

The original documents are located in Box 125, folder “United Nations” 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 Ron Nessen donated to the United States of America his copyrights in all of his unpublished writings in National Archives collections.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.

PRESIDENT'S MEETING WITH ARTHUR GOLDBERG

PRE
PRESS ANNOUNCEMENT

To be announced or volunteered at the Thursday, May 8, 1975 press briefing:

The President will meet this afternoon at 5:00 p.m. with Arthur Goldberg, former US Ambassador to the United Nations. The meeting will provide the President with an opportunity to review the course of our Middle East negotiations with Mr. Goldberg with whom he has not met privately as President. Secretary Kissinger will also attend the meeting.

There will be a White House photo at the beginning of the meeting.

BACKGROUND

F.Y.I. As the US Ambassador to the United Nations during the 1968 war and passage of UN Security Council Resolution 242, Mr. Goldberg has followed the Middle East problem with keen interest. (At one time, he proposed to the USSR and Egypt a draft UN resolution calling for Israel to withdraw from all occupied territory in exchange for non-belligerency. It was rejected by the Arabs who were at that time unwilling to accept Israel.) He is very concerned over the present situation and has been pressing for a meeting with you to present his views. He is, naturally, in close touch with Israeli leaders and influential in the American Jewish community.

July 1, 1975

THE PRESIDENT ON UN POLICIES

Reporters are giving the President's remarks at Moynihan's swearing-in good coverage, especially his remarks that "We will firmly resist efforts by any group of countries to exploit the mechanism of the United Nations for narrow political interests or Parliamentary manipulations."

These stories may provoke the following questions:

Q: What was the President referring to when he mentioned resisting efforts by any group of countries to exploit the machinery of the United Nations for narrow political interests, or for parliamentary manipulation?

A: The President believes a strong viable United Nations, whose members work in a spirit of cooperation, is essential to world peace and prosperity. He believes it is important in advancing that goal for the U.S. to speak out when it feels the ^{proliferation of the} United Nations is being ^{impaired} ~~threatened~~.

In this connection it is important for the UN body to give appropriate weight to the views of its members and seek to work in a spirit of consensus and not through mechanical voting majorities.

Q: Was the President issuing a warning to the Third World?

A: The President's statement clearly indicates U.S. support of the United Nations and a desire for cooperation with all, including the developing world. The Administration, however, is concerned in trends in the UN system over the past year or so that do injury to the viability of the United Nations.

July 1, 1975

THE PRESIDENT ON UN POLICIES

Reporters are giving the President's remarks at Moynihan's swearing-in good coverage, especially his remarks that "We will firmly resist efforts by any group of countries to exploit the mechanism of the United Nations for narrow political interests or Parliamentary manipulations."

These stories may provoke the following questions:

Q: What was the President referring to when he mentioned resisting efforts by any group of countries to exploit the machinery of the United Nations for narrow political interests, or for parliamentary manipulation?

A: The President believes a strong viable United Nations, whose members work in a spirit of cooperation, is essential to world peace and prosperity. He believes it is important in advancing that goal for the U.S. to speak out when it feels the ^{proper timing of the} United Nations is being threatened. In this connection it is important for the UN body to give appropriate weight to the views of its members and seek to work in a spirit of consensus and not through mechanical voting majorities.

Q: Was the President issuing a warning to the Third World?

A: The President's statement clearly indicates U.S. support of the United Nations and a desire for cooperation with all, including the developing world. The Administration, however, is concerned in trends in the UN system over the past year or so that do injury to the viability of the United Nations.

VIETNAM, SOUTH KOREA UN MEMBERSHIP

Q. Can you comment on the State Department announcement that we will veto UN membership applications of the two Vietnams if South Korea is not admitted?

A. As the State Department said yesterday, we are prepared to support the membership of all three of these states; however, we will not be a party to attempts to admit one state while excluding another. To do otherwise would be in direct violation of the principle of universality upon which the UN was founded.

FYI: Yesterday in a meeting to consider applications for membership South Korea failed by two votes to get the nine required for consideration. The applications for Vietnamese membership passed overwhelmingly (US abstained); when the membership committee votes later this week to send the Vietnamese applications forward, the US will veto.

IF PRESSED: The United States will continue to support the candidacy of South Korea and will vote against any proposal that does not include them.



UNITED STATES MISSION TO THE UNITED NATIONS

PRESS RELEASE

799 UNITED NATIONS PLAZA
NEW YORK, N. Y. 10017

FOR IMMEDIATE RELEASE

Press Release USUN-108(75)
October 5, 1975

Address by Ambassador Daniel P. Moynihan, United States Representative to the United Nations, at the AFL/CIO 11th Constitutional Convention, San Francisco, October 3, 1975.

President Meany, Secretary-Treasurer Kirkland,

It is a ritual of these occasions for the speaker to declare that he is honored to be here, and there is no helping this, but even so it is a shame of sorts because it detracts attention from the fact that it really is an honor to address the free American labor movement -- an honor any time, but an especial honor at this time when freedom is on the defensive, if not on the run, in so much of the world.

It is an honor for anyone and for many, I wouldn't doubt, the fulfillment of an equally honorable ambition. I would certainly be in the former category - and more than certainly sensible of that fact - but not in the latter category for it never seemed to me the least likely that I might one day be up here with the leaders of the movement. Just as a kid, it may possibly, once in a while have occurred to me that I might someday be down there, when you are, with the delegates. But if it did, it didn't do for long.

This is not because I wasn't raised around unions, but because I was. I was a member of the Steelworkers at 15 and the Laundry workers at 16. I went to work on the North River piers at 16 but Mr. Gleason will take any meaning when I say that although those were union docks I never got into the union because in those days that was a privilege reserved for married men. What I mean to say is that I was brought up in a neighborhood where the names of the

-more-

local union leaders - Marty Lacey, Johnny Strong - were at least as well known as the names of the local Democratic politicians - and that issuing something in a district that once boosted George Washington Plunkett and was still a fiefdom of the McMarie. In such a neighborhood a boy could at least imagine getting elected to something in a union local some day. I don't know how many American kids anymore have that experience, but most of you I expect did, and I did, and you will know my meaning when I say it is something that stays with you. Anyway, I got as far as the Government and Civil Employees Organizing Committee of the CIO before my string ran out, and I have had no grounds for complaint.

To the contrary, I am one of those Americans who owes to the American labor movement a good deal more than the slightly better wages I may have earned as a young man. I got from the labor movement the idea that a man ought to stand for something and beyond that an idea of what some of those things ought to be and what can be done about them.

In truth I owe even more to the movement. Some of you may have read in one of Theodore H. White's green books on the Making of the Presidency that one President, as White puts it "wanted Daniel P. Moynihan, of Harvard as his Secretary of Labor - (but) the leaders of labor vetoed the choice." A man gets to be indebted for life after a favor like that.

So here I am. I was never important enough before to speak here and if I have my choice, which I assume I can do, I will never be important enough again. And so I will say my piece with a certain easiness, returning the honor you have done me by showing respect for you. I will tell you what I think, whether I think you will like it or not, and I will tell you in my own words.

In his report to this convention George Meany said. "This country is in trouble at home and abroad."

He is right.

More than that. Since he didn't say it, I will. Not only is he right, he is vindicated. Because the troubles we are in, as I see them, are the troubles George Meany and the American labor movement have seen coming for the whole one quarter century that I have been in and out of public life. They are not just happening, they are happening the way he has said they were going to happen and pretty much, again as I would see it, for the reasons he has said they would happen.

What is it we have got wrong, or better put maybe, never got right?

At home: One over-riding, pervasive, dominating fact. In thirty postwar years, years of even greater economic product and ever greater government activity, we have nonetheless never achieved full employment. Indeed at the end of 30 years we have never been further from it.

-more-

Now if you want to, and I suppose that you do - you almost always do - you can blame the policies and people of the moment for this. What worries me is that in all these years there have been all manner of policies, and all manner of people making them, and even so we have never got to where we wanted to be. Indeed, we have been redefining where we want to be in terms that make the original goal recede further and further.

In the immediate aftermath of the Employment Act of 1946 (originally the "Full" Employment Act) it was thought that a 3 percent unemployment rate was an acceptable level. Given the rates at the time it was surely a reasonable one. Then came the 1950's and the long period of economic doldrums following the Korean War. In the early 1960's President Kennedy's Council of Economic Advisors wished to set 4% as an acceptable goal. I was Assistant Secretary of Labor then; and recall Willard Wirtz' struggle to get this declared an "interim" goal. By the 1970's officials were setting 6% as the goal - admittedly a short-term goal, but when does the short-term end?

Since 1950 only when the U.S. was at war has the unemployment rate dropped below 4%, and only once -- 22 years ago -- did it drop below 3%. The years ahead - with the proportion of young workers in the labor force steadily rising - will have to be harder to deal with than those of the recent past - and what prospect is there of our really doing better.

In truth we are likely, on form, to do worse simply because we have not been laying down the foundations of economic growth. In 1960, campaigning for the Presidency, John F. Kennedy said he was not satisfied with the lowest growth rate among all industrial nations. To change this rate was a central theme of his campaign, and he won his election. But the situation did not really improve. The rates of growth even proved indifferent to the stimulus of a wartime economy. For the period 1965-72 we had a GNP growth rate of 3.2%. In the same period Japan's economy grew at four times that rate. From the whole period 1950-72 real GNP per employed citizen grew at the lowest rate of any western industrial nation.

Investment rates have got to be a part of the problem. In 1950 our investment rate was lower than any nation save Britain, and in time we were outstripped even by them. In President Kennedy's first year in office the American Investment rate dropped to 13.8% of GNP; that of Japan rose to 40.5%

For awhile we made up for low investment by high production: the genius of American management and American workers. But in time we fell behind even there. An event of symbolic and substantive significance: in the course of the 1960's output per man hour in the Japanese Iron and Steel industry outstripped that of the United States. 1966 - 1973, as if to anticipate the "energy crisis", output per man hour in coal mining actually decreased.

more-

Unemployment is the disease of capitalism, and we have not eliminated it. Indeed, it has grown endemic, like fever in a swamp-land. It has weakened the society, and the society, experimenting with first one cure, then another, has in turn weakened itself. In the main we have responded to weakness in the private sector of the economy by expanding the public sector: now past a third of GNP and heading for half. But too rarely have the results been what we expected, and too frequently what we did not expect. More and more America shows symptoms of what Walter Lippman once called "the sickness of any over-governed society." Less and less do we seem confident of what to do next.

This crisis of confidence is evident, is it not, in the present plight of New York City, the capital of the country in most respects, certainly our first city, and the one where a sickness of over-government brought only a sickness of unemployment is much in evidence. No one wants to do anything about it -- because no one is confident that what would be done would make things any better. The situation is like that of the Sherlock Holmes story in which the dog didn't bark. That was the clue to the detective story. What did not happen. It is the clue to New York City's situation. It is what the State Legislature is not doing, and the Congress is not doing, and the Governor, and the President not doing which is the give away. We no longer think we know what to do. There has been a change of mind.

Abroad our situation is no better. In his statement yesterday George Meany said that the "nation has never suffered more foreign policy defeats than it has in the past year." If what he means is "never recently," - we can agree can we not that when the British burned Washington it was a sort of a setback, and there have been others - if he means "never recently" then I think most of us would agree. But here again there is a crisis of confidence, for many Americans would not at all agree with the list of events which President Meany regards as defeats. Some would see them as victories, some as standoffs, some as opening rather than concluding events.

Saying that I agree with George Meany far more than I disagree with him. Let me say here that I would not agree that the conclusion of the Helsinki Conference on Security and Cooperation in Europe was a defeat. In the terms that President Ford spelled out at the Conference, in the terms in which Secretary Kissinger carried out those negotiations, the Conference was something that had to come, and came as much on our terms as the realities of power allowed.

It is these realities that assail us, and to suppose otherwise is to court self deception and even worse setbacks.

The realities of power are in the first instance economic. The industrial world - the United States included - is in the midst of the worst recession since the 1930's. This time, however, we suffer not only from internal disorders, but from external attack. The oil producing nations of the world have brought about - without retaliation or redress - an increase in the price of energy that has proved jolting to the most advanced economies of the world and devastating to the least advanced.

If, as I think, it is a sign of strength that such measures can occur without retaliation - when America and its allies speak about respecting the territorial integrity and independence of other countries we mean it - it is no less a sign of weakness that such measures can have such effects. The rest of the world cannot but note.

Nor fail, I fear, to gloat. For this is the second reality of power that assails us, the reality, as George Meany said yesterday, that "Democracy has come under increasing attack."

It is hard, I suppose, for us to understand this. Too easy perhaps to ascribe it to the wrong doings of democracy itself, to mistakes that we have made that have brought on inevitable, justified, even admirable retaliation. Again, this crisis of confidence: the trouble we have in trusting ourselves. But let me say that we distrust ourselves to our utmost period. For democracy is indeed under increasing attack, the West is under increasing attack, and increasingly the attack succeeds. Increasingly the attack is seen to succeed.

I see it every day at the United Nations. Every day, on every side, we are assailed. There are those in this country whose pleasure, or profit it is to believe that our assailants are motivated by what is wrong about us. They are wrong. We are assailed because of what is right about us. We are assailed because we are a democracy.

A quarter century ago the future looked good enough for democracy, at least in most parts of the world. The old democracies of Europe were reviving. Old autocracies such as Japan seemed to be following the evolution that had given way to democracy in Western Europe and would have done in Eastern Europe had not the Bolsheviks seized power. One by one the colonies of Africa and Asia were becoming independent. And one by one they were establishing democratic regimes.

All this has changed. One by one the new democracies have disappeared, and even some of the old ones. President Meany included India in his list of recent disasters in American foreign relations, and again he was right to do so. Not that events there were the result of anything America did, but simply because of what those events do to America. When half the people in the world with democratic rights lose those rights -- lose them in a sequence of government repression that began, typically, with the breaking of a strike and the imprisonment of trade union leaders -- then the American democracy suffers, too. It is too soon to write off India, but hardly too soon to take note of what is happening there.

And elsewhere. In the United Nations today there are in the range of two dozen democracies left. Totalitarian Communist regimes and assorted ancient and modern despotisms make up all the rest. And nothing so unites these nations as the conviction that their success ultimately depends on our failure.

It is no accident that on Wednesday, "His Excellency Field Marshal Al Hadji Idi Amin Dada, President of the Republic of Uganda" -- to give him his U.N. title -- called for "the extinction of Israel as a state." And it is no accident I fear, this "racist murderer" -- as one of our leading newspapers called him this morning -- is head of the Organization of African Unity. For Israel is a democracy and it is simply the fact that despotisms will seek whatever opportunities come to hand to destroy that one which threatens them most, which is democracy. At this very moment in New York, for example, Mr. Leonard Garment, Counsel to the U.S. Delegation, is fighting back the latest such move, a resolution now before the Third Committee which equates "Zionism" with "racism", calling for the eradication of both. I put it to you that this outrage is likely as not to be voted for by a majority of the membership of the United Nations.

NY
Times

I hope and trust that members of the Organization of African Unity will disavow Amin and all he stands for. Certainly it was African countries at the last OAU meeting in Kampala, which broke the gathering force of the movement to suspend Israel from the General Assembly. Just Wednesday that issue was quietly put to rest. But then hours later Amin commenced yet a new campaign.

There will be more campaigns. They will not abate, for it is sensed in the world that democracy is in trouble. There is blood in the water and the sharks grow frenzied. They commence, of course, to consume one another and the chaos

mounts. Let me offer you a statistic. There are 142 members of the U.N. We calculated last evening for the benefit of this occasion just what was the length of time in which the typical U.N. member had enjoyed a relatively stable government without violent overthrow or usurpation, including revolution. We put ourselves down for 199 years, Belgium for 144, France for 127, Australia for 74. And what did the median come out to be? 11 years. 11 years since the last overthrow of government in the median member of the U.N. In a world where technologists in the field of nuclear energy measure the length of storage of reactor wastes in what they have come to term "geological time": five thousand years, 30,000 years. Such are the issues we are handling with governments which can not survive even eleven years.

A year ago I was far more optimistic about all this than I am today. It seemed to me then that many of the new countries of the world had inherited, mostly from Western Europe, a decent and honorable tradition of democratic socialism which if it had a certain anti-American bias was nonetheless a tradition we could work with and respect. A year later I am not at all sure about that. Such has been the success of Communist arms, Communist intrigue, Communist treachery in Asia and Africa that the reputation of democracy in those regions has all but collapsed.

Certainly it has done so where I work. There is much that the United Nations has done in its 30 years that is honorable and good. But it has done damn all for democracy. All that talk of freedom gets frighteningly close to the Orwellian inversion: War is Peace; Slavery is Liberty; Injustice is Justice. What the U.N. has done is simply to extend the nation state to the farthest reaches of the inhabited world. Now that was going to happen, I assume, and the U.N. is hardly to blame if it happened under its auspices. But let there be no illusions: Most of the new states and most of the old ones have ended up enemies of freedom as we would know it, as we have inherited it, and as we have tried to preserve it.

What is to be done? as someone once said. This it seems to me obvious enough. It is to set for ourselves the agenda the labor movement has set at home and abroad -- and not least to see the connection between the two.

Let me speak to the issues in what is now my field, that of foreign affairs, and especially that aspect of foreign affairs which tends to legitimate or delegitimize democratic practices and private institutions.

-more-

If we have fallen back, we have also shortened our lines; and if we have taken more than a little punishment, it may be it has served to wake us up to what is going on.

What is going on is a systematic effort to create an international society in which government is the one only legitimate institution. The old dream of a new international economic order in which one single nation dominated is being replaced by a not different vision of the domination of a single idea, the idea of the all-encompassing state, a state which has no provision for the liberties of individuals, much less for the liberties of collections of individuals such as trade unions.

I think we are in a position to respond to this. Everyone has been talking about the new international order, and as the United States has already indicated in Secretary Kissinger's address on September 1, we stand ready to participate in the creation of a world from which starvation would be eliminated and in which everyone would be assured a basic minimum of economic sustenance. It must be clear, however, that the United States doesn't wish to do this because we accept responsibility for the economic condition of the Third and Fourth Worlds. We repudiate the charge that we have exploited or plundered other countries, or that our own prosperity has ever rested on any such relation. We are prosperous because we are-or were-an energetic and productive people who have lived under a system which has encouraged the development of our productive capacities and energies. We also consider that we have been reasonably helpful and generous in our economic dealings with other countries. We do not, then, wish to contribute toward the creation of a new international order out of guilt or as a matter of reparations. The idea of reparations implies a debt incurred as a result of past wrongs. The United States acknowledges no such debt.

What we acknowledge is a common humanity and a common concern arising out of our own sense of what we can and ought to do.

Not guilt, then, and not fear. We are moved as a matter of free choice and out of a growing willingness in our culture to broaden the boundaries of fellow feeling beyond those which define the territories of the nation-state. We elect to act because the plight of people in other countries increasingly presses itself upon us and we wish to take whatever effective measures we can to alleviate suffering that can be alleviated and to eliminate such causes of suffering as can be eliminated.

But it is important to stress -- as important, it seems to me, as any thing can be -- that this willingness of ours has as its object the fate of individuals. Ours is a culture based on the primacy of the individual -- the rights of the individual, the welfare of the individual, the claims of the individual against those of the state. We have no wish, therefore, to participate in any new economic arrangements whose beneficiaries will be the state rather than the individual, leaders rather than the individual, politicians and bureaucrats rather than the individual. If there is to be an increased flow of wealth to the countries of the South, the United States will insist that it be channeled into the pockets of individuals and not into Swiss bank accounts, and we will insist that necessary precautions be taken to that effect.

-more-

The United States will also insist on another point. We will insist on broadening the definition of welfare to include not only the economic condition of the individual but his political condition as well. If there is to be a new international order, the United States will insist that the right to a minimum standard of political and civil liberty is no less fundamental than the right to a minimum standard of material welfare. President Ford affirmed our commitment to universal human rights at Helsinki, and we reaffirm it here.

The new nations when we say things like that respond, and understandingly in some cases, that we talk about individual rights but they care about economic rights. There is, or so it seems to me, one indisputably valid response to this point. It is for the United States Government to put the utmost emphasis, in multilateral relations and in bilateral relations, on the single most important area where individual rights and economic rights can be seen to merge, to complement one another, to reinforce one another, and that is the area of trade union rights, and trade union responsibilities. Things we know and believe in things. Rights that are here for any honest eye to see. Rights to be seen in at least half the world, and maybe more. For one of the lessons of the 20th century is that democratic trade unions can be a lot tougher than democratic governments.

They survive when almost everything else disappears. I think we have as our guest at this Convention some of those survivors, and we are proud to have them. And they will survive even better if they know we know they are there.

The American Labor Movement has done its share of upholding this standard. The American Government can do no less. There is, it seems to me, no question of the way we have to go.

This will involve different individuals at different times. A trouble with your U.N. representatives, indeed, is the rate that we come and go. Since 1945 there have been thirteen U.S. Representatives to the United Nations. By comparison, since 1886, there have been three heads of the AFL and now AFL-CIO, leaving aside O'Brien who was only in one year.

The very stability of this movement, its strength, its confidence, its understanding of what has gone on -- not for the past 11 years but for the past 111 years -- is a fundamental resource of the American democracy at a moment when it needs all the help and resources it can get. I think you know this. I think you know that I and others know it, and there is no need to expand the point.

-more-

Samuel Gompers started it off and so let me end with him. In Paris, in 1919, where he headed the Commission of the Peace Conference and drew up the Charter of the International Labor Organization, he spoke one evening to a group of officials and dignitaries outlining the plans for the new organization. He could sense the fear he was arousing: new ideas; new men; new methods. Above all, new freedoms. Suddenly he interrupted his talk. He paused a moment; he looked at his audience and he pronounced one of the purest, most moving sentences in the literature of American democracy. "You do not know," he said, "how safe a thing Freedom is."

Why is it safe? I will answer that in part it is because men and women such as you, and leaders such as George Meany, guard it so.

* * * * *

Call Moynihan

October 9, 1975

PRESIDENTIAL STATEMENT

ON MOYNIHAN'S REMARKS AT AFL-CIO

We feel that the attacks made by Ugandan President Idi Amin at the UN were out of place and uncalled for, and in that context I feel that Ambassador Moynihan said what needed to be said in reply. We recognize, however, that all of President Amin's remarks do not reflect the views of the OAU, and we do not want any misconceptions about our attitude toward that institution, for which we have very high regard.

We consider the OAU one of the very important regional organizations in the world and one with which the United States will continue to develop and strengthen our good relations. Hope OAU would discover

what Amin said ~~about~~ about A + I.

As Moynihan said OAU broke the veil of the
gathering movement
for suspension
of Israel from UN.

January 9, 1976

U. S. LINKS ECONOMIC AID TO NATIONS' VOTES AT UN

Q. Leslie Gelb reports today that the State Department has initiated a policy of selecting for cutbacks in American aid those nations that have voted against the U. S. in the United Nations. Can you comment on this story and is this now the U. S. policy on countries that don't vote our way?

A. I think that as your question involves the conduct of U. S. foreign policy, it is best left to the State Department to address. You will recall our remarks and those of the Department on this issue following the UN vote on Zionism last month, but I suggest you check with State on this question.

Generally, ~~the~~ ^{action}, I would say that consistently unfriendly or unsupportive ~~votes in the UN~~ cannot help but have some effect on our bilateral relations with those governments ~~whose votes~~ [&]

~~the State Department.~~

FYI: The President in his Press Conference in Atlanta, November 14 addressed the question of the Zionism resolution and said at the time "we have no particular plans for any recriminatory action against... those nations. We just think they were very wrong."

Relevant portions of the State briefing, December 11, are attached.

directly --

Q Wait a minute, I was just going to ask another question. Is it a possibility? Is that one of the options we are considering, to withdraw from other U.N. functions?

A I think I will just have to say that we are studying the implications of the vote. As far as the U.N. is concerned, just so there is no misunderstanding, and as certainly has been implied, and has also been explicitly clear from everything we have said on this vote, that we regret this action very much.

* { For one thing, it may result in a decrease of public support by the American people in this institution. And the U.N., after all, does serve American policy interests in many important ways, including keeping the peace in the Middle East.

Q You didn't answer Lars question directly. Are we to take that to mean that one of the possibilities that the United States is studying is financial retaliation against the U.N., or the individual members who supported the resolution?

A What do you mean, "financial"?

Q Well, we would withdraw the American contributions to the United Nations, the assessments. I assume that is what he means. At least I would mean that. And that perhaps there would be direct retaliation against some of the countries that supported the resolution, by withdrawals of aid and some such.

* A As far as bilateral assistance, I think basically it is important to remember that our bilateral assistance programs are geared to over-all U.S. national interest.

Now, as far as any other actions we might take in the U.N. along the lines you have suggested in your question, I think I will just have to stand on what I said initially, that we are reviewing carefully the implications of this vote.

Q I want to be sure I understand exactly what you are saying there, Bob. You are suggesting that as of now, as far as you know, there is no consideration of taking punitive action against individual members of the U.N. for their votes on this issue.

A That is correct.

Q I am not quite sure I understand the implication

of that, Bob. If this vote and the ramifications of this vote have been sufficiently reviewed that you are in a position to say that; then why aren't you in a position to respond to the larger question?

A You mean, on the U.N.?

Q Yes. In other words, obviously a policy decision had to be made within the State Department that we were not going to in any manner change our bilateral assistance program as a result of this vote. That called for some consideration. Why aren't you in a position to answer the total question?

A Obviously you can only answer what you are prepared to answer at any given moment, Ted. We have recently made a proposal to the Congress just a few days ago on bilateral security assistance, and those requests stand. And the Administration will be testifying in favor of their adoption by the Congress.

As far as any further specific actions other than this one that I mentioned, I am just not in a position to respond to that.

Q Bob, the fact is, though, that in Congress and in the public at large, there is a strong reaction against the U.N. and against U.N. members for this vote.

January 28, 1976

SPANISH SAHARAN SITUATION HEATING UP

FOR YOUR BACKGROUND ONLY:

The Spanish Saharan situation is becoming more tense as Moroccan and Mauritanian forces try to secure the area and deal with the guerrilla tactics of the Algerian-supported Polisario Front.

Though we have known that the Algerians have been directly supporting the Polisario elements, the public Algerian acknowledgement that their own troops are operating inside the territory is significant.

This situation increasingly carries with it the prospect of a drawn out "war of liberation" between Moroccan/Mauritanian and Algerian-backed Polisario units, or an escalation of a major confrontation between Moroccan and Algerian armed forces. Both sides are lining up support in the Arab world, which is polarizing along the customary lines -- Algeria backed by the radicals (Libya especially) and Moroccan support coalescing around Tunisia, Jordan, Egypt, and Saudi Arabia. Hassan has made repeated appeals for strong U. S. support, describing the situation as an Angola-like test in the global U. S. - USSR power struggle. He is anxious for expedited U. S. arms supplies and is sending an emissary to meet with Secretary Kissinger tomorrow to discuss urgently the Saharan situation.

If asked about the Algerian-Moroccan clashes, you may say that our policy has been, and continues to be, that we hope the current conflicts can be resolved peacefully through diplomatic means by the parties themselves.

NOTE: Classified cable attached.

*****~~C O N F I D E N T I A L~~***** COPY

OP IMMED
 PHA429ALB685
 DE RUPHRS #0195 0261045
 O 261030Z JAN 76
 FM AMEMBASSY ALGIERS

TO SECSTATE WASHDC IMMEDIATE 3726

INFO AMEMBASSY NOUAKCHOTT IMMEDIATE 268
 AMEMBASSY RABAT IMMEDIATE 2794

~~C O N F I D E N T I A L~~ ALGIERS 0195

E.O. 11652: GDS
 TAGS: P00R, PFOR, AG, MO, SS
 SUBJECT: SAHARA: ALGERIAN-MOROCCAN CLASH
 REF: ALGIERS 0190

1. IN WAKE OF CLASH REPORTED REPTTEL BETWEEN ALGERIAN AND MOROCCAN UNITS IN SAHARA, PRESIDENT BOUMEDIENE CONVOKED ALGERIAN COUNCIL OF REVOLUTION AND COUNCIL OF MINISTERS IN AFTERNOON JAN. 27. PRESS REPORTED THAT COUNCILS "TOOK CERTAIN NUMBER OF MEASURES," AND, WHILE GOING SITUATION SERIOUS, CALLED UPON ALGERIAN PEOPLE TO BE "CALM AND VIGILANT." MEDIA TREATMENT OF INCIDENT THUS FAR RELATIVELY RESTRAINED ALTHOUGH BRIEF EDITORIAL JAN. 28 LINKED MOROCCAN POLICY CLOSELY WITH "WORLD CAPITALISM" AND WITH MOROCCAN MONARCHY'S "MASTERS IN WASHINGTON AND PARIS."

2. LITTLE FURTHER INFORMATION AVAILABLE ON MILITARY SITUATION. FOREIGN JOURNALIST WHO RECENTLY VISITED SAHARA SAYS THAT AMGHALA (AS SPELLED IN ALGERIAN ARABIC-LANGUAGE PRESS) REGION WHERE CLASH TOOK PLACE IS SITE OF LARGE, POLISARIO-CONTROLLED REFUGEE CAMP NEAR MAURITANIA'S NORTHERN FRONTIER WITH SAHARA BETWEEN BOUCRAA AND TIFARITI. MAPS AVAILABLE TO US SHOW A REGION CALLED "ANGALA" AT 2623N-1127W, SOMETHING OVER 200 MILES AS CROW FLIES FROM ALGERIAN-SAHARA FRONTIER. WE CONSIDER IT LIKELY THAT CAMP IS ON OR NEAR ROAD LEADING FROM SMARA TO LA GUELTA, ALTHOUGH MAPS PLACE REGION SOME 40 KILOMETERS TO EAST OF THIS ROAD.

3. GIVEN AMGHALA'S LOCATION IN POLISARIO-CONTROLLED

*****~~C O N F I D E N T I A L~~***** WHSR COMMENT *****

BT CROFT, HYLAND, LL

RECALLED
 P8N1035680 PAGE 01

TOR:026/11:16Z

DTG:261030Z JAN 76

*****~~C O N F I D E N T I A L~~***** COPY

W H m 11/30/00

~~*****CONFIDENTIAL*****~~ COPY

AREA AND REPORTS THAT ALGERIAN TROOPS HAVE BEEN OPERATING IN SAHARA, WE SPECULATE THAT ALGERIAN ARMY COLUMN INVOLVED IN INCIDENT MAY HAVE BEEN, AS ALGERIANS SAY, ON MORE OR LESS ROUTINE MISSION OF ASSISTING POLISARIO AND REFUGEE CAMPS WHEN IT ENCOUNTERED MOROCCAN FORCES. MOROCCAN UNIT MAY HAVE BEEN INVOLVED IN EXTENDING GOMIS CONTROL INTO OUTLYING REGIONS OF SAHARA. THERE HAVE BEEN RUMORS THAT MOROCCAN ARMY WAS PLANNING TO BEGIN SUCH AN OPERATION. IN ANY CASE, PRESENCE OF ALGERIAN ARMY UNIT IN SAHARA 200 MILES FROM ALGERIAN-SA HARA FRONTIER SUGGESTS EXTENT OF ALGERIAN INVOLVEMENT IN OPERATIONS WITHIN SAHARA. IN THIS CONNECTION WE NOTE LATE ALGERIAN NEWS REPORT (FBIS LONDON 272255Z JAN 76) THAT ALGERIAN AND MOROCCAN UNITS FOUGHT THROUGHOUT AFTERNOON JAN. 27.

4. COMMENT: FOR MOMENT, REGIME HERE APPEARS TO BE TREATING INCIDENT WITH RELATIVE CALM. AS YET, TOO EARLY TO TELL WHETHER BALLOON HAS GONE UP BUT SEEMS UNLIKELY THAT TENSIONS COULD INCREASE FURTHER WITHOUT IT DOING SO.

5. INCIDENT ILLUSTRATES DANGERS INHERENT IN PRESENCE OF LARGE ALGERIAN AND MOROCCAN FORCES ON BORDER AND IN SAHARA, AND REPRESENTS CONSIDERABLE ESCALATION IN LEVEL OF MILITARY AND PSYCHOLOGICAL CONFRONTATION. LYNE
BT

PSN:035680 RECALLED OF 02 TOR:028/11:16Z DTG:281030Z JAN 76
PAGE 02

~~*****CONFIDENTIAL*****~~ COPY

MOYNIHAN AND BLOC-VOTE BUSTING IN THE UN

Q. The New York Times carries a front page story on Amb. Moynihan's cable on bloc-vote busting in the UN. Can you verify that it is the policy of the Administration to cut back aid to nations that vote against American interest in the United Nations and to reward nations that support the Administration? Along those lines, is it the position of the Administration to try to break up anti-U.S. voting blocs in the UN?

A. First, let me say that our position on aid to other nations has been and continues to be that our bilateral assistance programs are geared to overall U.S. national interest. We have also said that our attitudes towards other countries are based on their actions toward us. Both the President and the Secretary of State (speech in Milwaukee) have spoken out about the inadvisability of the politicization of the UN and the disruptive effects of such actions on the long-term effectiveness of the UN as a forum for resolving international disputes.

NOTE: If you are pressed for more details of our policy, you should refer to the State Department. The State Department has more detailed guidance on this issue. Public statements on voting blocs have been made at the Department's briefing November 11, the President's press conference in Atlanta November 14, and in a lengthy speech by the Secretary in Milwaukee, July 14.

Q. Can you verify the accuracy of the cable, or the apparent lack of understanding on the part of some State Department officials on Moynihan's attempts to break up anti-U. S. voting blocs?

A. For information on the latter, I would refer you to the State Department. As to the cable, I would not have any comment on it.

NOTES AND REMINDERS

1. LEBANON REPORT: Attached.
2. RABIN READ-OUT: to be provided subsequent to the meeting today. It is expected that they will continue their discussions.
3. GRAHAM MARTIN: As to any speculation on whether the President will reassign Graham Martin as an Ambassador, take the question.
4. PL-480 REPORT: Specific questions on the President's PL-480 Report should be referred to AID or Agriculture (The DOA must purchase the food; AID distributes it).
5. 200 MILE LIMIT: The 200 Mile Limit legislation will be voted on today. You may say that while you do not want to commit the President in advance, you expect that if the legislation contains the provision that it does not take effect until January, 1977, he will probably sign the bill.

OP IMMED /PRIORITY
E8A6470MC634
DE RUQMBE #0802 0201035
O P 201017Z JAN 76
FM AMEMBASSY BEIRUT

TO SECSTATE WASHDC IMMEDIATE 0354

INFO AMEMBASSY AMMAN IMMEDIATE 1185
AMEMBASSY ATHENS PRIORITY 0200
AMEMBASSY DAMASCUS IMMEDIATE 2491

~~CONFIDENTIAL~~ BEIRUT 0802

DELIVER TO NEA/ARN/DRAPER AT OPENING OF BUSINESS
E.O. 11652: GDS
TAGS: PINS, PINT, LE
SUBJECT: 0900 LEBANON REPORT

1. CEASEFIRE DOING WELL ALTHOUGH ISOLATED BREACHES WERE REPORTED YESTERDAY. MOST SERIOUS WAS AMBUSH OF ARMY ESCORT FOR FONMIN KHADDAM RETURNING FROM SYRIAN BORDER. TWO ARMY MEN WERE KILLED AND SEVEN WOUNDED. AMBUSH WAS BY "OTHER ARMY FORCES" REPORTEDLY LED BY A REBELLIOUS ARMY OFFICER FROM SIDON AREA WHO CLAIMS TO BE LEADING A NEW GROUP CALLED THE LEBANESE ARAB ARMY. HE IS A MOSLEM REBELLING AGAINST ARMY HIERARCHY. IT IS NOT CLEAR IF HIS GROUP IS RELATED TO MUTINY WHICH, ACCORDING TO OUR ARMY SOURCES, TOOK PLACE IN MASNAI, LAST CHECKPOINT ON BORDER WITH SYRIA. THIS COULD BE FAIRLY SERIOUS REFLECTION OF GENERAL DISAFFECTION IN ARMY AND CONTINUING REPORTS OF DIFFERENCES BETWEEN CHRISTIANS AND MOSLEMS, INCLUDING ONE ARMED CLASH A FEW DAYS AGO IN WHICH A NUMBER OF ARMY PEOPLE WERE KILLED ON BOTH SIDES.

2. THERE WERE SOME ISOLATED INCIDENTS IN THE BEKAA, A RAID ON AN INTERNAL SECURITY FORCE HEADQUARTERS NEAR BEIRUT RIVER (PRESUMABLY CHRISTIAN RIGHTIST FORCES SEIZING ARMS), AND LOOTING OF SEVERAL FOODSTUFF FACTORIES BY PRESUMABLY HUNGRY PEOPLE. HEAD OF ICRC SPECIAL MISSION HERE TO DEAL WITH EMERGENCY CAUSED BY SOME 10,000 REFUGEES FROM MOSLEM GUARANTINA AND CHRISTIAN DAMOUR CALLED ON ME THIS MORNING REQUESTING USG'S SUPPORT; SEE SEPTTEL.

***** WHSR COMMENT *****

SCONCROFT, HYLAND, LL

PSN:035693 RECALLED TOR:020/11:30Z DTG:201017Z JAN 76
PAGE 01

*****C O N F I D E N T I A L*****S COPY

3. WITH KHADDAM IN DAMASCUS AND SHEHABI JUST REPORTED TO BE MAKING QUICK TRIP TO ALGERIA, POLITICAL NEGOTIATIONS HERE HAVE DWINDLED. FUTL CABINET WILL MEET THIS MORNING FOR FIRST TIME IN SEVERAL WEEKS. PRESS IS REPORTING THAT FRANGIE WILL NOT MAKE HIS ANNOUNCEMENT OF CEASEFIRE AGREEMENT UNTIL AFTER HE HAS TALKED WITH ASAD IN DAMASCUS. THERE IS SOME PRESS COVERAGE OF ENLARGED CABINET IN THE FUTURE, WITH POSSIBILITY THERE MAY BE AS MANY AS TWENTY-FOUR MEMBERS, MAINLY "TECHNICIANS", ALONG WITH A FEW TOP POLITICAL LEADERS.

4. EMBASSY PERSONNEL ALL SAFE. WE HAVE LESS THAN A HANDFUL OF OFFICIAL EVACUEES STILL TO GO, LANBRAKIS
BT

RECALLED

PSN:035693

PAGE 02

OF 02

TOR:028/11:30Z

DTG:281017Z JAN 76

*****C O N F I D E N T I A L*****S COPY

QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS

Q. There are reports that the Soviet Union has again begun discussions with United States grain companies to purchase additional wheat and corn. How does this square with the five year grain agreement announced last October?

A. The Agriculture Department informs me that there have been no recent purchases of US grain by the Soviet Union. Purchases up to an additional 4 million metric tons would be fully consistent with the understanding which we reached in concluding the US-Soviet grain agreement last October, however. *(Allowed 17; purchased 13, including 3 since Oct with no fanfare.)*
The grain agreement between the United States and the Soviet Union will run for five years, beginning October 1, 1976.* Grain sales which take place until that date are therefore not included under the terms of the agreement.

In reaching the agreement, the Soviets assured us that their additional purchases of grain in the current crop year would not be in a volume which could disrupt the US market. USDA officials stated that this would allow for up to 17 million metric tons during this crop year ^{7 million} ~~above~~ the 10 million which had been made at that time. Since that time, the Soviets have purchased some 3 million tons, in normal commercial transactions, bringing the current total to roughly 13 million tons.

*The agreement commits the Soviet Union to purchase a minimum of 6 million metric tons of wheat and corn annually, and permits them to purchase an additional 2 million tons annually without consultation.

Feb. 27, 1976

USING WHEAT AS A LEVERAGE AGAINST
THE SOVIETS

Kissinger, Feb. 3, 1976:

"We find very often that we are told abstractly that we should use American economic power in order to influence foreign policy decisions of other countries. But we also find that when we attempt to do so we would inevitably interrupt private markets and private arrangements because there is no way of using our economic power without some degree of control."

"Now, with respect to the wheat deal to the Soviet Union, it is not generally realized that there was a voluntary restraint of sales to the Soviet Union from July to October while we were negotiating a long-term agreement, and that in many parts of the country and in many sections of the Congress this valuable restraint is looked upon with great disfavor. We believe that the long-term agreement that was made with the Soviet Union over a five year period introduces some stability into our market. It creates a cut-off point during emergency situations in which further negotiations will have to be conducted before we would agree to the sale of additional wheat."

"We believe that the circumstances that have so far existed have not justified the cut-off of wheat, because the cut-off of wheat, because the cut-off has not been effective in any time frame relevant to -- for example -- the issues of Angola. We believe -- and we have said

repeatedly -- if the relations with the Soviet Union deteriorate drastically -- which we would hope strongly to avoid -- it will effect our other relations. But at the present time it was an excessive reaction which would not have helped in relation to the Angola problem."

~~CONFIDENTIAL~~

ZCZCWHC022

*****ZZ WTE 14

DE WTE 1741 0931758

Z 021821Z APR 76

FM BUD MCFARLANE

TO DICK CHENEY - MILWAUKEE

ZEM

~~CONFIDENTIAL~~ WH60474

DECLASSIFIED

E.O. 12958, Sec. 3.5

NSC Memo, 11/24/98, State Dept. Guidelines
By W/H/201, NARA, Date 11/30/00

APRIL 2, 1976

TO: DICK CHENEY

FROM: BUD MCFARLANE

DICK, BRENT HAS READ AND APPROVED THE ATTACHED. HE ASKED THAT I SEND IT ON TO YOU AS SOON AS IT WAS CLEARED WITH JUSTICE AND PHIL EUCHEN, WHICH I HAVE SINCE DONE.

ATTACHMENT:

~~CONFIDENTIAL~~

ACTION

APRIL 2, 1976

MEMORANDUM FOR THE PRESIDENT

FROM: BRENT SCOWCROFT

SUBJECT: STATEMENT ON FIRING INTO SOVIET UN MISSION

AT APPROXIMATELY 3:50 THIS MORNING THERE WAS STILL ANOTHER SHOOTING INTO THE SOVIET MISSION TO THE UNITED NATIONS IN NEW YORK. THREE RIFLE SHOTS WERE FIRED INTO A ROOM WHERE WOMEN AND CHILDREN WERE SLEEPING. FORTUNATELY NO ONE WAS INJURED. AN ANONYMOUS CALLER IDENTIFIED THE JEWISH ARMED RESISTENCE GROUP AS THOSE RESPONSIBLE FOR THE FIRING.

SIMILAR FIRINGS ON SOVIET PROPERTY IN NEW YORK EARLIER THIS YEAR HAVE RESULTED IN STIFF SOVIET PROTESTS, BOMB THREATS TO OUR EMBASSY IN MOSCOW AND CONTINUING HARASSMENT OF OUR DIPLOMATS STATIONED THERE. THIS MORNING THE SOVIET UN REPRESENTATIVE PROTESTED TO AMBASSADOR SCRANTON IN VERY STRONG TERMS, AND THE EMBASSY HAS DONE SO WITH THE STATE DEPARTMENT. THE SECRETARY OF STATE AND GOVERNOR SCRANTON RECOMMEND, AND I CONCUR, THAT YOU ISSUE AS SOON AS POSSIBLE TODAY THE STATEMENT AT TAB A EXPRESSING YOUR VERY ADVERSE REACTION TO THIS MOST RECENT SHOOTING INCIDENT AND CALLING ON APPROPRIATE OFFICIALS AT THE FEDERAL, STATE AND CITY LEVEL TO TAKE EVERY STEP TO INSURE THAT OUR LAWS ARE ENFORCED

END OF PAGE 01

~~CONFIDENTIAL~~

~~CONFIDENTIAL~~

AND OUR OBLIGATION AS UN HOST COUNTRY ARE FULFILLED.

IT IS OUR UNDERSTANDING THAT MAYOR BEAME WILL BE ISSUING A STATEMENT TODAY. THE TEXT OF YOUR MESSAGE HAS BEEN COORDINATED WITH THE DEPARTMENTS OF STATE, AND JUSTICE. PHILIP BUCHEN AND ROBERT HARTMANN (DOUGLAS SMITH FOR) CONCUR.

RECOMMENDATION

THAT YOU APPROVE THE STATEMENT AT TAB A FOR IMMEDIATE RELEASE BY RON NESSEN.

APPROVE-----

DISAPPROVE-----

TAB A

Statement by the President

PRESIDENTIAL STATEMENT

~~APRIL 2, 1976~~

I AM DEEPLY DISTURBED BY THE GUN FIRING INTO THE SOVIET MISSION TO THE UNITED NATIONS THAT TOOK PLACE LAST NIGHT. THIS IS THE LATEST OF A SERIES OF UNCIVILIZED ACTS CARRIED OUT BY EXTREMIST GROUPS WHO ARE ACTING IN A SPIRIT TOTALLY CONTRARY TO THE AMERICAN TRADITION. THE PEOPLE OF THIS NATION ARE REPELLED BY TERRORISM AND DEMAND THAT IT END. IT IS IRONIC THAT THOSE RESPONSIBLE FOR ENDANGERING LIVES, THREATENING CHILDREN AND HARASSING WOMEN CLAIM TO HAVE A CONCERN FOR HUMAN RIGHTS. MANIFESTLY THEY DO NOT.

(more) →

~~I HAVE INSTRUCTED THE ATTORNEY GENERAL TO DO EVERYTHING HE CAN TO BRING THOSE WHO HAVE COMMITTED THESE VICIOUS ACTS TO JUSTICE AND PREVENT SUCH INCIDENTS FROM OCCURRING IN THE FUTURE. I CALL UPON THE GOVERNOR OF NEW YORK AND THE MAYOR OF NEW YORK CITY TO CONTINUE TO TAKE EVERY STEP WITHIN THEIR OWN AUTHORITY TOWARD THESE SAME ENDS, AND TO COOPERATE WITH FEDERAL OFFICIALS TO ENSURE THAT OUR LAWS ARE ENFORCED TO THE FULLEST EXTENT.~~

0581

1741

[Handwritten signature]

NNNN

~~CONFIDENTIAL~~

May 11, 1976

U. S. VOTE ON MPLA MEMBERSHIP IN THE UN

- Q. There is the distinct possibility that the MPLA application for membership in the UN will come up for a vote at 4:00 pm today. Given our past attitude on the MPLA, will we veto the application for membership?
- A. Our position on the MPLA government of Angola has been and continues to be that we do not object to the MPLA government itself, but rather to the presence of Cuban forces in Angola. Our relations and our attitude toward Angola will be based on that consideration. As to how the U. S. might vote on MPLA membership, we will have to watch the progress of the debate and make our position known at the time of the vote.

FYI:

There is a chance that the vote on MPLA membership will come up today. President Ford has instructed Ambassador Scranton to vote against MPLA membership. Contingency Q's and A's are presently being prepared.

DOUBLE UN RESOLUTIONS ON
TERRORISM / ENTEBBE RAID

Following the inconclusive votes in the Security Council Wednesday evening July 14 on the two UN resolutions on Terrorism and on the Entebbe raid, USUN representative Tapley Bennett issued a brief statement in explanation of the US position (attached).

In essence the statement:

1. Regrets that no conclusive resolution condemning hijacking was adopted.
2. Deeply regrets and expresses condolences on all loss of life
3. Reiterates that the sovereignty and territorial integrity must be maintained and protected.

Further to point three, Bennett explains: We particularly recall our own deep concern that this principle from the very outset of our life as a nation. We do not, however, view the exceptional nature of the incident on Entebbe as unjustified under international law. At the same time, we do not see it as a precedent which would justify any future unauthorized entry into another State's territory that is not similarly justified by exceptional circumstances.

July 9, 1976

PRESIDENT'S MEETING WITH AMBASSADOR SCRANTON

The President will meet this afternoon at 5:30 pm with UN Ambassador William Scranton. The Ambassador will report to the President on his recent trip to Africa and his upcoming trip to Europe. Brent Scowcroft will also attend.

BACKGROUND:

Governor Scranton has just returned from Africa where he visited 11 countries: Sierra Leone, Senegal, Upper Volta, Gabon, Tanzania, Mozambique, Swaziland, Botswana, Zambia, Cameroon and the Ivory Coast.

The Governor's European trip is tentatively scheduled for July 14-23. He plans to visit the Hague for talks on EC-UN cooperation, visit NATO in Brussels, attend the ECOSOC Conference in Geneva, and visit Belgrade for talks on the upcoming Non-Aligned Conference on Colombo August 16-19. END BACKGROUND.

Q. Will Governor Scranton and the President discuss the recent hijacking and Israeli rescue mission?

A. I do not have a specific agenda for you, but I wouldn't be surprised if the subject came up.

Q. Will there be a UN Security Council debate on the hijacking?
What will our position be?

A. I understand that the Security Council is scheduled to
take up the issue of the Uganda rescue by the Israelis the
afternoon of July 9. Our position on the issue will be made
known as the debate emerges.

VIETNAM'S MEMBERSHIP IN THE U. N.

Q: The United Nations Security Council will again be considering Vietnam's application for membership. Will the United States continue to veto any recommendation that Vietnam be granted UN membership?

A: The United States' policy towards Vietnam's membership in the United Nations has not changed. That is, we would not support the admission of Vietnam to the UN until Vietnam has fulfilled its obligation to provide a full accounting of U. S. service-men missing in Southeast Asia. As you are aware, we will be holding bilateral discussions with the Vietnamese in Paris in the near future. We regard these talks as a potentially positive development which we hope will lead to progress in obtaining such an accounting of American MIAs.

U. N. AMBASSADOR

Q. There are reports in Washington that you offered
the job of United Nation's Ambassador to William Scranton
and he turned you down. Is that correct?

PRESIDENT'S UNGA RELATED MEETINGS
1974-1975

September 9, 1974	Kurt Waldheim	UNGA-Sec General
September 18, 1974	Kurt Waldheim	UNGA-Sec General
September 19, 1974	Swaran Singh	Indian FM
September 20, 1974	Andrey Gromyko	USSR FM
September 21, 1974	Alberto Vignes	Argentina FM
September 24, 1974	James Callaghan	British, Foreign Secretary
September 25, 1974	Adam Malik	Indonesian FM
September 26, 1974	Hans Genscher	FRG FM
September 28, 1974	John San Vagnargues	French FM
September 29, 1974	Antonio Silvera	Brazil FM
October 1, 1974	Sheikh Rahman	Bangladesh PM
October 4, 1974	Gough Whitlam	Australian PM
October 5, 1974	Ismail Fahmy	Egyptian FM
October 17, 1974	Ahmed Aziz	Pakistan Minister of State
October 18, 1974	Francis Costa-Gomes	Portugal President
September 18, 1975	Saud Faisal	Saudi FM
September 18, 1975	Andrey Gromyko	USSR FM
September 23, 1975	Mariano Rumor	Italy FM
September 27, 1975	Jean San Vagnargues	French FM
September 30, 1975	Seewoosag Ramgoolong	Mauritius PM
October 6, 1975	Y. B. Chavan	India FM
October 9, 1975	Ahmed Azia	Pakistan FM
October 10, 1975	Melo Antunes	Portugal FM

Total 23

2. Can you provide any details on the Washington Post report this morning that the United States is boycotting a special U. N. fund which provides emergency relief to the most seriously effected developed countries? Why is the U. S. not being more helpful in this process?

GUIDANCE: The U. S. position with regard to this ^{new} special fund was spelled out by the U. S. Representative to the U. N.

yesterday. I would suggest you check with State for any

further details on this U. S. position. *Already channels & supply aid.*

3. Do you have any comment on the action of South Korea expelling the U. S. Missionary Reverend Ogle in a particularly hasty and brutal manner?

DOS
receiving
a formal
statement
@ 12:30

Jack -

You may wish to combine announcements
and use Para II for U.N.
REPLACEMENT FOR US AMBASSADOR TO UN guidance

Q: There is speculation that you will soon appoint Ambassador Moynihan to replace Ambassador Scali at the United Nations. Is this your plan and if so does it reflect, as some have speculated, irritation over the United Nations' performance in the recent past and your determination to get tough with the United Nations and the Third World?

A: Ambassador Scali ^{has been} is an outstanding U.S. representative at the United Nations and ^{retains} has my full confidence. Ambassador Moynihan ^{He is being offered another senior position in the field of foreign affairs} has been a valuable public servant, he was an outstanding Ambassador to India, and I would hope that he would continue to be available for public service.

As for this Administration's attitude toward the United Nations and the Third World, I would only note that on the whole range of issues, we have continuing and constructive consultations with UN authorities and through the UN system and elsewhere similar contacts with the Third World. ~~(As they do frequently, Secretary Kissinger and UN Secretary General Waldheim met recently and had a useful positive exchange concerning several current matters of common interest.)~~ As in the past, this Administration will continue to support a spirit of negotiation not confrontation in the UN and elsewhere. But we are concerned about the increasing spirit of confrontation on the part of many new countries.

Good on
US attitude
on U.N.

Draft Statement on US Abstention on
Angola's Membership in the UN

The United States will abstain on Angola's application for membership in the United Nations. Our decision to abstain, rather than to oppose this application, was made out of respect for the sentiments expressed by our many African friends.

We still have serious doubts about the true independence of the current Angolan Government. It is hard to reconcile the presence of a massive contingent of Cuban troops with the claim that Angola enjoys truly independent status. The Angolan Government exercises only tenuous control over the two-thirds of Angola that still resists domination by the regime in Luanda. The fact that it depends heavily on Cuban forces for the maintenance of its security casts doubt on the degree of popular support which it can command within the country.

It is clear that the Cuban army, a foreign, non-African force, is waging a bloody and difficult guerrilla war in three separate areas of Angola. We have heard disturbing reports that these Cuban occupation forces have been carrying out military assaults upon undefended

~~CONFIDENTIAL~~

DECLASSIFIED

E.O. 12958, Sec. 3.5

NSC Memo, 11/24/98, State Dept. Guidelines

By W/HM, NARA, Date 11/30/00

~~CONFIDENTIAL~~

-2-

villages and towns in Angola. These reported attacks include the execution of men and boys, the burning of villages and the slaughter of the people's main source of food and livelihood, their cattle. Reportedly up to 5000 Angolans have fled from this recent onslaught across the border into Namibia.

We continue to believe that there is absolutely no justification for such a large foreign armed presence in an African state.

The real victims of this policy, of course, are the people of Angola, who have borne the weight of 14 years of colonial war and now almost two years of civil war, with no end in sight. Even now there are an estimated 700,000 refugees and displaced persons in Angola.

Nevertheless the United States has followed a consistent policy of support for African solutions to African problems and respect for the role of the Organization of African Unity. The Organization of African Unity has formally recommended UN membership for Angola, and OAU members have asked us to facilitate Angola's entry. For the reasons I have enumerated earlier we cannot, in good conscience, vote in favor of the Angolan application.

~~CONFIDENTIAL~~

~~CONFIDENTIAL~~

-3-

for membership in this organization. In this case,
however, out of deference to African views, we will
not oppose the application.

~~CONFIDENTIAL~~