

S

1.3:

71/1849



THE DEPARTMENT OF STATE BULLETIN

Volume LXXI • No. 1849 • December 2, 1974

THE ENERGY CRISIS: STRATEGY FOR COOPERATIVE ACTION

Address by Secretary Kissinger 749

SECRETARY KISSINGER VISITS FIVE ARAB NATIONS AND ISRAEL 757

U.N. CALLS FOR COOPERATION IN ACCOUNTING
FOR MISSING AND DEAD IN ARMED CONFLICTS

Statement by Senator Percy and Text of Resolution 772

U.S. VOTES AGAINST EXPULSION OF SOUTH AFRICA FROM THE U.N.

Statement by Ambassador Scali and Text of Draft Resolution 775

Section 101
Superintendent of Documents

NOV 25 1975

DEPOSITORY

THE OFFICIAL WEEKLY RECORD OF UNITED STATES FOREIGN POLICY

For index see inside back cover

THE DEPARTMENT OF STATE BULLETIN

VOL. LXXI, No. 1849
December 2, 1974

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

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

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

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

PRICE:

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

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

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

The Energy Crisis: Strategy for Cooperative Action

Address by Secretary Kissinger¹

A generation ago the Western world faced a historic crisis—the breakdown of international order in the wake of world war. Threatened by economic chaos and political upheaval, the nations of the West built a system of security relations and cooperative institutions that have nourished our safety, our prosperity, and our freedom ever since. A moment of grave crisis was transformed into an act of lasting creativity.

We face another such moment today. The stakes are as high as they were 25 years ago. The challenge to our courage, our vision, and our will is as profound. And our opportunity is as great.

What will be our response?

I speak, of course, of the energy crisis. Tonight I want to discuss how the administration views this problem, what we have been doing about it, and where we must now go. I will stress two themes that this government has emphasized for a year and a half:

—First, the problem is grave but it is soluble.

—Second, international collaboration, particularly among the industrial nations of North America, Western Europe, and Japan, is an inescapable necessity.

The economic facts are stark. By 1973, worldwide industrial expansion was outstripping energy supply; the threat of shortages was already real. Then, without warn-

ing, we were faced first with a political embargo, followed quickly by massive increases in the price of oil. In the course of a single year the price of the world's most strategic commodity was raised 400 percent. The impact has been drastic and global:

—The industrial nations now face a collective payments deficit of \$40 billion, the largest in history and beyond the experience or capacity of our financial institutions. We suffer simultaneously a slowdown of production and a speedup of an inflation that was already straining the ability of governments to control.

—The nations of the developing world face a collective yearly deficit of \$20 billion, over half of which is due to increases in oil prices. The rise in energy costs in fact roughly equals the total flow of external aid. In other words, the new oil bill threatens hopes for progress and advancement and renders problematical the ability to finance even basic human needs such as food.

—The oil producers now enjoy a surplus of \$60 billion, far beyond their payments or development needs and manifestly more than they can invest. Enormous unabsorbed surplus revenues now jeopardize the very functioning of the international monetary system.

Yet this is only the first year of inflated oil prices. The full brunt of the petrodollar flood is yet to come. If current economic trends continue, we face further and mounting worldwide shortages, unemployment, poverty, and hunger. No nation, East or

¹ Made before a University of Chicago Board of Trustees banquet at Chicago, Ill., on Nov. 14 (text from press release 500).

West, North or South, consumer or producer, will be spared the consequences.

An economic crisis of such magnitude would inevitably produce dangerous political consequences. Mounting inflation and recession—brought on by remote decisions over which consumers have no influence—will fuel the frustration of all whose hopes for economic progress are suddenly and cruelly rebuffed. This is fertile ground for social conflict and political turmoil. Moderate governments and moderate solutions will be under severe attack. Democratic societies could become vulnerable to extremist pressures from right or left to a degree not experienced since the twenties and thirties. The great achievements of this generation in preserving our institutions and constructing an international order will be imperiled.

The destinies of consumers and producers are joined in the same global economic system, on which the progress of both depends. If either attempts to wield economic power aggressively, both run grave risks. Political cooperation, the prerequisite of a thriving international economy, is shattered. New tensions will engulf the world just when the antagonisms of two decades of the cold war have begun to diminish.

The potentially most serious international consequences could occur in relations between North America, Europe, and Japan. If the energy crisis is permitted to continue unchecked, some countries will be tempted to secure unilateral benefit through separate arrangements with producers at the expense of the collaboration that offers the only hope for survival over the long term. Such unilateral arrangements are guaranteed to enshrine inflated prices, dilute the bargaining power of the consumers, and perpetuate the economic burden for all. The political consequences of disarray would be pervasive. Traditional patterns of policy may be abandoned because of dependence on a strategic commodity. Even the hopeful process of easing tensions with our adversaries could suffer, because it has always presupposed the political unity of the Atlantic nations and Japan.

The Need for Consumer Cooperation

This need not be our fate. On the contrary, the energy crisis should summon once again the cooperative effort which sustained the policies of North America, Western Europe, and Japan for a quarter century. The Atlantic nations and Japan have the ability, if we have the will, not only to master the energy crisis but to shape from it a new era of creativity and common progress.

In fact we have no other alternative. The energy crisis is not a problem of transitional adjustment. Our financial institutions and mechanisms of cooperation were never designed to handle so abrupt and artificially sustained a price rise of so essential a commodity with such massive economic and political ramifications. We face a long-term drain which challenges us to common action or dooms us to perpetual crisis.

The problem will not go away by permitting inflation to proceed to redress the balance between oil producers and producers of other goods. Inflation is the most grotesque kind of adjustment, in which all other elements in the domestic structure are upset in an attempt to balance one—the oil bill. In any event, the producers could and would respond by raising prices, thereby accelerating all the political and social dangers I have described.

Nor can consumers finance their oil bill by going into debt to the producers without making their domestic structure hostage to the decisions of others. Already, producers have the power to cause major financial upheavals simply by shifting investment funds from one country to another or even from one institution to another. The political implications are ominous and unpredictable. Those who wield financial power would sooner or later seek to dictate the political terms of the new relationships.

Finally, price reductions will not be brought about by consumer-producer dialogue alone. The price of oil will come down only when objective conditions for a reduction are created, and not before. Today the producers are able to manipulate prices at will and with apparent impunity. They are

not persuaded by our protestations of damage to our societies and economies, because we have taken scant action to defend them ourselves. They are not moved by our alarms about the health of the Western world, which never included and sometimes exploited them. And even if the producers learn eventually that their long-term interest requires a cooperative adjustment of the price structure, it would be foolhardy to count on it or passively wait for it.

We agree that a consumer-producer dialogue is essential. But it must be accompanied by the elaboration of greater consumer solidarity. The heart of our approach must be collaboration among the consuming nations. No one else will do the job for us.

Blueprint for Consumer Cooperation

Consumer cooperation has been the central element of U.S. policy for the past year and a half.

In April 1973 the United States warned that energy was becoming a problem of unprecedented proportions and that collaboration among the nations of the West and Japan was essential. In December of the same year, we proposed a program of collective action. This led to the Washington Energy Conference in February 1974, at which the major consumers established new machinery for consultation with a mandate to create, as soon as possible, institutions for the pooling of effort, risk, and technology.

In April 1974 and then again this fall before the U.N. General Assembly, President Ford and I reiterated the American philosophy that global cooperation offered the only long-term solution and that our efforts with fellow consumers were designed to pave the way for constructive dialogue with the producers. In September 1974 we convened a meeting of the Foreign and Finance Ministers of the United Kingdom, Japan, the Federal Republic of Germany, France, and the United States to consider further measures of consumer cooperation. And last month President Ford announced a long-term national policy of conservation and

development to reinforce our international efforts to meet the energy challenge.

In our view, a concerted consumer strategy has two basic elements:

—First, we must create the objective conditions necessary to bring about lower oil prices. Since the industrialized nations are the principal consumers, their actions can have a decisive impact. Determined national action, reinforced by collective efforts, can transform the market by reducing our consumption of oil and accelerating development of new sources of energy. Over time this will create a powerful pressure on prices.

—Second, in the interim we must protect the vitality of our economies. Effective action on conservation will require months; development of alternative sources will take years. In the meantime, we will face two great dangers. One is the threat of a new embargo. The other is that our financial system may be unable to manage chronic deficits and to recycle the huge flows of oil dollars that producers will invest each year in our economies. A financial collapse—or the threat of it—somewhere in the system could result in restrictive monetary, fiscal, and trade measures and a downward spiral of income and jobs.

The consumers have taken two major steps to safeguard themselves against these dangers by collaborative action.

One of the results of the Washington Energy Conference was a new permanent institution for consumer energy cooperation—the International Energy Agency (IEA). This agency will oversee a comprehensive common effort—in conservation, cooperative research and development, broad new action in nuclear enrichment, investment in new energy supplies, and the elaboration of consumer positions for the consumer-producer dialogue.

Equally significant is the unprecedented agreement to share oil supplies among principal consumers in the event of another crisis. The International Energy Program that grew out of the Washington Energy Conference and that we shall formally adopt

next week is a historic step toward consumer solidarity. It provides a detailed blueprint for common action should either a general or selective embargo occur. It is a defensive arrangement, not a challenge to producers. But producing countries must know that it expresses the determination of the consumers to shape their own future and not to remain vulnerable to outside pressures.

The International Energy Agency and the International Energy Program are the first fruits of our efforts. But they are only foundations. We must now bring our blueprint to life.

To carry through the overall design, the consuming countries must act in five inter-related areas:

—First, we must accelerate our national programs of energy conservation, and we must coordinate them to insure their effectiveness.

—Second, we must press on with the development of new supplies of oil and alternative sources of energy.

—Third, we must strengthen economic security—to protect against oil emergencies and to safeguard the international financial system.

—Fourth, we must assist the poor nations whose hopes and efforts for progress have been cruelly blunted by the oil price rises of the past year.

—Fifth, on the basis of consumer solidarity we should enter a dialogue with the producers to establish a fair and durable long-term relationship.

Let me deal with each of these points in turn.

Coordination of Conservation Programs

Conservation and the development of new sources of energy are basic to the solution. The industrialized countries as a whole now import nearly two-thirds of their oil and over one-third of their total energy. Over the next decade, we must conserve enough oil and develop sufficient alternative supplies to reduce these imports to no more than

one-fifth of the total energy consumption. This requires that the industrialized countries manage the growth of their economies without increasing the volume of their oil imports.

The effect of this reduced dependence will be crucial. If it succeeds, the demand of the industrialized countries for imported oil will remain static while new sources of energy will become available both inside and outside of OPEC [Organization of Petroleum Exporting Countries]. OPEC may attempt to offset efforts to strengthen conservation and develop alternative sources by deeper and deeper cuts in production, reducing the income of producers who seek greater revenues for their development. The majority of producers will then see their interest in expanding supply and seeking a new equilibrium between supply and demand at a fair price.

Limiting oil imports into industrial countries to a roughly constant figure is an extremely demanding goal requiring discipline for conservation and investment for the development of new energy sources. The United States, which now imports a third of its oil and a sixth of its total energy, will have to become largely self-sufficient. Specifically, we shall set as a target that we reduce our imports over the next decade from 7 million barrels a day to no more than 1 million barrels, or less than 2 percent of our total energy consumption.

Conservation is of course the most immediate road to relief. President Ford has stated that the United States will reduce oil imports by 1 million barrels per day by the end of 1975—a 15 percent reduction.

But one country's reduction in consumption can be negated if other major consumers do not follow suit. Fortunately, other nations have begun conservation programs of their own. What is needed now is to relate these programs to common goals and an overall design. Therefore, the United States proposes an international agreement to set consumption goals. The United States is prepared to join an international conservation agreement that would lead to systematic and long-term savings on an equitable basis.

As part of such a program, we propose that by the end of 1975 the industrialized countries reduce their consumption of oil by 3 million barrels a day over what it would be otherwise—a reduction of approximately 10 percent of the total imports of the group. This reduction can be carried out without prejudice to economic growth and jobs by cutting back on wasteful and inefficient uses of energy both in personal consumption and in industry. The United States is prepared to assume a fair share of the total reduction.

The principal consumer nations should meet each year to determine appropriate annual targets.

Development of Alternative Energy Sources

Conservation measures will be effective to the extent that they are part of a dynamic program for the development of alternative energy sources. All countries must make a major shift toward nuclear power, coal, gas, and other sources. If we are to assure substantial amounts of new energy in the 1980's, we must start now. If the industrialized nations take the steps which are within their power, they will be able to transform energy shortages into energy surpluses by the 1980's.

Project Independence is the American contribution to this effort. It represents the investment of hundreds of billions of dollars, public and private—dwarfing our moon-landing program and the Manhattan Project, two previous examples of American technology mobilized for a great goal. Project Independence demonstrates that the United States will never permit itself to be held hostage to a strategic commodity.

Project Independence will be complemented by an active policy of supporting cooperative projects with other consumers. The International Energy Agency to be established next week is well designed to launch and coordinate such programs. Plans are already drawn up for joint projects in coal technology and solar energy. The United States is prepared to expand these collective activities substantially to include such fields as uranium enrichment.

The area of controlled thermonuclear fusion is particularly promising for joint ventures, for it would make available abundant energy from virtually inexhaustible resources. The United States is prepared to join with other IEA members in a broad program of joint planning, exchange of scientific personnel, shared use of national facilities, and the development of joint facilities to accelerate the advent of fusion power.

Finally, we shall recommend to the IEA that it create a common fund to finance or guarantee investment in promising energy projects in participating countries and in those ready to cooperate with the IEA on a long-term basis.

Financial Solidarity

The most serious immediate problem facing the consuming countries is the economic and financial strain resulting from high oil prices. Producer revenues will inevitably be reinvested in the industrialized world; there is no other outlet. But they will not necessarily flow back to the countries whose balance of payments problems are most acute. Thus many countries will remain unable to finance their deficits and all will be vulnerable to massive sudden withdrawals.

The industrialized nations, acting together, can correct this imbalance and reduce their vulnerability. Just as producers are free to choose where they place their funds, so the consumers must be free to redistribute these funds to meet their own needs and those of the developing countries.

Private financial institutions are already deeply involved in this process. To buttress their efforts, central banks are assuring that necessary support is available to the private institutions, particularly since so much of the oil money has been invested in relatively short-term obligations. Private institutions should not bear all the risks indefinitely, however. We cannot afford to test the limits of their capacity.

Therefore the governments of Western Europe, North America, and Japan should move now to put in place a system of mutual support that will augment and buttress private

channels whenever necessary. The United States proposes that a common loan and guarantee facility be created to provide for redistributing up to \$25 billion in 1975, and as much again the next year if necessary.

The facility will not be a new aid institution to be funded by additional taxes. It will be a mechanism for recycling, at commercial interest rates, funds flowing back to the industrial world from the oil producers. Support from the facility would not be automatic, but contingent on full resort to private financing and on reasonable self-help measures. No country should expect financial assistance that is not moving effectively to lessen its dependence on imported oil.

Such a facility will help assure the stability of the entire financial system and the creditworthiness of participating governments; in the long run it would reduce the need for official financing. If implemented rapidly it would:

- Protect financial institutions from the excessive risks posed by an enormous volume of funds beyond their control or capacity;

- Insure that no nation is forced to pursue disruptive and restrictive policies for lack of adequate financing;

- Assure that no consuming country will be compelled to accept financing on intolerable political or economic terms; and

- Enable each participating country to demonstrate to people that efforts and sacrifices are being shared equitably—that the national survival is buttressed by consumer solidarity.

We have already begun discussion of this proposal; it was a principal focus of the meeting of the Foreign and Finance Ministers of the Federal Republic of Germany, the United States, Japan, the United Kingdom, and France in September in Washington.

Easing the Plight of Developing Countries

The strategy I have outlined here is also essential to ease the serious plight of many developing countries. All consuming nations are in need of relief from excessive oil

prices, but the developing world cannot wait for the process to unfold. For them, the oil crisis has already produced an emergency. The oil bill has wiped out the external assistance of the poorer developing countries, halted agricultural and industrial development, and inflated the prices for their most fundamental needs, including food. Unlike the industrial nations, developing countries do not have many options of self-help; their margin for reducing energy consumption is limited; they have little capacity to develop alternative sources.

For both moral and practical reasons, we cannot permit hopes for development to die or cut ourselves off from the political and economic needs of so great a part of mankind. At the very least, the industrial nations must maintain the present level of their aid to the developing world and take special account of its needs in the multilateral trade negotiations.

We must also look for ways to help in the critical area of food. At the World Food Conference, I outlined a strategy for meeting the food and agricultural needs of the least developed countries. The United States is uniquely equipped to make a contribution in this field and will make a contribution worthy of its special strength.

A major responsibility must rest with those oil producers whose actions aggravated the problems of the developing countries and who, because of their new-found wealth, now have greatly increased resources for assistance.

But even after all presently available resources have been drawn upon, an unfinanced payments deficit of between \$1 and \$2 billion will remain for the 25 or 30 countries most seriously affected by high oil prices. It could grow in 1976.

We need new international mechanisms to meet this deficit. One possibility would be to supplement regular International Monetary Fund facilities by the creation of a separate trust fund managed by the IMF to lend at interest rates recipient countries could afford. Funds would be provided by

national contributions from interested countries, including especially oil producers. The IMF itself could contribute the profits from IMF gold sales undertaken for this purpose. We urge the Interim Committee of the IMF and the joint IMF-IBRD [International Bank for Reconstruction and Development] Development Committee to examine this proposal on an urgent basis.

Constructive Dialogue With Producers

When the consumers have taken some collective steps toward a durable solution—that is, measures to further conservation and the development of new supplies—and for our interim protection through emergency planning and financial solidarity, the conditions for a constructive dialogue with producers will have been created.

We do not see consumer cooperation as antagonistic to consumer-producer cooperation. Rather we view it as a necessary prerequisite to a constructive dialogue, as do many of the producers themselves, who have urged the consumers to curb inflation, conserve energy, and preserve international financial stability.

A dialogue that is not carefully prepared will compound the problems which it is supposed to solve. Until the consumers develop a coherent approach to their own problems, discussions with the producers will only repeat in a multilateral forum the many bilateral exchanges which are already taking place. When consumer solidarity has been developed and there are realistic prospects for significant progress, the United States is prepared to participate in a consumer-producer meeting.

The main subject of such a dialogue must inevitably be price. Clearly the stability of the system on which the economic health of even the producers depends requires a price reduction. But an equitable solution must also take account of the producers' need for long-term income security and economic growth. This we are prepared to discuss sympathetically.

In the meantime the producers must recognize that further increases in the prices while this dialogue is being prepared and when the system has not even absorbed the previous price rises would be disruptive and dangerous.

On this basis—consumer solidarity in conservation, the development of alternative supplies, and financial security; producer policies of restraint and responsibility; and a mutual recognition of interdependence and a long-term common interest—there can be justifiable hope that a consumer-producer dialogue will bring an end to the crisis that has shaken the world to its economic foundations.

The Next Step

It is now a year and a month since the oil crisis began. We have made a good beginning, but the major test is still ahead.

The United States in the immediate future intends to make further proposals to implement the program I have outlined.

Next week, we will propose to the new International Energy Agency a specific program for cooperative action in conservation, the development of new supplies, nuclear enrichment, and the preparation of consumer positions for the eventual consumer-producer dialogue.

Simultaneously, Secretary [of the Treasury William E.] Simon will spell out our ideas for financial solidarity in detail, and our representative at the Group of Ten will present them to his colleagues.

We will, as well, ask the Chairman of the Interim Committee of the IMF as well as the new joint IMF-IBRD Development Committee to consider an urgent program for concessional assistance to the poorest countries.

Yesterday, Secretary [of the Interior Rogers C. B.] Morton announced an accelerated program for domestic oil exploration and exploitation.

President Ford will submit a detailed and comprehensive energy program to the new Congress.

Let there be no doubt, the energy problem is soluble. It will overwhelm us only if we retreat from its reality. But there can be no solution without the collective efforts of the nations of North America, Western Europe, and Japan—the very nations whose cooperation over the course of more than two decades has brought prosperity and peace to the postwar world. Nor, in the last analysis, can there be a solution without a dialogue with the producers carried on in a spirit of reconciliation and compromise.

A great responsibility rests upon America, for without our dedication and leadership no progress is possible. This nation for many years has carried the major responsibility for maintaining the peace, feeding the hungry, sustaining international economic growth, and inspiring those who would be free. We did not seek this heavy burden, and we have often been tempted to put it down. But we have never done so, and we cannot afford to do so now—or the generations that follow us will pay the price for our self-indulgence.

For more than a decade America has been torn by war, social and generational turbulence, and constitutional crisis. Yet the most striking lesson from these events is our fundamental stability and strength. During our upheavals, we still managed to ease tensions around the globe. Our people and our institutions have come through our domestic travails with an extraordinary resiliency.

And now, once again, our leadership in technology, agriculture, industry, and communications has become vital to the world's recovery.

Woodrow Wilson once remarked that “wrapped up with the liberty of the world is the continuous perfection of that liberty by the concerted powers of all civilized people.” That, in the last analysis, is what the energy crisis is all about. For it is our liberty that in the end is at stake and it is only through the concerted action of the industrial democracies that it will be maintained.

The dangers that Woodrow Wilson and his generation faced were, by today's standards, relatively simple and straightforward. The dangers we face now are more subtle and more profound. The context in which we act is more complex than even the period following the Second World War. Then we drew inspiration from stewardship; now we must find it in partnership. Then we and our allies were brought together by an external threat, now we must find it in our devotion to the political and economic institutions of free peoples working together for a common goal. Our challenge is to maintain the cooperative spirit among like-minded nations that has served us so well for a generation and to prove, as Woodrow Wilson said in another time and place, that “The highest and best form of efficiency is the spontaneous cooperation of a free people.”

Secretary Kissinger Visits Five Arab Nations and Israel

Following are remarks made by Secretary Kissinger and foreign leaders during his trip to Egypt, Saudi Arabia, Jordan, Syria, Israel, and Tunisia November 5-9.¹

THE VISIT TO EGYPT, NOVEMBER 5-6

Remarks by Secretary Kissinger Upon Arrival, Cairo, November 5

Press release 480 dated November 5

Ladies and gentlemen: I'm on a quick visit to Cairo to see President Sadat and Foreign Minister Fahmy to discuss with them their conclusions in the light of the Rabat summit as to how further progress can be made toward a successful and lasting peace in the Middle East. The United States stands ready, as it has throughout the past year, to be helpful in making rapid progress toward peace.

Thank you.

News Conference by Secretary Kissinger and President Sadat, November 6

Press release 481 dated November 6

President Sadat: I am glad that my friend Dr. Kissinger was able to come and exchange with me views and measures. As you well know, I have the fullest confidence in Dr. Kissinger, and we support his continuing efforts for achieving a lasting and just peace in the Middle East. We believe that the United States can play an active role toward further progress in this respect, and I want

to emphasize that the doors for progress are still open.

Q. Mr. President, would you tell us if you are attempting or have attempted to bring about some kind of a dialogue between Secretary of State Kissinger and the PLO [Palestine Liberation Organization]?

President Sadat: I leave this to Dr. Kissinger.

Secretary Kissinger: I simply want to make a general statement. The talks between the President and myself have been useful and constructive, as always. As I said upon arrival at the airport yesterday, the United States is prepared to remain actively engaged in attempting to bring about a just and lasting peace in this area. I emphasized on many occasions our views which can be most effectively achieved by a step-by-step approach.

I am just beginning a trip through the Middle East, and we will remain in active and close diplomatic contact with all of the parties to see what possibilities exist and to encourage progress wherever possibilities exist.

I want to thank the President for receiving me in spite of the fact that he has a very bad cold.

Q. Mr. President, I would like to ask you, sir, what is your judgment as to how the Rabat summit conference affects the step-by-step negotiation process in which Egypt has been engaged with the United States?

President Sadat: Well, I can't see at all that the Rabat conference has put any block in this. The Rabat conference has been mainly for the question of Palestine, and it was inevitable that at some time the Pales-

¹ For documentation related to Secretary Kissinger's trip to the U.S.S.R., India, Bangladesh, Pakistan, Afghanistan, Iran, Romania, Yugoslavia, and Italy Oct. 23-Nov. 5, see BULLETIN of Nov. 25, 1974, p. 701.

tinian question was going to be tackled as a political problem rather than a humanitarian problem.

Q. Dr. Kissinger, are you optimistic?

Secretary Kissinger: I believe that progress is possible, and with the cooperation of the parties, we will continue our efforts, and we believe that progress is possible.

Q. Does that mean, Dr. Kissinger, that is not possible at the moment?

Secretary Kissinger: No. We believe that progress is possible in the months ahead.

Q. Mr. President, is Egypt ready to begin discussions with Israel about further withdrawals in the Sinai, whether or not there are similar discussions on the West Bank?

President Sadat: Well, we shall always be in Egypt ready to regain whatever land we can.

Q. Dr. Kissinger, last time you thought the United States was concerned by Jordan negotiating with Israel as regards the West Bank. You said that this was the U.S. point of view. Now that the PLO is going to take this role up, how do you think this can be resolved as regards to the United States?

Secretary Kissinger: What my view was, and is, is that it will be the best solution, and we now have to see the impact of the recent visit with respect to that particular problem. In my own point of view it has complicated matters.

Q. Mr. President, can you tell us how your discussions yesterday with Mr. Arafat affect your discussions with Dr. Kissinger?

President Sadat: I don't see how my discussions with Arafat yesterday and with Dr. Kissinger yesterday and today make any contradictions. There is no contradiction.

Q. Dr. Kissinger, are you going to meet Mr. Yasir Arafat here in Cairo?

Secretary Kissinger: No.

Q. Mr. President, when will you have another meeting with Dr. Kissinger?

President Sadat: Well, this depends upon

the momentum of the process in the near future.

Q. Would you expect that momentum to slow down or can you give us your expectation of when the negotiations between Egypt and Israel on the next disengagement will begin, sir?

President Sadat: Well, the momentum is continuing, and it hasn't been hindered. As I said in my statement, the efforts of Dr. Kissinger in the near future are needed much more than they were needed before.

Q. Thank you, sir.

Remarks by Secretary Kissinger Upon Departure, November 6

Press release 182 dated November 6

Q. During the talks with the President, did you submit any concrete proposals this time or the time before?

Secretary Kissinger: I have not submitted a complete proposal on either of the trips, either in October or now. I am here to discuss in general manner the procedures and approaches that could be used, and I will cover exactly the same subjects in every country that I visit. I would like to remind you all that it is exactly one year today that I visited Cairo for the first time and many things have changed since then, and I hope that by this time next year other things will have changed.

Q. Was there anything on the disengagements in the Sinai?

Secretary Kissinger: We have had no concrete discussions on any specific plan.

EXCHANGE OF REMARKS UPON DEPARTURE, RIYADH, SAUDI ARABIA, NOVEMBER 6

Press release 484 dated November 7

Foreign Minister Umar al-Saqqaf

It has been customary so far for the Secretary of State to start speaking and to give his impressions of his visit to our country. I feel it my pleasant obligation now to turn

the tables on him and start expressing my appreciation for the Secretary's visit, if he agrees.

Dr. Kissinger's visit was a good one, a useful one; and it came at an appropriate time, following several activities in the Arab area. For instance, I would mention the Arab summit conference, which was a big conference. This was an international Arab summit conference pertaining to the Arabs, the heads of states, their countries, in which they discussed affairs of concern to their respective countries and also discussed world problems and problems of interest to the rest of the world. This was the nature of that Arab summit conference.

This conference was successful, constructive, and effective. It had nothing new that we demanded different from what was the case during the Algiers conference last year. The attitude we took in Algiers was still the same. Our conviction is still the same; namely, that the way followed by Dr. Kissinger is a way that would in the future realize the complete, expeditious Israeli withdrawal based on justice. We would never do without his efforts or those of the great country he represents.

Our two countries are friends—the United States of America and the Kingdom of Saudi Arabia. We insist on being friends. We insist on challenging or defying problems and surmounting them. We do not accept that the problems challenge us and beat us. That is why we wish all success to our friend Henry and his mission toward which he expended a lot of energy, a lot of intellect, and, what was more important, his having put to work without any restraint his deep convictions in bringing about justice.

Our policy is the same. We want to see complete withdrawal to the 1967 borders and the return of Arab Jerusalem to its people and the restoration of their legitimate rights to the Palestinian people. I have no new demands. This is what I said even before the Rabat conference. I am saying this and repeating it simply because we have no new demands.

There is another topic touched upon by

my friend Dr. Kissinger; namely, that of oil. I repeat that the policy of my King and my government is still the same as it was; namely, to keep the prices as they are and to try to reach a reduction, albeit a symbolic reduction, or if we can, a greater reduction—and we would be doing this because of our awareness and of the welfare of humanity at large.

Finally, I greet our guests, the Secretary of State and the colleagues who came with him, and look forward to seeing him in the not too distant future when at least part of these problems we have been discussing will have been solved.

Secretary Kissinger

I have nothing much to add to what has been so eloquently expressed by my friend the Foreign Minister. We had very good talks, very useful talks, with His Majesty, explaining to our friends in the Kingdom the situation as we saw it and our determination, if the parties could cooperate, to move step by step toward a just and lasting peace. I found His Majesty understanding and supportive. With this encouragement the United States will continue its efforts to bring the parties closer together. I hope to make progress toward a just and lasting peace.

With respect to the question of oil, I had an opportunity, as the Foreign Minister pointed out, to explain the impact of the current prices on international stability. I would like to express our gratification for the statement of the Foreign Minister that the Government of the Kingdom of Saudi Arabia will continue to work for the lowering of prices.

The Foreign Minister, who has been a voice for moderation and wisdom in this area, will be coming to the United States next week to the General Assembly, and I look forward to continuing our discussions on that occasion. It remains only for me to thank him for all of my colleagues for the characteristic hospitality shown us on this visit to the Kingdom, and we leave determined

to strengthen even further the already warm relations between our two countries.

Thank you.

DEPARTURE, AMMAN, JORDAN, NOVEMBER 7

Press release 486 dated November 7

I would like to say that the talks we've had here were conducted in the warm, cordial, and friendly atmosphere of close cooperation that has always characterized the relationship between Jordan and the United States. We reviewed recent events in the area, and I expressed our view that I have also expressed elsewhere: that some recent decisions have complicated problems and possibilities for solution.

I have also explained that the United States would continue to make efforts to bring about a just and lasting peace in the area on the basis of the step-by-step methods we have been pursuing and that we believe are the only possible ones. As far as our relationship to the Kingdom of Jordan is concerned, Jordan is of course an old, valued, and trusted friend, and that friendship has, if anything, been strengthened by recent events.

The United States considers Jordan a major factor in the area, and it will continue to base its policy on that conviction. Our talks here have strengthened that relationship.

Thank you very much.

DEPARTURE, DAMASCUS, SYRIA, NOVEMBER 7

Press release 488 dated November 8

I wanted to say that the talks were conducted in the cordial atmosphere that has become characteristic of our conversations. President Asad explained to me his interpretation of the significance of the Rabat summit. I told the President that we remained ready to proceed on a step-by-step basis in bringing a just and lasting peace to the area and that this required the cooperation of all of the parties involved.

We decided that we would remain in contact with each other over the weeks ahead and that we would continue to exchange views. It was also agreed that, whatever happens in the negotiations, the strengthening of friendly relations between Syria and the United States, which is an objective of the policies of both countries, would continue.

Thank you very much.

THE VISIT TO ISRAEL, NOVEMBER 7-8

Exchange of Remarks Upon Arrival, Jerusalem, November 7

Press release 489 dated November 8

Foreign Minister Yigal Allon

I am delighted to welcome once more Secretary Henry Kissinger on his tireless mission to achieve peace in our area. We consider this as a very important visit of his, particularly that between his last visit and this one, as you all know, two events took place—one in the General Assembly of the United Nations, which decided to invite representatives of the so-called PLO to address the Assembly; the other one is the Rabat conference, which decided that only the so-called PLO will represent the Palestinians in seeking some sort of a solution. As you all know, we think that these two events are counterproductive, very harmful to the effort of achieving peace. Nevertheless, we mustn't get desperate.

All those who believe in peace, such as our government in this country—and of course Mr. Kissinger is one of the greatest believers in the necessity and the possibility of peace in this area—we should do our best to see to it that the momentum is not lost and [inaudible] further steps will be studied in order to achieve this great goal.

Welcome, Mr. Kissinger.

Secretary Kissinger

Thank you, Yigal. I'm here to discuss with our friends the impact of recent events and the possibilities for joint efforts toward peace. Since I have been here last, there has

been no change in American policy on any of the issues before us. Our friends and we will review all the possibilities. In every Arab capital that I have visited I have said what I shall also repeat here: The United States will make every effort, on a step-by-step basis, to contribute to a just and lasting peace in the Middle East. My friends here and I will review this evening what steps are possible, and we will do it in the atmosphere of frankness, cordiality, and warmth that has always characterized our relationship.

Thank you.

**Luncheon Hosted by Foreign Minister Allon,
Jerusalem, November 7**

Press release 490-A dated November 8

Toast by Foreign Minister Allon

Mr. Prime Minister, Mr. Secretary, colleagues and friends: This is an informal lunch, so I am not going to make a speech. We do deserve a good lunch, after working hard for—what is it—some 20 hours. Some people are always asking me if the Americans are already pressing and squeezing me. I say to them, “not yet,” but I must admit that they are pressing us, because whenever Henry Kissinger and his friends are coming here, they make us work so hard that they are violating our own law of work and, after work, rest.

Anyhow, I can say this: We were looking forward to your visit, Henry, and Joe [Joseph J. Sisco, Under Secretary for Political Affairs], and friends. Because with Rabat, without Rabat, with that disappointing resolution of the Assembly, without it, we must concentrate our efforts in our tremendous undertaking to achieve a political settlement, which absolutely must lead to peace in this area. There are so many reasons to get desperate. It's a sort of perpetual effort; whenever you get closer to the horizon you find the horizon is a little bit further away, and still you have to stick to this dream, because this is one of the greatest dreams that our generation has to turn into a reality.

I know you are Secretary of State of a great country, but many people—across the world, across borders—look upon you not just as the Secretary of State of America but a man who undertook a special mission, which many people and many governments tried before, including ourselves, and unfortunately failed. What we need today is the combination of great vision, faith, and skill—three qualities that characterize you, Mr. Secretary—and we hope in this grave situation we did not have, neither you nor us, to take any decision, because no definite proposals have been put before us. But exchange of views in assessing the situation was so important for us, and for you and your colleagues, in our joint effort to achieve a joint goal—which I'm sure will be the goal of some of our neighbors at least—that this trip can be considered a very useful one, and I'm sure you can see yourself that the atmosphere was very friendly, [and I say this] not just diplomatically, as when we meet we usually say what we think in candor and respect.

And I would like to raise my glass to all of us here, and I'm sure the day will come when we will celebrate the great political achievement. *L'chaim* [“To life”].

Toast by Secretary Kissinger

Yigal and friends: I hope you all noticed when Yigal started, he started with “Mr. Secretary, Mr. Prime Minister, colleagues and friends”—so at least we know who is not his friends. [Laughter.] It is a policy of equilibrium.

This is my ninth trip here in the last year, and there is a sort of fever chart that precedes every trip, always profound analyses that the United States has now finally changed its policy, and at last what has always been suspected has come true—that the United States will now really press Israel and force Israel to do things that Israel does not want to do, and may already have done it, and if there is a word in some communique that is not exactly the same word as in the former one, and since we're

never given credit for stupidity, it is always a profound design.

That fever chart we have gone through nine times, and the interesting thing to me is that never have these predictions survived our first meeting, because we always, when we meet and analyze the situation, develop a common approach, and this is no accident, because our relationship is not based on personalities. And anybody who talks about peace in the Middle East will sooner or later be driven to the same conclusion—that a peace to be lasting must make the participants feel that they are secure, that they have a sense of participation—and therefore, knowing the rivalries and the suffering and the tensions of the past generation, we have deliberately moved step by step, to permit all those who negotiate an opportunity to feel that what is being negotiated is really their negotiation, and not something that the United States has given.

On this particular trip there have been important events. As I said at the airport, and as I have tried to say for a week, not always with great success, there has been no change in American policy. I'm not here because there is a change in American policy, but because there is a continuing American policy which, in the light of circumstances, has to be analyzed from time to time. The objectives have to be set so that we know what we are doing, with confidence in each other; that has always characterized our relationship. We are now in an extremely delicate phase—it is extremely complicated—in which a great deal depends on psychological understanding, political sensitivity, and on confidence in each other.

I feel that after our talks here there is no question about the confidence in each other; there is no question about the direction in which we should go. We will now have to see what is possible, how it is possible. We will stay in close touch; no doubt I will come back here; no doubt there will be stories again that I am here to announce at last the change that has always been predicted and has never happened, that at last we are going to bring the pressure that has

not occurred and that I am too cowardly to exercise anyway. [Laughter.]

Be that as it may, there is no pressure necessary, because we are in essential agreement on the course. I believe, I hope, and I pray that we will look back to this trip as one of those that ushered in a period in which new advances were possible, even though we have to move carefully and we have to see what possibilities exist in a very complicated situation that has arisen as a result of the Rabat summit and other developments internationally.

So we leave here with confidence and with appreciation not only for the reception we have had but for the very frank, useful, and friendly talks that we have conducted. I look forward to an early opportunity to resume contact, and of course we will stay in intimate touch. So if you could change the instructions to [Israeli Ambassador Simcha] Dinitz so that he calls only three times a day, it will enable us to conduct foreign policy on other matters occasionally. [Laughter.] That is actually the only major complaint we have. [Laughter.]

Anyway, I would like to propose a toast to the Prime Minister and the Foreign Minister.

Exchange of Remarks Upon Departure, Jerusalem, November 8

Press release 491 dated November 8

Secretary Kissinger

Ladies and gentlemen: I've said earlier that this is my ninth or tenth visit in one year, and we all now know that it follows a certain course. There's always, before I come, a great deal of speculation about the momentous changes that are going to be brought about in policy as a result of my visit and what new pressures may be brought on Israel. And then we meet, we agree, we pursue a common approach, and we remain on the same course, which is to move step by step toward a just and lasting peace in the area, a peace that no people can want more and no people deserve more than the

people of Israel. We have had two days of very cordial, very frank, very friendly talks, and we agreed that in the new conditions that have arisen in these months we need to explore carefully what possibilities do exist. We will jointly explore them. The United States stands ready to help all the parties that are ready to move forward, and the United States, as always, maintains the closest relations with its old friends in Israel.

So the talks have been good. We know where we're going. We will explore carefully and deliberately. We will stay in close touch with each other, and we have hope for the future.

Foreign Minister Allon

While I can't but endorse everything that the Secretary of State had to say about his visit to the Middle East in general and to Israel in particular, it was quite natural that the Government of Israel was most anxious to hear an authoritative assessment of the situation after the Rabat conference.

I couldn't think of another person in the world today but Dr. Kissinger who could go to any Arab capital he wishes and from there go to Israel when his hosts there know very well that he is about to visit Jerusalem and talk to us. This gives us in addition to what we know from our own sources what was going on in Rabat, to hear Dr. Kissinger's opinion about the possibilities of the continuation of our joint political effort to achieve durable and just peace in the Middle East even if this has to be achieved step by step.

We are very happy to hear from the Secretary of State that these options are not blocked altogether. It is true that the situation is very complicated, very delicate, and therefore what is needed today is a great vision, a faith in the need and possibility to achieve peace, and the skill of a mediator. Happily, Dr. Kissinger possesses all these qualities, and therefore we think his visit to this country was most useful. We had good talks, very frank ones and a very friendly atmosphere. We do hope that sooner or

later, better sooner than later, we shall hear some news about the possibilities of some political progress in order to keep the momentum alive.

I am very happy that Mrs. Kissinger, Nancy, could come with him, but unfortunately he keeps us so busy that it doesn't give us a chance even to look at her. I hope this isn't out of jealousy—just because we are hard-working people. So next time I hope he'll take an extra day and come to a nice place like my kibbutz and relax a little bit, not only politically but also physically.

THE VISIT TO TUNISIA, NOVEMBER 8-9

Remarks by Secretary Kissinger Upon Arrival, Tunis, November 8

Press release 492 dated November 8

Ladies and gentlemen: A little over a year ago I stopped in Tunisia on my first trip to the Middle East. I came here to get the benefit of the views of your President Bourguiba and of all his associates about how the United States could best proceed to contribute to a just and lasting peace in the Middle East. Since then some progress has been made, and I am again on a trip to find out what the next steps might be and such a journey would not be complete without exchanging ideas with our old friends in Tunisia.

I bring the greetings of President Ford and also the congratulations to your President for his recent reelection.

Exchange of Remarks Upon Departure, November 9

Press release 493 dated November 11

Secretary Kissinger

Ladies and gentlemen: We have had a very brief but very warm, cordial, and useful visit here. The President and the Foreign Minister, who were in Rabat, explained to me their understanding of the significance of the conference of the Arab chiefs of state.

I told Tunisian friends that the United States believes that progress toward a just and lasting peace in the Middle East is possible on a step-by-step basis on which the United States would be prepared to participate if the parties involved were prepared to make the effort. President Bourguiba explained to me that in his own career he proceeded step by step against many obstacles and some criticism and finally prevailed in his objectives. We will come to draw courage from his example.

The Foreign Minister explained to me the important discussions that Tunisia arranged between the Foreign Minister of Portugal and the leaders of the independence movement in Angola that are taking place in Tunisia at this moment. The Foreign Minister also arranged an opportunity for me to meet the Foreign Minister of Portugal to discuss both bilateral Portuguese-U.S. relations and the important negotiations going on here in Tunisia. I believe that the negotiations now going on in Tunisia can be of historic importance and will be supported by the United States. I would like to congratulate the Foreign Minister of Tunisia and the Government of Tunisia for having taken this important initiative.

Finally, we reviewed the bilateral relationships between Tunisia and the United States, which are excellent. We are here among old friends. We agreed to begin discussions about setting up a commission between Tunisia and the United States to explore ways in which this relationship can be further strengthened in many fields.

It remains for me only to thank the Government of Tunisia, its great President, and its Foreign Minister for having arranged on short notice such a warm and successful visit.

Foreign Minister Habib Chatti

Ladies and gentlemen: As you see, we were very glad to welcome Secretary of State Kissinger and Mrs. Kissinger. This was a visit marked by friendship which shows very well this durable, old, and solid friendship that exists between Tunisia and the United States.

The talks with the Secretary of State were,

as always, extremely interesting, particularly on account of the trip he has just undertaken and the many issues with which he has been dealing, also because of his style of diplomacy.

Our talks were very interesting and, I would say, even very important, because they enabled us to gain an insight, a clear insight, into the situation as it exists in the Arab world and also in the United States, as an aftermath of the Rabat summit meeting. The situation as it now exists is quite difficult, and the task of the U.S. Secretary of State, in an effort to reach some middle ground between the Arab states and Israel, has become very difficult. We are facing a situation which is more difficult, but at the same time it is more clear, and therefore we must all act with determination so as to find the way to conciliation.

Tunisia, as well as the other Arab nations, are deeply dedicated to peace and wish to find a peaceful solution to this serious problem which poses a threat not only to the Mediterranean area but to the whole world.

The Secretary of State has assured us that he will continue to act toward conciliation with a view to finding a just and durable solution to the problems of the Middle East. We are particularly gratified by his good and sound determination.

President Bourguiba said yesterday to Secretary Kissinger that Tunisia will do all that is possible on its part in order to help the United States, and both Tunisia and its President consider that the United States can play an essential part to assure the attainment of this peace that is so much wished for in this region.

Without saying that we are optimistic regarding the evolution in the Middle Eastern situation, still we are not pessimistic. And since Secretary Kissinger is always optimistic, his optimism is definitely contagious. We wish him the greatest measure of success in the continuation of his mission because it does concern all of mankind.

Regarding bilateral relations I have not much to say except they are the very best possible and that the weather is always in the position of the fairest weather.

Secretary Kissinger Hosts Luncheon at Moscow

Following is an exchange of toasts between Secretary Kissinger and Soviet Foreign Minister Andrei A. Gromyko at a luncheon at Spaso House, Moscow, on October 26.¹

Press release 440A dated October 26

SECRETARY KISSINGER

Mr. Foreign Minister, Mrs. Gromyko, distinguished guests: The reason for the slight delay at the beginning was because the Foreign Minister and I were negotiating how to allocate the hour and 45 minutes we set aside for the toast. [Laughter.]

First of all, on behalf of all of my colleagues and of Mrs. Kissinger, I would like to express our profound gratitude to our Russian hosts for the very warm hospitality we have been shown here. Nancy returned from a trip last night and has definitely confirmed the existence of Leningrad. But until I have been shown it myself, I will reserve my judgment.

We have spent three days here on this my third visit to the Soviet Union in one year. The frequency of these visits and the intensity of our talks reflect the enormous importance the United States attaches to the relationship with the Soviet Union. Through changes of administration there has been one constant recognition—that the peace of the world depends on the degree to which the United States and the Soviet Union can cooperate for common objectives. So when we meet we review all topics. We know each other well enough now so that we speak with total frankness about exactly what we think, and yet the atmosphere is both businesslike and friendly and cordial. I think we have on this trip made good progress in a number of fields, and we have set a course which we hope and expect will be to the benefit of our two peoples and for the benefit of mankind.

¹For other documentation related to Secretary Kissinger's Oct. 23–27 visit to the U.S.S.R., see BULLETIN of Nov. 25, 1974, p. 701.

We intend to continue these frequent contacts and to find common points of view across an increasing range of activity.

And so with this attitude, I would like to propose a toast to Foreign Minister and Mrs. Gromyko, to the friendship of the Soviet and American people, and to peace in the world.

FOREIGN MINISTER GROMYKO

Mr. Secretary of State, Mrs. Kissinger, ladies and gentlemen, comrades: I wish to note as a very significant achievement right from the start the fact that the doubts that the Secretary of State had entertained as regards the existence of Leningrad have now been removed. He did not believe anyone except his own wife, but that is all too understandable.

We sympathize with what Dr. Kissinger has said just now as regards the role played by the two powers. Although this is perhaps a repetition, it is not out of place to say this several times. The more often statements of this sort emanate from both Moscow and Washington—and better still, from other world capitals, too—the better it will be. And it will be better still if these statements are buttressed by the practical actions of these two nations in the interest of détente and peace. And it is to promote that objective that we are now holding these talks in Moscow during this visit by Secretary of State Kissinger.

As regards the prevalent atmosphere, I would say—and I trust that this does not differ from Dr. Kissinger's assessment—that it is good, friendly, and businesslike, and this, too, is a good augury. The second point that I would like to make is to stress that the questions which are under discussion during these talks are of exceptional complexity, and there is really no need to dwell on that, because this is indeed universally known. And, of course, during their discussion there do at times appear certain differences of views, if perhaps not in the ultimate objectives then in the means and methods to be used to achieve them. Such differences do sometimes occur. But there

are no important and complex problems, at least among those existing since the end of the last war, which could be resolved, so to say, at one go without any difficulties.

We would perhaps like to see such an ideal situation come about—that situation has not existed and does not exist. Such is the state of affairs both in Europe and in regards to questions concerning other parts of the world and questions which cannot be allocated to various geographical localities. But the important thing is that the two sides should not end their efforts to achieve agreement and that they should not weaken their desire or their determination to find a common language on the questions under discussion.

As regards the Soviet Union, we do have both the desire and the determination to find a common understanding with the United States and with the leaders of that country on the questions that we are discussing. Frequently negotiations have to go through several stages, and the important thing is that there should indeed be movement from one stage to the next, and secondly, each new advance from one stage to the other should bring with it new success at every stage—new success leading toward ultimate agreement and accord. That is how we see the necessary approach to the outstanding issues of the day and to those questions that are under discussion between the United States and the Soviet Union.

So if in the course of this present stage of exchange of opinions some questions are not resolved to their very end, we believe—and we trust that this does not run counter to the opinion of the Secretary of State—the two nations must continue their search for a final solution; we are prepared to do so. The very fact that taking part in these talks from beginning to end is the General Secretary of the Central Committee of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union, Leonid Brezhnev, who has met with the Secretary of State several times, speaks for itself and most emphatically so. We should like to look ahead with optimism toward the future generally and in particular toward

the future of relations between the Soviet Union and the United States of America.

The Soviet Union and our leadership and I have already had an opportunity to draw your attention to this, Mr. Secretary. The Central Committee of our Party and the Soviet Government and personally the General Secretary of our Central Committee are fully determined to pursue the line that has been taken in Soviet-American relations, the line that we are following and the line which we intend to follow in the future. Improvement of relations between the Soviet Union and the United States is necessary not only in the interests of our two peoples; it is indeed in the interests of all the world. And this improvement should not be feared by any countries or by any people.

I believe we can say with full grounds that the results of the talks between the United States and the Soviet Union which have been held on several occasions and their positive outcome have been met with broad understanding and appreciation the world over, and I would venture to say almost everywhere in the world. That, we feel, is only too understandable, and this certainly heartens the Soviet people and the Soviet leadership. We trust this also evokes a positive attitude on the part of the United States leadership. This certainly goes to confirm the correctness of the path that we have jointly charted, aimed at improving relations between our two nations.

To the further development and improvement of relations between the United States and the Soviet Union; to both powers displaying determination to seek ways to resolve unresolved issues; to the useful and positive results of this new Soviet-American meeting in Moscow, even though it has not yet reached its conclusion; to your health, Mr. Secretary of State; to Mrs. Kissinger; to the health of all the representatives of the United States of America present here today, first and foremost the American Ambassador and his wife, in whose house we are all guests today; to all this I would like to ask all of you to raise your glasses and, if possible, drain them.

Federal Chancellor Kreisky of the Republic of Austria Visits the United States

Bruno Kreisky, Federal Chancellor of the Republic of Austria, made an official visit to the United States November 9–13. He met with President Ford and other government officials at Washington November 12–13. Following are an exchange of greetings between President Ford and Chancellor Kreisky at a welcoming ceremony in the East Room at the White House on November 12 and their exchange of toasts at a dinner at the White House that evening.

REMARKS AT WELCOMING CEREMONY

White House press release dated November 12

President Ford

Mr. Chancellor: It is a great privilege and a very high honor to welcome you to the United States.

I might apologize for the weather. We could not do much about that.

But speaking on behalf of the American people, let me say how very happy we are for this further opportunity to strengthen the ties of affection and the ties of respect that bind our two nations and our two peoples together.

Like all of the world, America has profited very greatly, Mr. Chancellor, from Austria's great contributions to the arts, to the law, education, medicine, and psychology, and of course there is the great legacy of music, the legacy of Vienna that the whole world treasures, the music of Mozart, the Strausses, and so many others; additionally, the great importance that Austria has served as a continuing force for peace and stability throughout the world.

Mr. Chancellor, modern Austria has proven beyond any doubt again and again in

recent years that a small country can make big contributions to world peace and world understanding. Your positive involvement in world affairs, your generous support of the United Nations, including an important role in the peacekeeping forces in the Middle East and Cyprus, your gracious hosting of important international conferences, such as the initial phase of the Soviet-American strategic arms negotiations and the force reduction talks now in process—all of these Austrian contributions are helping to build a better and more peaceful world.

We Americans, of course, are very, very proud of our long and sincere friendship with Austria. We cherish our many, many American citizens of Austrian ancestry, and we look with satisfaction and admiration at Austria's impressive economic achievements over the past 10 years.

Mr. Chancellor, we also look forward to our discussions and to the future good relations of Austria and the United States. The nations of the world face many, many challenges today—challenges in the field of finance, food, and energy, to name only a few. Meeting them will require our best common efforts and the counsel and understanding of many of our friends.

So, Mr. Chancellor, in anticipation of our session together and with our traditional Austro-American friendship in mind, America, one and all, bids you welcome and wishes you an enjoyable and most productive visit.

Chancellor Kreisky ¹

Mr. President: First of all, let me thank you for having invited me to come to Washington on an official visit at a time when you are extremely busy. We in Austria greatly

¹ Chancellor Kreisky spoke in German.

appreciate this high privilege, and we take it as proof of the strong and unimpaired friendship which has existed for decades between the American people and the Austrian people.

Mr. President, I come from a country which greatly appreciates the great contribution made by the United States—and we know this from experience—for the liberation of Europe and for the economic reconstruction of our continent.

We remember with great gratitude the sacrifices which the American people in so many ways have made for the restoration of peaceful conditions in Europe.

Today Austria is an economically prosperous country enjoying the blessings of freedom and democracy. We have not forgotten the significant contributions made by your country for this development.

Austria belongs among the smaller nations of Europe, and I regard it as an expression of international democracy that in its dealings with Austria, the United States has never disregarded the principles of equality and of respect for the sovereignty and freedom of our country. The friendship between our two countries and between our two peoples rests on the solid foundation of mutual trust and mutual respect.

Let me assure you, Mr. President, and Mrs. Ford, that Mrs. Kreisky deeply regretted to have been unable to join me in this trip and to see her fervent wish to be here unfulfilled.

Mr. President, I want to again thank you sincerely for this invitation, and I am looking forward to our discussions with my Minister also with the greatest of interest.

TOASTS AT WHITE HOUSE DINNER

White House press release dated November 12

President Ford

Mr. Chancellor and distinguished guests: It is a great privilege to honor you in the White House on this occasion. As I look around the room, I see many, many people that I know from personal experience, in-

cluding Mrs. Ford and myself, who have visited Austria and been the beneficiaries of the wonderful hospitality, the warmth, the friendship of the many, many fine Austrians who have bent over backwards to make us from America warmly welcome.

I must say to you, Mr. Chancellor, that sometime—I can't give you the date—but I am going to wander into Austria and take advantage of those wonderful Tyrolean Alps, because I do like to ski, and hopefully I will have an opportunity to do so just to not only enjoy the benefits of the mountains but the benefit of the wonderful people from your country.

There are many, Mr. Chancellor, who pass judgment on a country by its size and geography and its size in population. I don't think those are the most significant ways on which you really can judge a people or a country, and we recognize of course that Austria is relatively small in population and relatively small in geography, but as we look at the great history and the present in Austria, we find that looking from the outside to the country that you have a great humanitarian spirit, you have a great belief in friendship, but more importantly than almost anything, the people of Austria have a character.

And that is how we judge, in my opinion, the strength of a nation, despite its size either geographically or populationwise.

We know over the years since the end of the decade of the forties that Austria has contributed very significantly, despite many problems. You have contributed in the Middle East and Cyprus, and we commend you and we thank you for these efforts that have helped to preserve the peace and to build for it in the future.

I would simply like to express on behalf of all of us in the United States our gratitude for the friendship that we have with the people of Austria, the gratitude that we have for the actions of your government, and we look forward, I can say, Mr. Chancellor, without any reservation or qualification, the opportunity to work with you and the people of your country in the years ahead.

It is an enduring friendship predicated on a firm foundation of people to people and

government to government, and may I ask all of our distinguished guests here tonight to join me in a toast to Dr. Bruno Kreisky, the Chancellor of the Republic of Austria.

Chancellor Kreisky ²

Mr. President, Mrs. Ford, ladies and gentlemen: In your warm words of welcome, Mr. President, for which I sincerely thank you, you have mentioned the longstanding and proven ties between the United States and Austria. Certainly the peoples of the former Austro-Hungarian monarchy always harbored feelings of genuine friendship and admiration for the American people.

To the best of my recollection, however, the relations between the two governments were not always quite that cordial. [Laughter.]

It appears that His Imperial and Royal Apostolic Majesty Franz Joseph could not bring himself for a long time to receive the American envoy to Vienna.

Early in this century the developing official relations between Austria-Hungary and the United States of America, at least until the outbreak of World War I and the ensuing disintegration of the Austro monarchy, there really never was more than correct relations and therefore completely different from those we are fortunate to enjoy today.

Why do I choose to point this out? Because the development of our relations serves as a most convincing example which shows that a very special and close relationship between two nations can be developed in quite a few decades.

I see three reasons for this. In 1945 the United States became one of the four occupation powers in Austria and helped us from the very first day to lay all those foundations needed for the restoration of democracy. Nothing has made a greater contribution to the history of our democracy than the presence of the United States in Austria. You virtually were the guardian of our freedom, Mr. President.

Secondly, Austria was in ruins, and it

was hard to imagine at that time how our state could ever again become the home and heaven of our people. You gave to those of us who set out to clear the ruins not only a healthy dose of American optimism, but also the most generous material assistance.

Mr. President, I hope you will have the opportunity to see with your own eyes the fruits which have sprung from your country's contributions to the economic revival of Austria.

Aid under the Marshall plan was the foundation of our economic prosperity, and its effects are still being felt today. This aid constituted one of the chief reasons why twice as many people than in 1937 earn a good living in Austria today.

During the period from 1937 to 1970, our gross national product, given constant rises, quadrupled and has shown a marked increase since.

Let me add that your material assistance of that time still keeps giving today, as many Austrian firms receive lower interest, long-term investment loans from the ERP [European Recovery Program] counterpart front, which is sustained through repayment of earlier loans.

The fact that this aid by the United States for the restoration of our economy was given to us free of any contingencies of political dogma enabled us to utilize those sums, which appeared gigantic to us in the light of our circumstances, and complete independence.

And finally, the third reason. Through generous grants, Austrian scientists, engineers, and experts of every specialty have been afforded the opportunity to explore new dimensions in the advanced areas of your cultural and scientific life.

A further example is the considerable contribution made by the Ford Foundation to the Institute for Advanced Studies in Vienna, from which a great number of eminent social scientists have emerged in recent years. This constitutes ample reward for the contributions made by Austria to the cultural life of the United States.

Before raising my glass to the continued prospering of these relations, I would like

² Chancellor Kreisky spoke in English.

to again voice my regret that Mrs. Kreisky was unable, for reasons of health, to participate in this beautiful and impressive visit. She regretted this all the more because it robbed her of the opportunity to meet Mrs. Ford, whose restoration to health has made us all very happy and to whom I wish to extend warm personal wishes.

And now, ladies and gentlemen, I ask you to raise your glasses and join me in a toast to the health of the President of the United States and his charming wife and to the continued development of the excellent relations between our two countries.

U.S. Pledges Continued Efforts To Resolve Indochina MIA Question

Following are remarks made by Deputy Secretary Robert S. Ingersoll on November 1 upon presenting the Department of State's Tribute of Appreciation to Emmet J. Kay, an American civilian pilot who was held as a prisoner of Pathet Lao forces in Laos from May 7, 1973, to September 18, 1974.

Press release 458 dated November 1

As we recognize Mr. Kay for his courage and endurance as a prisoner for over 16 months in Laos, we think also of the many Americans who remain unaccounted for in Indochina. There are some 2,400 in all, more than half declared dead with their bodies not recovered, the rest listed as missing.

They include men from our military services, as well as some 30 American civilians, among them several journalists. Their families have waited for years in hope of additional information—as promised in the Viet-Nam and Laos agreements of 1973. Some 20 months have elapsed since those agreements were signed, with virtually no progress on accounting for the missing and the return of the remains of the dead.

Despite continuing efforts to arrange this, the Communist authorities have refused to agree to searches for crash sites, graves, and other information in areas under their control. We have long been ready to carry out such searches by unarmed American teams,

and we are prepared to discuss arrangements for such searches by representatives of neutral countries, by the International Committee of the Red Cross, or by responsible local authorities. Such searches have helped resolve a number of cases in South Viet-Nam, and we continue to hope they can be extended to other areas of Indochina as well.

The release of Emmet Kay and the release of nearly 400 other prisoners held by both sides in Laos was a welcome forward step in carrying out the Laos agreement and protocol. We hope this action will be followed by constructive efforts to account for the missing in all parts of Southeast Asia where Americans were lost. The families of our men have waited too long already; it's time to get on with the task.

I am pleased to note that the Third Committee of the U.N. General Assembly this week approved a resolution on the subject of accounting for the missing and dead in armed conflicts. From our discussions of this subject at the United Nations and at other international meetings we know it is a matter of concern to people in many countries which have experienced this problem during and after hostilities. There should be no political or military disagreement about this humanitarian question, and I pledge our own continued efforts to help resolve it.

U.S. Members Named to U.S.-India Educational, Cultural Subcommission

Press release 474 dated November 4

The Department of State announced on November 4 the appointment of 10 distinguished Americans as members of the Educational and Cultural Subcommission of the U.S.-India Joint Commission for Economic, Commercial, Scientific, Technical, Educational and Cultural Cooperation.

Establishment of this Subcommission was provided for in the Agreement for a Joint Commission signed on October 28 by Indian Foreign Minister Y. B. Chavan and Secretary Kissinger during Secretary Kissinger's recent trip to New Delhi.

The members, who will serve for two-year terms, include:

- ROBERT GOHEEN (Chairman), Chairman of the Council on Foundations
DR. RONALD S. BERMAN, Chairman, National Endowment for the Humanities
CHARLES BLITZER, Assistant Secretary for History and Art, Smithsonian Institution
EDWARD BOOHER, President, Book and Education Services Group, McGraw-Hill Co.
DR. DANIEL BOORSTIN, Director, National Museum of History and Technology, Smithsonian Institution
DR. EDWARD C. DIMOCK, JR., President, American Institute of Indian Studies, University of Chicago
DR. FRED H. HARRINGTON, program adviser, Ford Foundation
DR. FRANKLIN A. LONG, Henry Luce Professor of Science and Society, Cornell University
DR. ELEANOR B. SHELDON, President, Social Science Research Council
LEE T. STULL, Deputy Assistant Secretary for Educational and Cultural Affairs, Department of State

The American and Indian members of the Subcommittee will meet annually to review existing educational and cultural exchange activities and to explore opportunities for closer cooperation and expanded ties in educational and cultural fields.

The first meeting of the Subcommittee is expected to take place in New Delhi in January 1975. At this meeting the delegates will discuss proposals relating to Indian and American Studies, educational programs, collaborative research projects, media, library, and museum exchanges, performing arts, the role of foundations, and private cooperation and business involvement in exchange.

Letters of Credence

Belgium

The newly appointed Ambassador of the Kingdom of Belgium, Willy Van Cauwenberg, presented his credentials to President Ford

on October 4. For texts of the Ambassador's remarks and the President's reply, see Department of State press release dated October 4.

Greece

The newly appointed Ambassador of Greece, Menelas Alexandrakis, presented his credentials to President Ford on October 4. For texts of the Ambassador's remarks and the President's reply, see Department of State press release dated October 4.

Indonesia

The newly appointed Ambassador of the Republic of Indonesia, Rusmin Nurjadin, presented his credentials to President Ford on October 4. For texts of the Ambassador's remarks and the President's reply, see Department of State press release dated October 4.

Laos

The newly appointed Ambassador of the Kingdom of Laos, Khamphan Panya, presented his credentials to President Ford on October 4. For texts of the Ambassador's remarks and the President's reply, see Department of State press release dated October 4.

Netherlands

The newly appointed Ambassador of the Kingdom of the Netherlands, Age Robert Tammenoms Bakker, presented his credentials to President Ford on October 4. For texts of the Ambassador's remarks and the President's reply, see Department of State press release dated October 4.

Niger

The newly appointed Ambassador of the Republic of Niger, Illa Salifou, presented his credentials to President Ford on October 4. For texts of the Ambassador's remarks and the President's reply, see Department of State press release dated October 4.

U.N. Calls for Cooperation in Accounting for Missing and Dead in Armed Conflicts

Following is a statement by Senator Charles H. Percy, U.S. Representative to the U.N. General Assembly, made in Committee III (Social, Humanitarian and Cultural) on October 21, together with the text of a resolution adopted by the committee on October 29 and by the Assembly on November 6.

STATEMENT BY SENATOR PERCY

USUN press release 136 dated October 21

The resolution before us deals with the problem of accounting for the missing and the dead in armed conflicts. Concern about this humanitarian problem has been evident since ancient times. During the wars between Rome and Carthage, it is recorded, mothers and wives waited for news of those who died and the missing. More recently, following the First and Second World Wars, we remember pictures of relatives at railroad stations and ports as prisoners and refugees returned, with signs asking, "Has anyone information on my son?"—or husband or brother, as the case may be.

There is much of death and suffering in the heat of battle, and there is suffering that lingers after the fighting is over: physical sufferings from wounds, mental trauma from psychological injuries, and grief for relatives for whom the outcome of the battle is measured in terms of the death of loved ones.

The aftermath of armed conflict also brings the quiet anguish of those who wait

for information on the missing. Many people in many countries attest to this. Indeed, there is hardly an armed conflict, regardless of location, regardless of character, that has not resulted in cases of men missing in action.

Surely all would agree that the certain knowledge of a missing person's fate is better than extended uncertainty about the fate of a loved one. Sometimes families wait for years—for a lifetime—never knowing for sure what has happened to a missing relative.

This subject is of particular concern to my government because at the present time in Indochina many persons on both sides—combatant as well as noncombatant—remain unaccounted for. Families of missing men in my country have told me personally of their distress.

In addition to emotional stress, there are legal and practical difficulties if a man's fate cannot be established. But above all, there is the lingering ache of uncertainty.

From talks with other delegates here, I know the same situation exists elsewhere as a result of other recent armed conflicts. It is not the purpose of this resolution to single out specific problem areas or to point the finger of blame at any government. Rather it is to state and reaffirm international concern about this humanitarian problem.

The resolution we have joined in proposing recalls that one of the fundamental purposes of the United Nations is the promotion of international cooperation to resolve hu-

manitarian problems. With all peoples and nations, we would hope that negotiations could supplant war. At the same time, we recognize that armed conflicts continue to cause widespread devastation and human suffering. The purpose of this resolution is to call attention to a sometimes-unrecognized consequence of armed conflicts—the lack of information on persons, civilians as well as military personnel, who are missing in action or who died in connection with the conflict.

The yearning to know the fate of relatives lost in armed conflict is a basic human emotion. It is not limited to any one country or area of the world. People everywhere, whatever their situation, regardless of nationality, share this emotion and experience the sorrow of loss when their sons or husbands are missing in time of conflict. Surely all would agree that provision of information on those who are missing or who have died in armed conflicts deserves a high priority and should not be delayed pending resolution of other issues.

The resolution calls on participants in an armed conflict—regardless of the nature of the conflict or of its location—to take actions within their power to find and mark the graves of the dead, to facilitate the return of remains if this is requested by families, and to provide information on the missing in action. These are minimal requirements which, if observed, would go far toward satisfying the longing for information on loved ones.

This resolution notes with approval the resolution on this subject adopted by the International Conference of the Red Cross at Tehran on November 14, 1973. The name of the Red Cross has long been associated with the plight of victims of armed conflicts and with the Geneva Conventions of 1949, which state fundamental humanitarian law on this subject.

The Red Cross Conference resolution on the missing and dead was initiated by the United States and cosponsored by the Gov-

ernments of Denmark, Mexico, the Netherlands, Norway, and Pakistan. It was also cosponsored by the Red Cross delegations of Australia, Brazil, Canada, Ethiopia, the German Democratic Republic, the United Kingdom, Iceland, the Netherlands, Pakistan, and the United States. The resolution, which was adopted unanimously, reads as follows:

The XXIInd International Conference of the Red Cross,

Recognizing that one of the tragic consequences of armed conflicts is a lack of information on persons who are missing or who have died, including those who died in captivity, and

In conformity with the humanitarian traditions of the Red Cross and with the spirit of the Geneva Conventions of 1949,

Calls on parties to armed conflicts, during hostilities and after cessation of hostilities, to help locate and care for the graves of the dead, to facilitate the disinterment and return of remains, and to provide information about those who are missing in action, and

Further calls on parties to armed conflicts to cooperate with protecting powers, with the ICRC and its Central Tracing Agency, and with such other appropriate bodies as may be established for this purpose, including National Red Cross societies, to accomplish the humanitarian mission of accounting for the dead and missing, including those belonging to third countries not parties to the armed conflict.

The International Committee of the Red Cross (ICRC) has long sought to assist in resolving the cases of the dead and missing, in particular through its Central Tracing Agency, located in Geneva. During and after armed conflicts the ICRC and the tracing agency attempt to accumulate information on the missing and to record particulars on those who have died. This resolution endorses the efforts of the ICRC and the tracing agency in this area and calls on parties to armed conflicts to assist to the best of their ability in this humanitarian task.

It is appropriate and timely also for the United Nations to state concern on this subject, to give notice to all that accounting for the missing and dead in armed conflicts is a humanitarian subject of universal concern and a matter which should be kept

separate from political and military aspects of armed conflicts. It is hoped that approval of this resolution will remind parties to armed conflicts that the interests of humanity as well as the spirit of the Geneva Conventions of 1949 require that they make serious and timely efforts to account for the dead and missing.

I repeat—it is a consideration that applies to both sides and without regard to the character or location of a conflict. It applies to civilians as well as to military personnel—and to such special categories as journalists, whose protection has also been the subject of special consideration. The resolution concludes by asking the Secretary General to bring it to the attention of the Diplomatic Conference on Humanitarian Law, which resumes work in February 1975 in Geneva. It would be our hope that this diplomatic conference will be able to agree on improved methods for accounting for the missing and dead in armed conflicts.

I reiterate that the question of the missing in action is of special concern in my country but that this resolution does not single out specific problem areas nor does it point the finger of blame at any government. We mean only to state and reaffirm international concern about an important humanitarian problem.

TEXT OF RESOLUTION ¹

Assistance and co-operation in accounting for persons who are missing or dead in armed conflicts

The General Assembly,

Recalling that one of the purposes of the United Nations is the promotion of international co-operation in solving international problems of humanitarian character,

Regretting that, in violation of the principles of the Charter of the United Nations, the resort to force has continued to occur, causing loss of human lives, widespread devastation and other forms of human suffering,

Reaffirming that it is one of the fundamental obligations of Member States to ensure and promote international peace and security by preventing or ending armed conflicts,

Recognizing that one of the tragic results of armed conflicts is the lack of information on persons, civilians as well as combatants, who are missing or dead in armed conflicts,

Noting with satisfaction resolution V, adopted by the twenty-second International Conference of the Red Cross held at Teheran from 28 October to 15 November 1973, calling on parties to armed conflicts to accomplish the humanitarian task of accounting for the missing and dead in armed conflicts,

Bearing in mind the inadmissibility of a refusal to apply the Geneva Conventions of 1949,

Reaffirming the urgent need to ensure full adherence to, and effective implementation of, the Geneva Conventions of 1949 on the protection of war victims by all States, and in particular those signatories to the Geneva Conventions of 1949,

Considering that the desire to know the fate of loved ones lost in armed conflicts is a basic human need which should be satisfied to the greatest extent possible, and that provision of information on those who are missing or who have died in armed conflicts should not be delayed merely because other issues remain pending,

1. *Reaffirms* the applicability of the Geneva Conventions of 1949 to all armed conflicts as stipulated by those Conventions;

2. *Calls* on parties to armed conflicts, regardless of their character or location, during and after the end of hostilities and in accordance with the Geneva Conventions of 1949, to take such action as may be within their power to help locate and mark the graves of the dead, to facilitate the disinterment and the return of remains, if requested by their families, and to provide information about those who are missing in action;

3. *Appreciates* the continuing efforts of the International Committee of the Red Cross to assist in the task of accounting for the missing and dead in armed conflicts;

4. *Calls* on all parties to armed conflicts to co-operate in accordance with the Geneva Conventions of 1949 with protecting Powers or their substitutes, and with the International Committee of the Red Cross, in providing information on the missing and dead in armed conflicts, including persons belonging to other countries not parties to the armed conflict;

5. *Requests* the Secretary-General to bring the present resolution to the attention of the second session of the Diplomatic Conference on the Reaffirmation and Development of International Humanitarian Law Applicable in Armed Conflicts.

¹ A/RES/3220 (XXIX); (A/C.3/L.2110/Rev.2, as amended; text from U.N. doc. A/9829); adopted by the Assembly on Nov. 6 by a vote of 95 (U.S.) to 0, with 32 abstentions.

U.S. Votes Against Expulsion of South Africa From the U.N.

Following is a statement made in the U.N. Security Council by U.S. Representative John Scali on October 30, together with the text of a draft resolution which was vetoed that day by the United States, the United Kingdom, and France.

STATEMENT BY AMBASSADOR SCALI

USUN press release 154 dated October 30

Over the past two weeks, distinguished members of our organization and individual petitioners to this Council have expressed their opposition to the South African Government's practice of apartheid. In virtually all cases, their arguments were predicated on the abhorrence of the unequal treatment of peoples within a society and a minority rule which discriminates against the majority on the basis of color.

Let there be no doubt or confusion, despite the efforts of some, about the attitude of the U.S. Government concerning apartheid. In simplest terms, Mr. President, the Government of the United States opposes it categorically and absolutely. It is evil. It is ugly.

The United States shares the indignation of those who during this debate have decried South Africa's persistence in holding on to the iniquitous and callous policy of apartheid. The system of legislated racial discrimination and associated repressive legislation that prevails in South Africa is an indefensible affront to the spirit and principles of the charter and to human dignity around the world. It denies what the U.N. Charter proclaims—the dignity and worth of every person and the equal rights of all men and women. It is a matter of profound concern to the United States that the South African Government has ignored calls in the Security Council and in the General Assembly to put

an end to its inhumane, outmoded, and short-sighted policies.

Despite all warnings and admonitions, the South African Government continues to practice apartheid. It continues to uproot non-whites and consign them to often-barren "homelands" in order to preserve the supremacy of the fifth of the population who are white. It maintains draconian restrictions on the movement of non-whites. It persists in providing to non-whites inferior education, keeping them in a disadvantageous position. Segregation and inequality in all areas of life are pervasive. Non-whites are not represented in the government that dominates and intrudes into almost every aspect of their lives.

South Africa's denial of basic human rights is compounded in Namibia by its illegal occupation of that territory. The United States finds it reprehensible that South Africa has failed to honor its obligations under international law to withdraw from Namibia in accordance with General Assembly and Security Council resolutions and the 1971 opinion of the International Court of Justice.

South Africa's continuing illegal occupation of Namibia is made all the more outrageous by the manner in which it administers the territory. The repression of peaceful political activity, the flogging of dissidents by the South African administration's surrogates, and the division of the territory into so-called homelands are indefensible and inconsistent with the responsibilities South Africa had assumed as administrator of a mandated territory.

But, Mr. President, I am obliged to point out that even in this grievous case, the United States continues strongly to adhere to the view that resorts to force and other forms of violence are not acceptable means to induce change. This is our view with regard to other serious problems throughout the world, and it is our view with respect to South Africa. Armed confrontation is no substitute for communication.

The description of South Africa's transgressions I have just presented is not new. Observers have agreed about the essential facts of apartheid for many years.

Some of the words I have just used are borrowed. Members of the Council may be familiar with the statement made in the Special Political Committee of the General Assembly on October 17 on the issue of apartheid by my distinguished co-delegate Mr. Joseph Segel. This is a personal statement, as well as an official one, delivered from the heart by a man now serving as a public member—I repeat, a public member—of the U.S. delegation. It is also a statement to which I subscribe, to which the U.S. Government subscribes.

We are heartened indeed by some encouraging words in this chamber voiced by the Permanent Representative of South Africa. On October 24, he himself implied that South Africa is responding not in a vacuum but in reaction to world events, not the least of which has been the condemnation of South Africa's apartheid, Namibian, and Rhodesian policies within this international organization. I have noted with special interest that a distinguished African leader, whose bitter experiences in the past make him an impressive witness today, has also found hopeful aspects in the new South African voices.

We believe that a just solution of South Africa's racial dilemma indeed lies within South Africa itself. Taking practical steps toward improving the condition of non-whites and seeking change through communication seem to us more likely to have impact than some other measures suggested.

American firms in South Africa, for example, have had notable success in improving the pay and working conditions of their non-white workers. They do this as a matter of enlightened policy—with the support of the U.S. Government. The United States believes that through its current cultural exchange program prominent South Africans of all races have gained a new, more accurate perspective of their country's problems and a determination to seek a solution to them.

At the same time, the United States con-

tinues to bar the sale of military equipment to South Africa. In this regard, I would like to state flatly that the United States has not collaborated with South Africa on military or naval matters for over a decade and has no intention of beginning such cooperation in the future.

The situation in southern Africa is significantly different now from that of six months ago. South Africa has no alternative but to reassess its position in light of recent events. The United States urges that in doing so, the South African Government look at the realities of the future.

We call on South Africa to make good the assurances it gave Secretary General Waldheim in April last year to allow the people of Namibia to determine the future of the territory by exercising their right of self-determination, and to withdraw from Namibia. We urge that South Africa simultaneously begin to bring an end to its apartheid policies and to establish the basis for a just society and government where all are equal. We believe that after a quarter of a century of warnings it is time for the South African Government to adopt the measures which will lead to a society of equal opportunity, equal rewards, and equal justice for all. We call on South Africa to fulfill its obligations under article 25 of the charter and to comply with Security Council resolutions on Southern Rhodesia.

Mr. President, some speakers have argued that the best way to bring the Government of South Africa to accomplish these objectives—to bring the South African Government to heel—is for this Council to recommend to the General Assembly that South Africa be expelled from membership in the United Nations organization.

My government believes that this kind of all-or-nothing approach would be a major strategic mistake, especially at a time when we have been hearing what may be new voices of conciliation out of South Africa. These new voices should be tested. We must not be discouraged, as we may have been last December when we instructed the Secretary General to abandon his contacts with the South Africans on Namibia.

Mr. President, many of our colleagues during the past weeks have cited time and time again the poetic reference to "winds of change." With the fresh winds of change blowing from an enlightened Portuguese policy toward Angola and Mozambique, effecting important and progressive changes in southern Africa, the United States believes that it is incumbent upon this organization not to deflect those very winds as they rush toward South Africa. By doing so, we confess that this organization is powerless to influence change there. My government does not accept the view that the United Nations is powerless; rather, we strongly believe that it is through both increased bilateral contacts and the strong will of a determined United Nations that peaceful change will occur in South Africa.

Mr. President, the United Nations was not founded to be simply a league of the just. Rather, in our view, it is a unique international forum for the exchanging of ideas, where those practicing obnoxious doctrines and policies may be made to feel the full weight of world opinion. There is therefore a clear, positive, and indispensable role for the United Nations in bringing change to South Africa.

My delegation believes that South Africa should continue to be exposed, over and over again, to the blunt expressions of the abhorrence of mankind for apartheid. South Africans could hear of this abhorrence only from afar were we to cast them from our ranks, beyond the range of our voices.

Our analysis is that expulsion would say to the most hardened racist elements in South Africa that their indifference to our words and resolutions had been justified. We think it would say to the South Africans that we have not heard, or do not wish to encourage, the new voices—the voices that augur hope of change.

We believe that the United Nations must continue its pressure upon South Africa, moving step by step until right has triumphed. It is self-defeating to fire a single last dramatic salvo with only silence to follow. History holds no example of a pariah state that reformed itself in exile. The pariah

is by definition an outlaw, free of restraint. There is no record of good citizenship in the land of Nod, east of Eden, where Cain, the first pariah, was banished.

My delegation has another grave concern about the wisdom of expelling South Africa. Even if this would help thwart the ugly crime of apartheid, expulsion would set a shattering precedent which could gravely damage the U.N. structure. It would bring into question one of the most fundamental concepts on which our charter is based—the concept of a forum in which ideas and ideals are voiced and revoiced along with conflicting views until elements of injustice and oppression are forced to give way to reason.

This, in sum, is the appeal of my delegation. Let us continue to hold the evils of apartheid under the light of world opinion until all our fellow human beings have seen it for what it is. Let us continue to press South Africa in this U.N. forum and others to move rapidly toward an era of equality and justice.

TEXT OF DRAFT RESOLUTION ¹

The Security Council,

Having considered General Assembly resolution 3207 (XXIX) of 30 September 1974, in which the Assembly called upon the Security Council "to review the relationship between the United Nations and South Africa in the light of the constant violation by South Africa of the principles of the Charter and the Universal Declaration of Human Rights",

Having heard the statements of the persons invited to address the Council on this issue,

Taking note of the special report of the Special Committee on Apartheid on "violations of the Charter of the United Nations and resolutions of the General Assembly and the Security Council by the South African régime" (S/11537),

Mindful of the provisions of the Charter of the United Nations concerning the rights and obligations of Member States, particularly Articles 1, 2, 6, 55 and 56,

Recalling its resolutions 134 (1960), 181 (1963), 182 (1963), 190 (1964), 282 (1970), and 311 (1972)

¹ U.N. doc. S/11543; the draft resolution was not adopted owing to the negative votes of three permanent members of the Council, the vote being 10 in favor, 3 against (U.S., France, U.K.), with 2 abstentions (Austria, Costa Rica).

on the question of the policies of *apartheid* of the Government of the Republic of South Africa,

Reaffirming that the policies of *apartheid* are contrary to the principles and purposes of the Charter of the United Nations and inconsistent with the provisions of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights, as well as South Africa's obligations under the Charter,

Recalling that the General Assembly and the Security Council have more than once condemned the South African Government for its persistent refusal to abandon its policies of *apartheid* and to abide by its obligations under the Charter, as called for by the Security Council and the General Assembly,

Noting with concern South Africa's refusal to withdraw its police and military forces, as well as its civilian personnel, from the mandated Territory of Namibia and to co-operate with the United Nations in enabling the people of Namibia as a whole to attain self-determination and independence,

Noting further that, in violation of the pertinent resolutions of the Security Council, particularly resolution 253 (1968) of 29 May 1968, South Africa has not only given support to the illegal régime in Southern Rhodesia, but has also sent into that Territory military and police personnel for the purpose of strengthening that régime in its attempt to impede the exercise of their inalienable rights by the people of that Territory,

Considering that effective measures should be taken to resolve the present situation arising out of the policies of *apartheid* of the Government of South Africa,

Recommends to the General Assembly the immediate expulsion of South Africa from the United Nations in compliance with Article 6 of the Charter.

U.S. Commends Work of International Atomic Energy Agency

Following is a statement made in the U.N. General Assembly by U.S. Representative John Seali on November 5.

USUN press release 160 dated November 5

Since its inception, nuclear technology has presented mankind with a fundamental dilemma. How are we to enjoy the fruits of this, our civilization's highest technical achievement, without also suffering its lethal poison? Never before in history has man possessed an instrument with such potential for

good or for evil. Never has man been more starkly faced with the moral responsibility to control the product of his own creation.

Events of the past year have highlighted our dilemma. Even the most reluctant must now acknowledge that the world community has yet to adequately exploit the potential benefits of nuclear technology or to fully control its awesome capacity for destruction. As a result, today's debate takes on a new and timely significance.

Recent dramatic developments in the field of energy have intensified the world search for new sources of energy. The fact that this new demand for alternate sources of energy results from an artificial restriction on oil production does not make the development of such alternates any less urgent.

The International Atomic Energy Agency's response to this new situation, particularly as it affects the developing countries, has been commendably swift and comprehensive. We congratulate the Agency for its decision to step up technical assistance to the developing countries. We are impressed with the Agency's recognition that an equally high priority must be placed on international standards for health, safety, and reactor reliability. We continue to attach the highest importance to all of these activities, and we congratulate the Director General [A. Sigvard Eklund] and his staff for the imaginative way in which they are carrying out their growing responsibilities.

As the world community expands access to the fruits of nuclear technology, we must also apply ever more rigorous and effective controls over its potential for destruction. "The challenge before the world," as Secretary Kissinger has remarked to the Assembly, "is to realize the peaceful benefits of nuclear technology without contributing to the growth of nuclear weapons or to the number of states possessing them."

Secretary Kissinger went on to set out a number of specific areas where action to control and limit the spread of nuclear arms is most urgent. These priority areas include the strengthening of safeguards and controls on

the transfer of nuclear materials and improving the physical security of such material. He also called for more comprehensive adherence to the Nonproliferation Treaty and the safeguards it provides.

I would like to take this occasion to say how impressed my government has been by the way in which the International Atomic Energy Agency is taking the lead in confronting each of these key issues.

In his message to the recent International Atomic Energy Agency General Conference, President Ford stated that the Nonproliferation Treaty was "one of the pillars of United States foreign policy." Director General Eklund has today reported to us on the status of the safeguards agreements concluded pursuant to that treaty. We share the Director General's concern over the delays in concluding these agreements. My government therefore would like again to urge those nations which have signed the Nonproliferation Treaty but have not yet concluded safeguards agreements to accelerate negotiations with the Agency in order to complete these agreements as soon as possible. We further urge these countries which have not yet become parties to the treaty to do so as soon as possible.

Secretary Kissinger suggested that the International Atomic Energy Agency consider urgently the development of an international convention to improve physical security against the theft or diversion of nuclear materials. We are very pleased to note that the Agency has already begun to turn its attention to this problem, and we look forward to cooperating fully with the Agency's efforts.

The addendum to the International Atomic Energy Agency annual report¹ tells of the Agency's recent actions to prepare itself to respond to requests for services related to nuclear explosions for peaceful purposes. Once again I would like to note that my government is pleased that the agency has established the necessary expertise to follow the work in this field, to keep abreast of the tech-

nological developments, and to carry out its responsibilities under article V of the Nonproliferation Treaty.

In closing, Mr. President, I would like to record my government's full support of the program of the International Atomic Energy Agency. We believe that under the forceful and imaginative leadership of Director General Eklund, the Agency is responding well to the unprecedented and still-increasing challenges of a nuclear age.

TREATY INFORMATION

Current Actions

MULTILATERAL

Antarctica

Recommendations relating to the furtherance of the principles and objectives of the Antarctic treaty. Adopted at Wellington November 10, 1972.¹
Notification of approval: Argentina, October 17, 1974.

Ocean Dumping

Convention on the prevention of marine pollution by dumping of wastes and other matter, with annexes. Done at London, Mexico City, Moscow, and Washington December 29, 1972.¹
Ratification deposited: Jordan, November 11, 1974.

Patents

Strasbourg agreement concerning the international patent classification. Done at Strasbourg March 24, 1971.
Accession deposited: Israel, October 7, 1974.
Enters into force: October 7, 1975.
Notification from World Intellectual Property Organization that accession deposited: Egypt, October 17, 1974.

Property—Industrial

Convention of Paris for the protection of industrial property of March 20, 1883, as revised. Done at Stockholm July 14, 1967. Articles 1 through 12 entered into force May 19, 1970; for the United States August 25, 1973. Articles 13 through 30 en-

¹ U.N. doc. A/9722/Add. 1.

¹ Not in force.

tered into force April 26, 1970; for the United States September 5, 1970. TIAS 6923.

Notification from World Intellectual Property Organization that accession deposited: Zaire, October 31, 1974.

Property—Intellectual

Convention establishing the World Intellectual Property Organization. Done at Stockholm July 14, 1967. Entered into force April 26, 1970; for the United States August 25, 1970. TIAS 6932.

Ratification deposited: Zaire, October 28, 1974.

Notification of intention to apply transitional provisions: Republic of Viet-Nam, October 30, 1974.

Safety at Sea

International convention for the safety of life at sea, 1974, with annex. Done at London November 1, 1974. Open for signature November 1, 1974, until July 1, 1975. Enters into force 12 months after the date on which not less than 25 states, meeting certain requirements, have become parties.

Signatures: Bulgaria,² Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic,² Chile,² Congo (Brazzaville),² Czechoslovakia,² Denmark,² Egypt,² France,² Ghana,² Greece,² Hungary,² Iceland,² Indonesia,² Iran,² Israel,² Republic of Korea,² Liberia,² Mexico,² Monaco,³ Portugal,² Sweden,² Switzerland,² Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic,³ Union of Soviet Socialist Republics,² United Kingdom,² United States,² Venezuela,² Republic of Viet-Nam,² Yemen (San'a'),² Yugoslavia,² November 1, 1974.

Sea, Exploration of

Protocol to the convention for the International Council for the Exploration of the Sea (TIAS 7628) amending article 14(2). Done at Copenhagen August 13, 1970.¹

Ratification deposited: United States, October 31, 1974.

Telecommunications

Telegraph regulations, with appendices, annex, and final protocol. Done at Geneva April 11, 1973. Entered into force September 1, 1974.⁴

Notifications of approval: Denmark, Overseas Territories for the international relations of which the United Kingdom is responsible, August 21, 1974; Finland, Japan, August 29, 1974; Luxembourg, September 4, 1974; Sweden, August 30, 1974; Thailand, August 14, 1974; United Kingdom, August 12, 1974.⁵

Telephone regulations, with appendices and final protocol. Done at Geneva April 11, 1973. Entered into force September 1, 1974.⁴

Notifications of approval: Denmark, Overseas Territories for the international relations of which

the United Kingdom is responsible, August 21, 1974; Finland, Japan, August 29, 1974; Luxembourg, September 4, 1974; Sweden, August 30, 1974; Thailand, August 14, 1974; United Kingdom, August 12, 1974.⁵

Terrorism—Protection of Diplomats

Convention on the prevention and punishment of crimes against internationally protected persons, including diplomatic agents. Done at New York December 14, 1973.¹

Signatures: Nicaragua, October 29, 1974; Paraguay, October 25, 1974.

Trade

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

Acceptance deposited: Nicaragua, July 30, 1974.

Accessions deposited: Austria, August 22, 1974; Philippines, August 12, 1974.

Treaties

Vienna convention on the law of treaties, with annex. Done at Vienna May 23, 1969.¹

Accession deposited: Greece, October 30, 1974.

BILATERAL

Mexico

Agreement amending the agreement relating to the provision of support by the United States for a multi-spectral aerial photographic system capable of detecting opium poppy cultivation of June 10 and 24, 1974 (TIAS 7863). Effected by exchange of letters at México September 19, 1974. Entered into force September 19, 1974.

Agreement providing additional helicopters and related assistance to Mexico in support of its efforts to curb illegal production and traffic in narcotics. Effected by exchange of letters at México November 1, 1974. Entered into force November 1, 1974.

Viet-Nam

Agreement for sales of agricultural commodities. Signed at Saigon October 8, 1974. Entered into force October 8, 1974.

¹ Not in force.

² Subject to ratification, acceptance, or approval.

³ Without reservation as to ratification, acceptance, or approval.

⁴ Not in force for the United States.

⁵ Extended to Channel Islands and Isle of Man.

Atomic Energy. U.S. Commends Work of International Atomic Energy Agency (Scali) 778

Austria. Federal Chancellor Kreisky of the Republic of Austria Visits the United States (Ford, Kreisky) 767

Belgium. Letters of Credence (Van Cauwenberg) 771

Educational and Cultural Affairs. U.S. Members Named to U.S.-India Educational, Cultural Subcommission 770

Energy. The Energy Crisis: Strategy for Cooperative Action (Kissinger) 749

Greece. Letters of Credence (Alexandrakis) 771

India. U.S. Members Named to U.S.-India Educational, Cultural Subcommission 770

Indonesia. Letters of Credence (Nurjadin) 771

International Law. U.N. Calls for Cooperation in Accounting for Missing and Dead in Armed Conflicts (Percy, text of resolution) 772

Laos
Letters of Credence (Panya) 771

U.S. Pledges Continued Efforts To Resolve Indochina MIA Question (Ingersoll) 770

Middle East. Secretary Kissinger Visits Five Arab Nations and Israel (remarks by Secretary Kissinger and foreign leaders) 757

Netherlands. Letters of Credence (Tammenoms Bakker) 771

Niger. Letters of Credence (Salifou) 771

Presidential Documents. Federal Chancellor Kreisky of the Republic of Austria Visits the United States 767

South Africa. U.S. Votes Against Expulsion of South Africa From the U.N. (Scali, text of draft resolution) 775

Treaty Information. Current Actions 779

U.S.S.R. Secretary Kissinger Hosts Luncheon at Moscow (Kissinger, Gromyko) 765

United Nations
U.N. Calls for Cooperation in Accounting for Missing and Dead in Armed Conflicts (Percy, text of resolution) 772

U.S. Commends Work of International Atomic Energy Agency (Scali) 778

U.S. Votes Against Expulsion of South Africa From the U.N. (Scali, text of draft resolution) 775

Viet-Nam. U.S. Pledges Continued Efforts To Resolve Indochina MIA Question (Ingersoll) 770

Name Index

Alexandrakis, Menelas 771

Allon, Yigal 760

Chatti, Habib 764

Ford, President 767

Gromyko, Andrei A 765

Ingersoll, Robert S 770

Kissinger, Secretary 749, 757, 765

Kreisky, Bruno 767

Nurjadin, Rusmin 771

Panya, Khamphan 771

Percy, Charles H 772

Sadat, Anwar al- 757

Salifou, Illa 771

Saqqaf, Umar al- 758

Scali, John 775, 778

Tammenoms Bakker, Age Robert 771

Van Cauwenberg, Willy 771

**Check List of Department of State
Press Releases: November 11-17**

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

Releases issued prior to November 11 which appear in this issue of the BULLETIN are Nos. 458 of November 1, 474 of November 4, 480 of November 5, 481 and 482 of November 6, 484 and 486 of November 7, and 488, 489, 490A, 491, and 492 of November 8.

No.	Date	Subject
440A	10/26	Kissinger, Gromyko: exchange of toasts, Moscow.
493	11/11	Kissinger, Chatti: departure, Tunis, Nov. 9.
*495	11/12	Secretary's Advisory Committee on Private International Law Study Group on Negotiable Instruments, New York, Dec. 4.
*496	11/12	Advisory Committee on International Intellectual Property, International Industrial Property Panel, Dec. 10.
*497	11/13	Secretary's Advisory Committee on Private International Law Study Group on Maritime Bills of Lading, Dec. 6.
*498	11/14	Working committees established for National Commission for Observance of World Population Year.
*499	11/14	Nordness appointed consultant to World Population Year Commission (biographic data).
500	11/14	Kissinger: University of Chicago.
†501	11/15	Kissinger: news conference.
†502	11/15	Kissinger, Boyatt: Foreign Service Day memorial ceremony.

* Not printed.
† Held for a later issue of the BULLETIN.