with the USSR already in progress or projected in coming weeks with utmost seriousness and determination to achieve concrete and lasting results -- results in the best interests of the United States and in the interests of improved international stability. The key element, therefore, will be whether the Soviet Union will cooperate in this approach. Personally, I am hopeful.

## SOVIET JEWISH EMIGRATION

BACKGROUND: Senator Jackson and others have sought to link liberalized Soviet emigration policy to our granting of Most Favored Nation status to the USSR. We are seeking a meeting of minds with Jackson. There has been a one-third drop in Soviet Jewish emigration in the first eight months of this year. This has apparently resulted from (a) a stiffening of the Soviet attitude, and (b) a tendency among would-be emigrants to hold off seeking visas in the hope that a more liberal emigration system will emerge soon as a result of US pressure.

Q: How do you feel the United States Government should handle the matter of Soviet Jewish emigration?

A: Americans from all walks of life, including our officials at the highest levels, have tried to impress upon the Soviets just how deeply the American people feel about the opportunity to emigrate as a fundamental human right. Emigration traditionally has not been regarded as a right in the Soviet Union where it is considered to be a purely internal matter. Yet over the past few years 100,000 persons have been able to emigrate from the USSR to countries where they had ethnic or family ties. This is real progress. It shows that the quiet diplomacy practiced by our officials and the countless expressions of concern from private Americans have had a remarkable impact on Soviet thinking. I am in favor of continuing along this path, using persuasion and inducement within the

broad context of US-Soviet relations, rather than attempting confrontation tactics that might backfire and cause grave harm to the very people we are trying to help.

## SALT

- Q: Reports say you have assured the Soviet leaders of extensive efforts to further arms limitation negotiations. Other reports say the U.S. has no agreed SALT position. Where do you plan to go next on SALT?
- A: We are currently in the process of formulating our position for the next round of SALT negotiations which will resume in Geneva on September 18. Dr. Kissinger will take up the subject when he visits Moscow at the end of October. The SALT Delegation in Geneva will have an agreed U.S. position. In a message to General Secretary Brezhnev, I reaffirmed our commitment to further substantive negotiations in the limitation of strategic arms. As agreed at the recent Moscow Summit, the next round of negotiations will focus on an agreement covering the period until 1985.

## TRADE BILL PROSPECTS

Q: How do you assess the prospects for achieving a trade bill this year? Can you reach a compromise with Senator Jackson on MFN for the Soviet Union?

A: I think that the prospects for getting a trade bill this year are good. In my address to the Congress on August 12, I attached particular importance to passage of the Trade Reform Bill. With regard to Title IV, trade with Communist countries, I am aware of sentiment in the Congress for linking trade concessions to assurances of freer emigration from the Soviet Union. We have been working with members of the Congress to reach a mutually acceptable formula. I believe that with a spirit of compromise and cooperation we can move toward a bill that will find general support in the Congress and will serve the national interest.

## US-SOVIET ECONOMIC RELATIONS

Q: How does the development of US-USSR economic relations fit into the overall framework of lessening tensions with the Soviet Union?

A: Economic ties are a component of the overall framework of relations we are seeking to develop with the USSR. Clearly the Soviets have an important interest in access to Western markets, technology and credits. For our part, there are potential advantages in economic dealings with the Soviets of a very practical nature. Beyond this economic calculus on both sides, the development of economic relations between us can strengthen their stake in maintaining a stable relationship between us overall.

If the US is to continue to develop the full potential of economic relations with the Soviet Union, she must weigh all major economic dealings carefully in the context of the full range of relationships.

## SOVIET GRAIN PURCHASES

Q: What steps has this country taken to safeguard its grain supplies against massive purchases by the Soviet Union such as occurred in 1972?

A: First of all, I understand the situation in the Soviet Union is entirely different than it was in 1972 and that the Russians are expecting a larger crop than they did then. Furthermore, since the sales in 1972, the Department of Agriculture has initiated a reporting system which requires American firms to report their export sales of grain on a weekly basis. Last Friday, September 13, the Department of Agriculture began to require these firms to report their sales on a daily basis. This reporting system plus our improved dialogue on economic matters with the Soviet Union causes us to be confident that the 1972 situation will not be repeated.

## CYPRUS SITUATION

You may wish to preface any remarks on Cyprus with the following general comment:

First, in addressing the situation on Cyprus, I want to express our great concern about the tragic refugee situation in the island which we hope will become a major concern of the parties involved, and the entire international community. Through the International Committee for the Red Cross we have already contributed over \$6 million in cash grants, food, tents, other relief supplies and airlift costs. We intend to continue that assistance as long as the need remains.

Second, let me reiterate the principles of our policy toward the Cyprus situation:

-- The United States shall insist on the strict maintenance of the ceasefire on Cyprus.

-- We will continue to support efforts to bring the parties to the negotiating table.

-- The United States will play any role requested by the parties.

-- We believe it will be necessary for Turkey to display flexibility and a concern for Greek sensitivities, both in terms of territory and the size of military forces on the island.

-- The United States greatly values the traditional friendship of Greece. We will use our influence in any negotiations to take



into full account Greek honor and national dignity.

-- We are now and will remain in close touch with all the parties to assist in bringing about an equitable solution to Cyprus.

## CYPRUS

Q: Why did the United States not act more forcefully to restrain the Turkish actions on Cyprus? What will the US do now to bring peace there?

A: This Administration has taken every reasonable and appropriate step in our efforts with all parties involved to end the fighting and bring about early negotiations for a constructive solution of the Cyprus problem. We urged both military restraint and diplomatic flexibility to take into account the national dignity and security needs of all parties. In our attempts to bring the parties to the negotiating table, the United States has been willing to take part in any role that accords with the wishes of the parties. We remain willing to do so. The United States greatly values the friendship of Cyprus, Greece and Turkey, and it is in this context that we will continue to offer our assistance.

U.S. MILITARY ASSISTANCE TO TURKEY

Q: Members of Congress and the press are charging that continuation of our military assistance to Turkey is illegal. Do you plan to cut it off?

A: First of all, the plain fact is that our assistance to Turkey is in our own direct national interest, just as it is in the mutual interest of the West and Turkey for the defense of the Eastern Mediterranean.

Secretary Kissinger and I have discussed this matter at some length already; we will have additional discussions on this score, and I expect to take it up with Congressional leaders in the near future.

## TURKISH OPIUM

Q: What is the present status of our discussions with the Turkish Government regarding their decision to resume the production of opium?

A: Since the Turkish Government decided to authorize the resumption of the cultivation of the opium poppy, there has been high-level dialogue between our two governments on this issue. I took this dialogue up urgently when I assumed this office. We have made clear our concern at the possibility of a renewed flow of heroin made from Turkish opium to the United States and the vital need for effective controls. The Turkish Prime Minister has assured us of his government's strong determination to prevent this.

There have been very hopeful signs that the Turkish Government will support a production process that will provide much tighter control and that will effectively preclude opium from getting into the international illicit narcotics market. This is a matter which the Administration will continue to follow in close cooperation with the Government of Turkey.

C

## POLICY IN EAST ASIA

Q: Don't you think we are just bogged down in Asia with all this talk of a Nixon doctrine? Where do you think we are going?

A: Our Asian policy has been carefully thought out and implemented. We have reduced our forces in Asia over the last five years. We no longer have troops in Indochina, and we have reduced our presence in every other country where they are stationed. We have already been able to reduce the amount of military and economic assistance that we provide for the countries of Asia, and we are shifting more and more of that assistance from grants to loans.

This was never meant as a policy of withdrawal. It was meant as an adjustment to new conditions, to enable us to sustain our basic involvement in Asia. We want our allies to be less dependent on us; we wanted to preserve a military defense posture that was clearly not threatening to our adversaries.

I believe it is a vital interest of the United States to protect our friends and to help maintain peace and stability in Asia. I know the nations of Asia agree with and support such a policy. I believe that the American people also support it.

## US-JAPAN RELATIONS

Q: How would you describe our relationship with Japan as you prepare for your first trip overseas as President?

A: Our relationship with Japan is of vital importance to the United States, and I am happy to say that is probably closer than it has ever been. Japan's economic well-being as well as her security are closely linked with our own. Japan has in the past few years been shaping a more important role for herself in the world arena, one which accepts increasing responsibility for the development of her Asian neighbors despite serious new economic burdens.

We shall continue to work closely with Japan. My forthcoming visit to Japan -- the first by any American President -- best symbolizes this new era in our relations.

## JAPAN VISIT

Q: It looks as though the visit to Japan will be your first trip abroad as President. Why are you going to Japan now, and what do you hope to gain from this visit?

A: I consider our relations with Japan of crucial importance. Beyond demonstrating my personal commitment to the continued strengthening of relations between Japan and the United States, I want to become acquainted with the leaders of Japan and discuss additional areas of U.S. -Japanese cooperation in the common challenges we face in energy, inflation and expanding trade.



## SECURITY RELATIONSHIP WITH JAPAN

Q: Do you believe the U.S. needs to maintain military forces in Japan?

A: Yes. Japan remains as the northern anchor for the security of Asia and the Western Pacific area. It provides the bases and staging areas for U.S. ground, sea, and air forces, enabling the U.S. to provide visible evidence of its interest in Asia and, if necessary, to respond to military contingencies in Korea, and other areas of the Western Pacific, the Northern Pacific Ocean, the Sea of Japan, and the Yellow Sea.

People's Republic of China

QUESTION: Where do we stand today, and where are we heading, in relation with China?

ADVISORY: The Shanghai Communique issued at the conclusion of President Nixon's visit to China in February 1972 remains the "charter" of the US-PRC relationship. At present, Congressional and public interest is focussed primarily on whether and when the US will establish full diplomatic relations with the PRC and consequently change our relationship with the Republic of China on Taiwan. We have not publicly addressed this question; we have said that we will continue the process of normalizing relations with the PRC, but have not identified the end result.

ANSWER : The establishment of a new relationship with the PRC is one of the major developments in our foreign policy in recent years. Our relations with the PRC are no longer marked by suspicion and hostility, and this can contribute significantly to our goal of helping to build a structure of peace and progress.

In the Shanghai Communique, we agreed upon a set of principles to govern our relationship. We talk to each other on a wide variety of subjects through our Liaison Offices; trade has developed rapidly; Americans and Chinese can travel to each other's country. All this helps increase mutual understanding.

There are of course still differences in our societies and foreign policies. But we are pledged to continue the process of normalization of relations with the PRC, and we are confident that this will be of benefit to both countries.

## KOREA

Q. With the South-North Korean talks underway and the major powers in the Pacific area pursuing a policy of detente, why does the US continue to maintain its military force level of approximately 40,000 in Korea?

A. Our principal aim in Korea is to prevent another round of hostilities between North and South. Our help in maintaining a military balance on the peninsula is essential to the peace of the whole area. It is also intimately related to Japanese security and to a mutually satisfactory US defense relationship with the Japanese. Over time we hope that the continuation of a balance of power between North and South will lead to changes in relations between the two Koreas and the great powers that will serve to defuse the existing enmity on the peninsula.

The US-Korean Mutual Defense Treaty of 1954 provides the basis of our mutual security arrangements with the Republic of Korea. We contribute to the implementation of these arrangements, and thus US security policy, by maintaining a US force presence in Korea, and by assisting in the training and improvement of the ROK armed forces.

## US AID FOR THE REPUBLIC OF KOREA

Q: Do you favor continuing US military and economic aid to the Park regime in Korea, which uses US support to strengthen its repression of human rights?

A: We have made clear to the Korean government our views on the question of human rights, and shall continue to do so. But whatever may be our disagreements, Korea is, some twenty years after a devastating communist invasion and war, a viable country. US aid has lessened substantially, and grant aid is continuing to decline. But the existence of an independent, self-reliant Republic of Korea is a key element of our efforts to assure the stability and security of all of Northeast Asia. We consider these interests of paramount importance. I believe the prevention of war on the Korean peninsula is the first and most important step toward making possible conditions in which free political and social institutions can develop. Withholding essential economic and military assistance could well have the opposite effect.

FYI: The Foreign Relations Committee report on the Foreign Assistance Act recommends reducing economic and military aid to the ROK by stages and eliminating it entirely in 1977.

## A NEW HANOI OFFENSIVE

Q: Do you anticipate a new Hanoi offensive against South Vietnam? Will U.S. forces have to help defend South Vietnam?

A: We do not know if they will launch another country-wide offensive as they did in 1968 and 1972. We do know that the North Vietnamese have sent over 160,000 men and massive quantities of military equipment into South Vietnam over the last year and a half. A number of heavy attacks have recently been launched. Fortunately, the spirit and capability of the South Vietnamese armed forces is high and they have been able to contain these attacks and to retake many positions that had been overrun.

I would not try to predict in advance what the U.S. would do in the event of a North Vietnamese massive offensive against South Vietnam. Any action would, of course, be fully in accordance with our Constitutional process.

FYI: We are trying to keep some uncertainty in Hanoi's mind as to our ultimate intentions.

## THE U.S. ROLE IN INDOCHINA

Q: Many in Congress oppose further U.S. aid to Vietnam and Congress has severely cut U.S. assistance programs there. What do you see as the proper U.S. role in Indochina?

A: The proper American role in Vietnam today -- as it has been throughout our involvement -- is to achieve a reasonable opportunity for the Vietnamese people to decide their future for themselves. I believe that the Paris agreements -- if respected -- establish a satisfactory framework for that process to take place. Our military aid, extended in accordance with the Paris agreements, provides the minimal level of support necessary to maintain the security of South Vietnam. Our economic aid is a key ingredient in rebuilding the economic infrastructure of Vietnam and in getting on with the vital process of nation-building. Americans have never broken faith with an ally before and I don't intend to start now. The levels of military and economic aid so far voted by Congressional committees are clearly inadequate. Heavy cuts will jeopardize all that has been achieved after years of struggle.

REINTRODUCTION OF U.S. FORCES IN VIETNAM

Q: Do you anticipate a new Hanoi offensive against South Vietnam? Will U.S. forces have to help defend South Vietnam?

A: We do not know if they will launch another country-wide offensive as they did in 1968 and 1972. We do know that the North Vietnamese have sent over 160,000 men and massive quantities of military equipment into South Vietnam over the last year and a half. A number of heavy attacks have recently been launched. Fortunately, the spirit and capability of the South Vietnamese armed forces is high and they have been able to contain these attacks and to retake many positions that had been overrun.

I would not try to predict in advance what the U.S. would do in the event of a North Vietnamese massive offensive against South Vietnam. Any action would, of course, have to be fully in accordance with our Constitutional process.

## AID CUTOFF TO SOUTH VIETNAM

Q: What is wrong with the approach of cutting our military assistance to force President Thieu to honor the ceasefire agreement and achieve some type of political accommodation with the Communists?

A: First of all, it is the Communist side, not the GVN, that is refusing to implement the ceasefire:

-- The Viet Cong and the North Vietnamese have refused to contribute to the International Commission on Control and Supervision (ICCS) budget and have never assisted the ICCS in achieving a ceasefire.

-- They have walked out of the talks in Paris.

-- They have boycotted the talks in Saigon for over two months.

-- They have refused to let us search for any of our MIAs.

South Vietnam has repeatedly called for a complete implementation of all political provisions of the Agreement with a fixed date for elections. The Communist side has refused even to discuss these proposals.

If we force the GVN to accommodate the Communists while they (the Communists) are blatantly violating the Agreement, it will undermine the political stability of the GVN side and could lead to a Communist takeover.



## AID TO SOUTH VIETNAM

Q: What will be the net effect of the situation in Vietnam if the levels of aid, currently under discussion on the Hill, are approved?

A: I am very disappointed with the moves in Congress to cut military assistance drastically, and when I met with the bipartisan leadership last week, I asked the Congress to reconsider its actions. On the military side, we have asked for minimum amounts to assure adequate replacement of equipment on a one-for-one basis, as provided in the Paris Agreement, and to cope with increased levels of fighting. Any cuts from the levels requested will obviously reduce South Vietnam's ability to defend itself.

Our request for economic aid has thus far been cut about in half by Congressional action. Such an amount would fail even to maintain the status quo. We would hope to be able to help in the vital reconstruction process and to give South Vietnam an opportunity to build a viable, self-sufficient economy. Over the long run, that would mean less American aid.

## CORRUPTION IN SOUTH VIETNAM

Question:

Why do we support a corrupt dictatorship that suppresses and imprisons oppositionists?

Answer:

South Vietnam enjoys more political freedom than would most countries under similar circumstance. After all, it faces an enemy army in-country of over 300,000 and a well-organized Communist terrorist and subversive organization with tens of thousands of cadre [FYI: about 30,000 hard core cadre] -- all dedicated to imposing a Communist rule on South Vietnam.

There is in South Vietnam a great deal of open opposition from National Assembly and Senate members, politicians, intellectuals, journalists and others, which the Government has not attempted to suppress.

We have been unable to document any cases of individuals being imprisoned purely for political opposition -- as opposed, for example, to Communist cadre who are actively working to destroy the Government. As far as we can determine, everyone in jail in South Vietnam would also be jailed in western democratic societies.

In any case, I understand that the South Vietnamese Government has extended an open invitation to a dozen clearly objective members of Congress from

both Houses and both parties to come to the Republic  
of Vietnam to inspect prisons.

## CAMBODIA

Question: Is there any hope of a settlement in Cambodia?

Answer: We hope so. The other side has failed in its efforts to take Cambodia by military force. I hope that they will soon realize that the time has come for negotiations.

We believe negotiations should take place. The war has gone on too long. We think it is time for the Cambodians to get together to resolve their differences. I would point out that the Cambodian government has recently called for unconditional negotiations -- the United States fully supports that move.

However, unless and until there is a settlement, we will continue to support and assist our friends.

## THAILAND

Q. Why do we continue to maintain US forces in Thailand?

A. We continue to maintain US air units in Thailand as a symbol of our resolve to support the efforts of Southeast Asian countries in bringing lasting peace to the area. Although the US combat role in Indochina is ended, the presence of the US military in Thailand provides visible evidence that we are not abandoning those countries of Southeast Asia which we supported at great cost over the past decade. Until North Vietnamese intentions become clear, we are maintaining our forces in Thailand although at reduced levels.

Two years ago our forces in Thailand numbered more than 45,000 military personnel. By the end of the year, as a result of consultations with the Government of Thailand, it will be about 27,000.

It is our hope that a return to peaceful conditions in Southeast Asia will permit us to make further reductions in consultations with Thailand.

D

## LATIN AMERICA

Q: Will you comment on U. S. policy towards Latin America?

A: Over the past year the U. S. has given renewed attention to its relations with the countries of Latin America and the Caribbean. Together we have been working to broaden and deepen our relations and important progress has been made toward establishing a frank, open dialogue and regular consultations on a broad range of subjects. Periodic conferences of the Foreign Ministers have been established to facilitate this development. We have also made significant progress toward resolving some longstanding bilateral problems in the region. There are, of course, problems remaining, but I am sure with a continuing spirit of mutual understanding and cooperation, our efforts to resolve them and to further strengthen Hemispheric relations will be productive. I assure you the efforts of my Administration will be directed toward this end.

CHILE - ALLEGATIONS OF CIA INVOLVEMENT

Q: The CIA spent \$8 million to overthrow Allende. Do you intend to permit the CIA to continue engaging in these types of activity?

A: This characterization is totally incorrect. We did not encourage or support the coup. There have been occasions in the past, and there may be some in the future where the national interest may require that some action be taken in support of our foreign policy which it would not be in the national interest to announce publicly or to identify as an official U.S. action. All such actions are carefully controlled through the NSC system and approved by the President. They are taken under laws approved by the Congress, using funds provided by the Congress, and are reported to the committees designated by the Congress to review these operations.



## CUBA POLICY

Q: The OAS is about to begin consideration on possible lifting of the sanctions against Cuba. Will the U.S. abide by a decision of the OAS to end sanctions against Cuba?

A: Since I last spoke on this subject, a resolution has been introduced into the OAS to consider the Cuba sanctions question.

We are now consulting with other governments in the Hemisphere regarding their views. Should the members of that Organization decide that the conditions which gave rise to the Cuba resolutions no longer obtain, then that would certainly be one element we would have to weigh in any considerations of our own policies.

PANAMA CANAL NEGOTIATIONS

QUESTION: Do you support the current Panama Canal treaty negotiations?

SUGGESTED RESPONSE: Yes, ten years ago the United States agreed to negotiate new treaty arrangements which would establish a more modern relationship with Panama. This decision was made by President Johnson after consulting with ex-Presidents Truman and Eisenhower. President Nixon renewed the commitment. And I support it as a bi-partisan attempt to work out a new relationship that is acceptable to Panama while better protecting our interests, economic and strategic.

E

## AFRICA

Q: In your August 12 speech to Congress you failed to mention Africa. What would be your Administration's policy toward Africa?

A: African interests will be taken seriously in the foreign policy of my Administration. I met with the Black Caucus August 21 and discussed with them United States policy toward Africa and toward the member states of the Organization of African Unity. We want to increase our understanding of the problems and aspirations of Africa and will look for new ways in which we can be helpful. As a first step, and at my request, Secretary Kissinger met with the Ambassadors of the Black African nations the day after my inauguration. There he emphasized our desire to look more closely at their concerns and asked to meet with them again soon to discuss in depth issues of common interest.

## BYRD AMENDMENT

BACKGROUND: The Byrd Amendment, attached to a military appropriations bill in 1971, excludes Rhodesian chromite, ferrochrome and other minerals from the prohibition on trade with Rhodesia resulting from the unanimous 1968 UN Security Council vote to impose mandatory economic sanctions against Rhodesia. The amendment has created a major and severely criticized flaw in our otherwise good enforcement record on sanctions. We continue to support international sanctions as a means of inducing the 270,000 white Rhodesians to arrive at a settlement with the country's 5.7 million blacks. A repeal bill, supported by the Administration, has passed the Senate and has been voted out favorably by the House Foreign Affairs and Rules Committee. The bill is scheduled to be voted upon by the full House during the current session.

Q: What is your position on the Byrd Amendment?

A: I support the Administration's efforts to repeal this legislation.

We should live up to our international obligations.

GUINEA-BISSAU-MOZAMBIQUE

Q: What is the United States attitude towards recent events in the Portuguese African territories, including the resistance in Lourenco Marques, to the Portuguese-Mozambique independence agreement?

A: We are pleased and encouraged by the progress being made in the decolonization of the Portuguese African territories exemplified by the recent agreements on Guinea-Bissau and Mozambique.

We supported Guinea-Bissau's application for membership in the UN, formally recognized that new country and hope soon to establish diplomatic relations with it. The United States has long supported self-determination for the Portuguese territories.

ETHIOPIA

QUESTION: Mr. President, would you comment on the future of U.S.-Ethiopia relations?

ANSWER: We value the close ties that have developed over the years between the United States and Ethiopia and look forward to continuation of these good relations.

We are conducting normal relationships with the provisional military government, whose head, Lieutenant General Aman, has assured our Charge d'Affaires Parker Wyman of its desire to maintain a strong and friendly relationship with the United States.

QUESTION: Does the U.S. intend to continue military assistance to Ethiopia?

ANSWER: Our budget proposals for the new fiscal year contain a request for continued military assistance to Ethiopia, both in grants and in credit sales.

F



## OIL PRICES

BACKGROUND: The US initiative of December 1973 led to the Washington Energy Conference of February 1974, and the creation of the twelve-member Energy Coordinating Group. We now expect to conclude in the near future a broad international energy agreement. This agreement will establish an integrated emergency program to reduce our vulnerability to possible future supply interruption. It will also establish a long term cooperative program in the area of Research and Development, conservation, uranium enrichment, and the development of alternative sources of energy designed to reduce our dependency on imported oil.

Q: What should we do to get international oil prices down?

A: We must make a continuous effort to persuade the oil producers that current prices are simply not sustainable and will cause serious economic disruption if not relieved. We must persuade them that breakdown of the global economic system will affect producers as well as oil consumers. In the long run, we must reduce our dependence upon imported oil by conservation and by the development of alternative sources of energy under Project Independence.

I would strongly recommend encouraging energy conservation and cooperation among consuming nations. The first step in this process is early agreement on the so-called International Energy Program among the major oil consumers, which I understand is about to be concluded within the next few weeks.

like Japan and Western Europe. Finally, the US has a moral responsibility to aid in combating hunger and starvation in other parts of the world and to the extent that export controls interfere with our performing this responsibility, I think they are a mistake. The way to deal with these problems over the longer term is to get a better world system of production and reserves. This is the objective of the World Food Conference in November, and I fully support US leadership in this effort.

## OIL PRICES

Q: What is your reaction to the decision of OPEC oil producing countries to raise prices again?

A: The decision of major oil producing states to yet again raise oil prices is an unwelcome and unjustified action. It can only further complicate and worsen the serious economic and financial problems faced by the world and particularly by poor countries. The statement by the oil producers that the latest increase in prices is because of inflation turns the issue on its head. The continued increase in oil prices is a major cause of inflation in the world today. Oil producers are thus directly contributing to a continuing dangerous inflationary spiral and have placed a great burden on the international monetary system.

On the other hand, lower oil prices, effective reinvestment of oil incomes and expanded international trade will serve to strengthen the world economy. We have not yet seen a decline in oil prices, but we believe mutual understanding and cooperation between producers and consumers and continued efforts at conservation can lead to progress. We are also working within the international financial system to provide a means

to make the oil income surpluses available to nations whose balance of payments are seriously threatened. We also expect the trade reform act to provide opportunities for expanded world trade by enabling the US to work with others to improve the international trading system and lower artificial barriers to trade.

There is still another measure which is essential. That is the avoidance of nationalistic policies whereby each nation attempts to protect itself at the expense of others. The international economy can be strengthened only through international cooperation, with each nation accepting its share of the burden in meeting our common difficulties.

FYI: All OPEC countries except Saudi Arabia have decided to increase government take on oil prices by 33 cents, from \$9.41 to \$9.74. They contend that this increase is intended to come out of oil company profits and that prices to consumers need not rise. It is highly likely however that most, if not all, of this increase will be passed on to consumers. It is estimated that the price increase will bring another \$3 billion in revenue annually to the producers applying the price hike.

## WORLD FOOD SITUATION AND US EXPORT CONTROLS

BACKGROUND: The World Food Conference convenes in Rome this November. The idea for it was launched by Secretary Kissinger in his speech last fall to the UN. The main issues to be discussed include (1) ways to increase food production in LDC's; (2) agreement in principle to a new international system of national food reserves, with more countries accepting responsibility to carry their own reserves; (3) better ways to implement and share responsibility for food aid programs; and (4) possible new fund for aid to LDC production and institutional arrangements to coordinate national efforts on reserves and food aid.

Q: How serious do you think the world's current food crisis is, and what do you think the US Government should be doing about it? Do you think export controls on food are a partial answer for the US?

A: The worldwide food situation is one of our most serious problems.

The recent drought in the Midwest of the US has increased concern about the situation. As the world's largest producer and exporter of wheat and feedgrains, the US has obligations both to help meet world food requirements and to ensure that US consumers do not suffer unduly from unreasonably high food prices caused by shortages.

However, I don't think export controls are the answer.

They would lower prices to US farmers and lead to the longer term loss of foreign markets. This would be self-defeating.

When we arbitrarily restrict exports, we undermine our reputation as a reliable supplier, and we saw last year the adverse political impact which controls produce in countries

## FOREIGN ASSISTANCE

Q: At a time of increasing economic difficulties and food shortages at home, the Administration is requesting large foreign assistance budgets. What will be your attitude toward foreign aid and PL-480 food programs?

A: Two points should be made. First, increasing economic difficulties, including food shortages, are world-wide and not restricted to the United States. Second, in times of shared adversity the worst policies are those in which each nation tries to protect itself at the expense of others.

We are always examining our foreign assistance budgets to ensure that our best interests are being served. At the same time, we must also ensure that we and others are sharing a common burden of humanitarian and development assistance equitably.

G

## HUMAN RIGHTS AND FOREIGN POLICY

Q: For the past several years U.S. foreign policy has been attacked for being insensitive to human rights issues in Greece, Korea, Chile and elsewhere. Do you contemplate any change in this approach to policy?

A: As Americans, we can never acquiesce in the suppression of human liberties. Many Americans have fought and died to preserve freedom in foreign lands. We will continue to adhere firmly to the human principles and rights stated in the United Nations Declaration on Human Rights -- not only in international forums, but also in our exchanges with other governments.

We want people everywhere to be free and we will use our influence to encourage respect for human rights, but we cannot refuse to deal with other states on grounds that they do not meet our standards.

I assure you we will continue to work for human rights in the manner we judge to be most effective in enhancing those rights.



## DEFENSE BUDGET

Q: You have said that the Defense budget is not sacrosanct but we still need a strong defense. What is your reaction to the Senate's \$5 billion cut in the Defense Appropriations Bill?

A: Our military strength is fundamental to the preservation of peace, and underwrites our diplomatic efforts. I am confident that the House-Senate Conference Committee will arrive at a compromise on the FY 1975 Defense budget which will be acceptable to both houses and sufficient for our national security needs.

For the FY 1976 Defense program which is now being formulated, I intend to review the program personally in the near future, paying particular attention that it supports our overall national security policies. I want to emphasize that we will not save money in the long run by weakening our national defense. Peace can only be built on the clear ability and will of the American people to protect our interests whenever they may be threatened.

## MILITARY PERSONNEL LEVELS

BACKGROUND: Some members of the Congress believe that military personnel strengths are higher than justified. The basis for this belief is usually one or more of the following premises:

- (a) That the US has too many military overseas in a period of detente and reduced commitments.
- (b) That military personnel in "support" (non-combat) activities can be reduced.
- (c) That the economy cannot afford the cost of this level of military personnel.

Authorized active military strengths for FY 1975 are:

<u>Army</u>	<u>Navy</u>	<u>Marine Corps</u>	<u>Force</u>	<u>Total</u>
785,000	540,400	196,400	627,500	2,149,300

Q: Do you believe that the maintenance of current military personnel strengths is justified?

A: Considering our national security needs and commitments, our military strength levels are fully justified.

We must remember that our forces have already been adjusted to our new conditions and new priorities. The military strength of 2,150,000 authorized by the Congress for FY 1975 is the lowest military strength for the United States since before the Korean War. It is 530,000 lower than our strength in 1964, just before the Vietnam buildup. Compared to these reductions, Soviet military manpower has grown steadily, from approximately 3,100,000 in 1964 to about 4,000,000 today.

This growing disparity in force size must be a matter of increasing concern. In a period of strategic equilibrium, conventional forces become increasingly important to national security.

I believe we should, as the Defense Department is now doing, seek to strengthen our conventional forces by reallocating military manpower from support activities, such as headquarters, to increased combat capability.

## NUCLEAR EMPLOYMENT OPTIONS/TARGETING DOCTRINE

BACKGROUND: There have been several statements by the Secretary of Defense announcing the development of a more flexible range of nuclear employment options, and an associated targeting doctrine to allow response at levels appropriate to the provocation.

Q: What do you think of the new course that we are following with regard to adding more response options to our contingency plans and the associated retargeting of our nuclear weapons necessary for them? Does this increase the danger of war?

A: I believe no President should ever be placed in a position where his only option in meeting a limited nuclear aggression is an all-out nuclear response. Any potential aggressor must be aware that the United States will continue to have the resolve and the capacity to act in the face of aggression in all circumstances and with the requisite level of force. In other words, a credible deterrent in a time of strategic parity requires greater flexibility among response options.

By developing and declaring increased flexibility in our contingency plans, we reduce the temptation for any prospective enemy to embark on limited attacks, nuclear or nonnuclear, against the US or its allies. Therefore, it should reduce, not increase, the risk of war.

No one can guarantee that a limited exchange would not escalate to massive attacks. This consideration further strengthens the deterrence value of this policy.

## 200-MILE FISHERIES LEGISLATION

Q: What is your position on efforts in the Congress to pass legislation extending unilateral U.S. fisheries jurisdiction to 200 miles?

A: Such legislation would undercut U.S. efforts to work out man's use of the oceans (including fishing rights) in international negotiations, specifically, the UN Law of the Sea Conference.

A unilateral action by the United States at this time could prompt other nations to make unilateral claims of their own without waiting for the outcome of negotiations -- and such claims would not be in our best interests.

## CASE AMENDMENT

QUESTION: How do you feel about Congressional actions, like the Case Amendment to the State Department Authorization Bill, aimed at compelling the Executive Branch to obtain explicit Congressional approval of basing agreements overseas?

SUGGESTED RESPONSE: The Executive Branch has an obligation to keep Congress fully informed of activities carried out in discharge of its foreign policy responsibilities under the law; and the Congress has an obligation to ensure that public monies are spent for sound policies. Somewhere in this broad area of Executive-Legislative interaction lies the solution to the current problem of ensuring adequate Congressional review of basing strategies and agreements overseas, while also preserving the President's need to be able to act. Imposing yet another level of Congressional review on the President's actions already sanctioned by law is simply too cumbersome to be a viable formula.