



THE DEPARTMENT OF STATE BULLETIN

Volume LXXI • No. 1851 • December 16, 1974

WORLD FOOD CONFERENCE MEETS AT ROME

*Addresses by Secretary Kissinger and Secretary of Agriculture Butz
and Texts of Resolutions 821*

SOUTHERN AFRICA FIVE YEARS AFTER THE LUSAKA MANIFESTO

Address by Assistant Secretary Easum 838

U.N. COMMENDS OUTER SPACE REGISTRATION CONVENTION

Statement by Thomas H. Kuchel and Texts of Resolutions 845

U.S. OPPOSES U.N. RESOLUTIONS ON QUESTION OF PALESTINE

Statement by Ambassador Scali and Texts of Resolutions 857

THE OFFICIAL WEEKLY RECORD OF UNITED STATES FOREIGN POLICY

For index see inside back cover

THE DEPARTMENT OF STATE BULLETIN

VOL. LXXI, No. 1851

December 16, 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.

World Food Conference Meets at Rome

The World Food Conference met at Rome November 5-16. Following are texts of an address made before the conference on November 5 by Secretary Kissinger, an address made on November 6 by Secretary of Agriculture Earl L. Butz, chairman of the U.S. delegation,¹ and four resolutions adopted by the conference on November 16.

ADDRESS BY SECRETARY KISSINGER

Press release 477 dated November 5

We meet to address man's most fundamental need. The threat of famine, the fact of hunger, have haunted men and nations throughout history. Our presence here is recognition that this eternal problem has now taken on unprecedented scale and urgency and that it can only be dealt with by concerted worldwide action.

Our challenge goes far deeper than one area of human endeavor or one international conference. We are faced not just with the problem of food but with the accelerating momentum of our interdependence. The world is midway between the end of the Second World War and the beginning of the 21st century. We are stranded between old conceptions of political conduct and a wholly new environment, between the inadequacy of the nation-state and the emerging imperative of global community.

In the past 30 years the world came to assume that a stable economic system and spreading prosperity would continue indefinitely. New nations launched themselves confidently on the path of economic and social development; technical innovation and

industrial expansion promised steady improvement in the standard of living of all nations; surpluses of fuel, food, and raw materials were considered a burden rather than a blessing. While poverty and misery still afflicted many parts of the globe, over the long run there was universal hope; the period was fairly characterized as a "revolution of rising expectations."

That time has ended. Now there are fundamental questions about our capacity to meet even our most basic needs. In 1972, partly due to bad weather around the globe, world grain production declined for the first time in two decades. We were made ominously conscious of the thin edge between hope and hunger, and of the world's dependence on the surplus production of a few nations. In 1973, first a political embargo and then abruptly raised prices for oil curbed production in the world's factories and farms and sharply accelerated a global inflation that was already at the margin of governments' ability to control. In 1974, the international monetary and trading system continues under mounting stress, not yet able to absorb the accumulated weight of repeated shocks, its institutions still struggling to respond. The same interdependence that brought common advance now threatens us with common decline.

We must act now and we must act together to regain control over our shared destiny. Catastrophe when it cannot be foreseen can be blamed on a failure of vision or on forces beyond our control. But the current trend is obvious, and the remedy is within our power. If we do not act boldly, disaster will result from a failure of will; moral culpability will be inherent in our foreknowledge.

The political challenge is straightforward: Will the nations of the world cooperate to

¹ For names of other members of the U.S. delegation, see press release 450 dated Oct. 30.

confront a crisis which is both self-evident and global in nature? Or will each nation or region or bloc see its special advantage as a weapon instead of as a contribution? Will we pool our strengths and progress together or test our strengths and sink together?

President Ford has instructed me to declare on behalf of the United States: We regard our good fortune and strength in the field of food as a global trust. We recognize the responsibilities we bear by virtue of our extraordinary productivity, our advanced technology, and our tradition of assistance. That is why we proposed this conference. That is why a Secretary of State is giving this address. The United States will make a major effort to match its capacity to the magnitude of the challenge. We are convinced that the collective response will have an important influence on the nature of the world that our children inherit.

As we move toward the next century the nations assembled here must begin to fashion a global conception. For we are irreversibly linked to each other—by interdependent economies and human aspirations, by instant communications and nuclear peril. The contemporary agenda of energy, food, and inflation exceeds the capacity of any single government, or even of a few governments together, to resolve.

All nations—East and West, North and South—are linked to a single economic system. Preoccupation with narrow advantage is foredoomed. It is bound to lead to sterile confrontations, undermining the international cooperation upon which achievement of national objectives depends. The poorest and weakest nations will suffer most. Discontent and instabilities will be magnified in all countries. New dangers will be posed to recent progress in reducing international tensions.

But this need not be our future. There is great opportunity as well as grave danger in the present crisis. Recognition of our condition can disenthral us from outdated conceptions, from institutional inertia, from sterile rivalries. If we comprehend our reality and act upon it, we can usher in a

period of unprecedented advance with consequences far transcending the issues before this conference. We will have built an international system worthy of the capacities and aspirations of mankind.

The Food Challenge

We must begin here with the challenge of food. No social system, ideology, or principle of justice can tolerate a world in which the spiritual and physical potential of hundreds of millions is stunted from elemental hunger or inadequate nutrition. National pride or regional suspicions lose any moral and practical justification if they prevent us from overcoming this scourge.

A generation ago many farmers were self-sufficient; today fuel, fertilizer, capital, and technology are essential for their economic survival. A generation ago many nations were self-sufficient; today a few food exporters provide the margin between life and death for many millions.

Thus food has become a central element of the international economy. A world of energy shortages, rampant inflation, and a weakening trade and monetary system will be a world of food shortages as well. And food shortages in turn sabotage growth and accelerate inflation.

The food problem has two levels—first, coping with food emergencies, and second, assuring long-term supplies and an adequate standard of nutrition for our growing populations.

During the 1950's and 1960's, global food production grew with great consistency. Per capita output expanded even in the food-deficit nations; the world's total output increased by more than half. But at the precise moment when growing populations and rising expectations made a continuation of this trend essential, a dramatic change occurred: during the past three years, world cereal production has fallen; reserves have dropped to the point where significant crop failure can spell a major disaster.

The longer term picture is, if anything, starker still. Even today hundreds of millions of people do not eat enough for decent and

productive lives. Since increases in production are not evenly distributed, the absolute numbers of malnourished people are, in fact, probably greater today than ever before except in times of famine. In many parts of the world 30 to 50 percent of the children die before the age of five, millions of them from malnutrition. Many survive only with permanent damage to their intellectual and physical capacities.

World population is projected to double by the end of the century. It is clear that we must meet the food need that this entails. But it is equally clear that population cannot continue indefinitely to double every generation. At some point we will inevitably exceed the earth's capacity to sustain human life.

The near- as well as the long-term challenges of food have three components:

—There is the problem of production. In the face of population trends, maintaining even current inadequate levels of nutrition and food security will require that we produce twice as much food by the end of this century. Adequate nutrition would require 150 percent more food, or a total annual output of 3 billion tons of grain.

—There is the problem of distribution. Secretary General Marei [Sayed A. Marei, of Egypt, Secretary General of the conference] estimates that at the present rate of growth of 2½ percent a year the gap between what the developing countries produce themselves and what they need will rise from 25 million to 85 million tons a year by 1985. For the foreseeable future, food will have to be transferred on a substantial scale from where it is in surplus to where it is in shortage.

—There is the problem of reserves. Protection against the vagaries of weather and disaster urgently requires a food reserve. Our estimate is that as much as 60 million tons over current carryover levels may be required.

In short, we are convinced that the world faces a challenge new in its severity, its pervasiveness, and its global dimension. Our minimum objective of the next quarter cen-

tury must be to more than double world food production and to improve its quality. To meet this objective the United States proposes to this conference a comprehensive program of urgent cooperative worldwide action on five fronts:

—Increasing the production of food exporters.

—Accelerating the production in developing countries.

—Improving means of food distribution and financing.

—Enhancing food quality.

—Insuring security against food emergencies.

Let me deal with each of these in turn.

Increased Production by Food Exporters

A handful of countries, through good fortune and technology, can produce more than they need and thus are able to export. Reliance on this production is certain to grow through the next decade and perhaps beyond. Unless we are to doom the world to chronic famine, the major exporting nations must rapidly expand their potential and seek to insure the dependable long-term growth of their supplies.

They must begin by adjusting their agricultural policies to a new economic reality. For years these policies were based on the premise that production to full capacity created undesirable surpluses and depressed markets, depriving farmers of incentives to invest and produce. It is now abundantly clear that this is not the problem we face; there is no surplus so long as there is an unmet need. In that sense, no real surplus has ever existed. The problem has always been a collective failure to transfer apparent surpluses to areas of shortage. In current and foreseeable conditions this can surely be accomplished without dampening incentives for production in either area.

The United States has taken sweeping steps to expand its output to the maximum. It already has 167 million acres under grain production alone, an increase of 23 million acres from two years ago. In an address

to the Congress last month, President Ford asked for a greater effort still; he called upon every American farmer to produce to full capacity. He directed the elimination of all restrictive practices which raise food prices; he assured farmers that he will use present authority and seek additional authority to allocate the fuel and fertilizer they require; and he urged the removal of remaining acreage limitations.

These efforts should be matched by all exporting countries.

Maximum production will require a substantial increase in investment. The best land, the most accessible water, and the most obvious improvements are already in use. Last year the United States raised its investment in agriculture by \$2.5 billion. The U.S. Government is launching a systematic survey of additional investment requirements and of ways to insure that they are met.

A comparable effort by other nations is essential.

The United States believes that cooperative action among exporting countries is required to stimulate rational planning and the necessary increases in output. We are prepared to join with other major exporters in a common commitment to raise production, to make the necessary investment, and to begin rebuilding reserves for food security. Immediately following the conclusion of this conference, the United States proposes to convene a group of major exporters—an Export Planning Group—to shape a concrete and coordinated program to achieve these goals.

Production in Developing Countries

The food-exporting nations alone will simply not be able to meet the world's basic needs. Ironically but fortunately, it is the nations with the most rapidly growing food deficits which also possess the greatest capacity for increased production. They have the largest amounts of unused land and water. While they now have 35 percent more land in grain production than the developed nations, they produce 20 percent less on this land. In short, the largest growth in world

food production can and must take place in the chronic deficit countries.

Yet the gap between supply and demand in these countries is growing, not narrowing. At the current growth rate, the grain supply deficit is estimated to more than triple and reach some 85 million tons by 1985. To cut this gap in half would require accelerating their growth rate from the historically high average of $2\frac{1}{2}$ percent per annum to $3\frac{1}{2}$ percent—an increase in the rate of growth of 40 percent.

Two key areas need major emphasis to achieve even this minimum goal: new research and new investment.

International and national research programs must be concentrated on the special needs of the chronic food-deficit nations, and they must be intensified. New technologies must be developed to increase yields and reduce costs, making use of the special features of their labor-intensive, capital-short economies.

On the international plane, we must strengthen and expand the research network linking the less developed countries with research institutions in the industrialized countries and with the existing eight international agricultural research centers. We propose that resources for these centers be more than doubled by 1980. For its part, the United States will in the same period triple its own contribution for the international centers, for agricultural research efforts in the less developed countries, and for research by American universities on the agricultural problems of developing nations. The existing Consultative Group on International Agricultural Research can play an important coordinating role in this effort.

The United States is gratified by the progress of two initiatives which we proposed at the sixth special session of the U.N. General Assembly last April: the International Fertilizer Development Center and the study on the impact of climate change on food supply. The fertilizer center opened its doors last month in the United States with funds provided by Canada and the United States; we invite wider participation and pledge its resources to the needs of the

developing nations. And the important study on climate and food supply has been taken on by the U.N. World Meteorological Organization (WMO).

National as well as international research efforts must be brought to bear. The United States offers to share with developing nations the results of its advanced research. We already have underway a considerable range of promising projects: to increase the protein content of common cereals; to fortify staple foods with inexpensive nutrients; to improve plant fixation of atmospheric nitrogen to reduce the need for costly fertilizers; to develop new low-cost, small-scale tools and machines for the world's millions of small farmers.

We also plan a number of new projects. Next year our space, agriculture, and weather agencies will test advanced satellite techniques for surveying and forecasting important food crops. We will begin in North America and then broaden the project to other parts of the world. To supplement the WMO study on climate, we have begun our own analysis of the relationship between climatic patterns and crop yields over a statistically significant period. This is a promising and potentially vital contribution to rational planning of global production.

The United States will also make available the results of these projects for other nations.

Finally, President Ford is requesting the National Academy of Sciences, in cooperation with the Department of Agriculture and other governmental agencies, to design a far-reaching food and nutrition research program to mobilize America's talent. It is the President's aim to dedicate America's resources and America's scientific talent to finding new solutions, commensurate both with the magnitude of the human need and the wealth of our scientific capacities.

While we can hope for technological breakthroughs, we cannot count on them. There is no substitute for additional investment in chronic food-deficit countries. New irrigation systems, storage and distribution systems, production facilities for fertilizer, pesticide, and seed, and agricultural credit

institutions are all urgently needed. Much of this can be stimulated and financed locally. But substantial outside resources will be needed for some time to come.

The United States believes that investment should be concentrated in strategic areas, applying existing, and in some cases very simple, technologies to critical variables in the process of food production. Among these are fertilizer, better storage facilities, and pesticides.

Modern fertilizer is probably the most critical single input for increasing crop yields; it is also the most dependent on new investment. In our view, fertilizer production is an ideal area for collaboration between wealthier and poorer nations, especially combining the technology of the developed countries, the capital and raw materials of the oil producers, and the growing needs of the least developed countries. Existing production capacity is inadequate worldwide; new fertilizer industries should be created, especially in the developing countries, to meet local and regional needs for the long term. This could be done most efficiently on the basis of regional cooperation.

The United States will strongly support such regional efforts. In our investment and assistance programs we will give priority to the building of fertilizer industries and will share our advanced technology.

Another major priority must be to reduce losses from inadequate storage, transport, and pest control. Tragically, as much as 15 percent of a country's food production is often lost after harvesting because of pests that attack grains in substandard storage facilities. Better methods of safe storage must be taught and spread as widely as possible. Existing pesticides must be made more generally available. Many of these techniques are simple and inexpensive; investment in these areas could have a rapid and substantial impact on the world's food supply.

To plan a coherent investment strategy, the United States proposes the immediate formation of a Coordinating Group for Food Production and Investment. We recommend that the World Bank join with the Food and

Agriculture Organization and the U.N. Development Program to convene such a group this year. It should bring together representatives from both traditional donors and new financial powers, from multilateral agencies, and from developing countries, with the following mandate:

—To encourage bilateral and international assistance programs to provide the required external resources.

—To help governments stimulate greater internal resources for agriculture.

—To promote the most effective uses of new investment by the chronic deficit countries.

The United States has long been a major contributor to agricultural development. We intend to expand this contribution. We have reordered our development assistance priorities to place the central emphasis on food and nutrition programs. We have requested an increase of almost \$350 million for them in our current budget. This new emphasis will continue for as long as the need exists.

For all these international measures to be effective, governments must reexamine their overall agricultural policies and practices. Outside countries can assist with technology and the transfer of resources; the setting of priorities properly remains the province of national authorities. In far too many countries, farmers have no incentive to make the investment required for increased production because prices are set at unremunerative levels, because credit is unavailable, or because transportation and distribution facilities are inadequate. Just as the exporting countries must adjust their own policies to new realities, so must developing countries give a higher priority for food production in their development budgets and in their tax, credit, and investment policies.

Improving Food Distribution and Financing

While we must urgently produce more food, the problem of its distribution will remain crucial. Even with maximum foreseeable agricultural growth in the developing countries, their food import requirement is

likely to amount to some 40 million tons a year in the mid-1980's, or nearly twice the current level.

How is the cost of these imports to be met?

The earnings of the developing countries themselves of course remain the principal source. The industrialized nations can make a significant contribution simply by improving access to their markets. With the imminent passage of the trade bill, the United States reaffirms its commitment to institute a system of generalized tariff preferences for the developing nations and to pay special attention to their needs in the coming multilateral trade negotiations.

Nevertheless an expanded flow of food aid will clearly be necessary. During this fiscal year the United States will increase its food aid contribution, despite the adverse weather conditions which have affected our crops. The American people have a deep and enduring commitment to help feed the starving and the hungry. We will do everything humanly possible to assure that our future contribution will be responsive to the growing needs.

The responsibility for financing food imports cannot, however, rest with the food exporters alone. Over the next few years in particular, the financing needs of the food-deficit developing countries will simply be too large for either their own limited resources or the traditional food aid donors.

The oil exporters have a special responsibility in this regard. Many of them have income far in excess of that needed to balance their international payments or to finance their economic development. The continuing massive transfer of wealth and the resulting impetus to worldwide inflation have shattered the ability of the developing countries to purchase food, fertilizer, and other goods. And the economic crisis has severely reduced the imports of the industrialized countries from the developing nations.

The United States recommends that the traditional donors and the new financial powers participating in the Coordinating Group for Food Production and Investment make a major effort to provide the food and funds required. They could form a sub-

committee on food financing which, as a first task, would negotiate a minimum global quantity of food for whose transfer to food-deficit developing countries over the next three years they are prepared to find the necessary finances.

I have outlined various measures to expand production, to improve the earning capacity of developing countries, to generate new sources of external assistance. But it is not clear that even these measures will be sufficient to meet the longer term challenge, particularly if our current estimates of the gap by 1985 and beyond prove to be too conservative.

Therefore ways must be found to move more of the surplus oil revenue into long-term lending or grants to the poorer countries. The United States proposes that the Development Committee created at the recent session of the Governors of the World Bank and International Monetary Fund be charged with the urgent study of whether existing sources of financing are sufficient to meet the expected import requirements of developing countries. If these sources are not sufficient, new means must be found to supplement them. This must become one of the priority objectives of the countries and institutions that have the major influence in the international monetary system.

Enhancing Food Quality

Supplies alone do not guarantee man's nutritional requirements. Even in developed countries with ample supplies, serious health problems are caused by the wrong kinds and amounts of food. In developing countries, the problem is magnified. Not only inadequate distribution but also the rising cost of food dooms the poorest and most vulnerable groups—children and mothers—to inferior quality as well as insufficient quantity of food. Even with massive gains in food production, the world could still be haunted by the specter of inadequate nutrition.

First, we must understand the problem better. We know a good deal about the state of global production. But our knowledge of the state of global nutrition is abysmal.

Therefore the United States proposes that a global nutrition surveillance system be established by the World Health Organization (WHO), the Food and Agriculture Organization (FAO), and the United Nations Children's Fund (UNICEF). Particular attention should be devoted to the special needs of mothers and young children and to responding quickly to local emergencies affecting these particularly vulnerable groups. Nutrition surveying is a field with which the United States has considerable experience; we are ready to share our knowledge and techniques.

Second, we need new methods for combating malnutrition. The United States invites the WHO, FAO, and UNICEF to arrange for an internationally coordinated program in applied nutritional research. Such a program should set priorities, identify the best centers for research, and generate the necessary funding. The United States is willing to contribute \$5 million to initiate such a program.

Third, we need to act on problems which are already clear. The United States proposes an immediate campaign against two of the most prevalent and blighting effects of malnutrition: vitamin A blindness and iron-deficiency anemia. The former is responsible for well over half of the millions of cases of blindness in less developed countries; the current food shortages will predictably increase this number. Iron-deficiency anemia is responsible for low productivity in many parts of the world. Just as the world has come close to eradicating smallpox, yellow fever, and polio, it can conquer these diseases. There are available new and relatively inexpensive techniques which could have a substantial impact. The United States is ready to cooperate with developing countries and international donors to carry out the necessary programs. We are prepared to contribute \$10 million to an international effort.

Finally, we need to reflect our concern for food quality in existing programs. This conference should devote special attention to food aid programs explicitly designed to fight malnutrition among the most vulner-

able groups. The United States will increase funding for such programs by at least \$50 million this year.

Insuring Against Food Emergencies

The events of the past few years have brought home the grave vulnerability of mankind to food emergencies caused by crop failures, floods, wars, and other disasters. The world has come to depend on a few exporting countries, and particularly the United States, to maintain the necessary reserves. But reserves no longer exist, despite the fact that the United States has removed virtually all of its restrictions on production and our farmers have made an all-out effort to maximize output. A worldwide reserve of as much as 60 million tons of food above present carryover levels may be needed to assure adequate food security.

It is neither prudent nor practical for one or even a few countries to be the world's sole holder of reserves. Nations with a history of radical fluctuations in import requirements have an obligation, both to their own people and to the world community, to participate in a system which shares that responsibility more widely. And exporting countries can no longer afford to be caught by surprise. They must have advance information to plan production and exports.

We commend FAO Director General [A. H.] Boerma for his initiative in the area of reserves. The United States shares his view that a cooperative multilateral system is essential for greater equity and efficiency. We therefore propose that this conference organize a Reserves Coordinating Group to negotiate a detailed agreement on an international system of nationally held grain reserves at the earliest possible time. It should include all the major exporters as well as those whose import needs are likely to be greatest. This group's work should be carried out in close cooperation with other international efforts to improve the world trading system.

An international reserve system should include the following elements:

—Exchange of information on levels of reserve and working stocks, on crop prospects, and on intentions regarding imports or exports.

—Agreement on the size of global reserves required to protect against famine and price fluctuations.

—Sharing of the responsibility for holding reserves.

—Guidelines on the management of national reserves, defining the conditions for adding to reserves, and for releasing from them.

—Preference for cooperating countries in the distribution of reserves.

—Procedures for adjustment of targets and settlement of disputes and measures for dealing with noncompliance.

The Promise of Our Era

The challenge before this conference is to translate needs into programs and programs into results. We have no time to lose.

I have set forth a five-point platform for joint action:

—To concert the efforts of the major surplus countries to help meet the global demand.

—To expand the capacity of chronic food-deficit developing nations for growth and greater self-sufficiency.

—To transfer resources and food to meet the gaps which remain.

—To improve the quality of food to insure adequate nutrition.

—To safeguard men and nations from sudden emergencies and the vagaries of weather.

I have outlined the contribution that the United States is prepared to make in national or multilateral programs to achieve each of these goals. And I have proposed three new international groups to strengthen national efforts, coordinate them, and give them global focus:

—The Exporters Planning Group.

—The Food Production and Investment Coordinating Group.

—The Reserves Coordinating Group.

A number of suggestions have been made for a central body to fuse our efforts and provide leadership. The United States is openminded about such an institution. We strongly believe, however, that whatever the mechanisms, a unified, concerted, and comprehensive approach is an absolute requirement. The American delegation, headed by our distinguished Secretary of Agriculture, Earl Butz, is prepared to begin urgent discussions to implement our proposals. We welcome the suggestions of other nations gathered here. We will work hard, and we will work cooperatively.

Nothing more overwhelms the human spirit, or mocks our values and our dreams, than the desperate struggle for sustenance. No tragedy is more wounding than the look of despair in the eyes of a starving child.

Once famine was considered part of the normal cycle of man's existence, a local or at worst a national tragedy. Now our consciousness is global. Our achievements, our expectations, and our moral convictions have made this issue into a universal political concern.

The profound promise of our era is that for the first time we may have the technical capacity to free mankind from the scourge of hunger. Therefore, today we must proclaim a bold objective—that within a decade no child will go to bed hungry, that no family will fear for its next day's bread, and that no human being's future and capacities will be stunted by malnutrition.

Our responsibility is clear. Let the nations gathered here resolve to confront the challenge, not each other. Let us agree that the scale and severity of the task require a collaborative effort unprecedented in history. And let us make global cooperation in food a model for our response to other challenges of an interdependent world: energy, inflation, population, protection of the environment.

William Faulkner expressed the confidence that "man will not merely endure: he will prevail." We live today in a world so complex that even only to endure, man must prevail. Global community is no longer a sentimental ideal, but a practical necessity.

National purposes, international realities, and human needs all summon man to a new test of his capacity and his morality.

We cannot turn back or turn away.

"Human reason," Thomas Mann wrote, "needs only to will more strongly than fate and it is fate."

ADDRESS BY SECRETARY OF AGRICULTURE BUTZ

Department of Agriculture press release dated November 6

The number-one responsibility of this conference is to move the world toward a higher level of food production. Its success in guiding and stimulating farmers to grow more food will be the ultimate measure of its achievement—the yardstick by which history will appraise our efforts of the next few years.

There are other subjects to consider, of course. There is the matter of food reserves. There is the question of emergency aid. There is the subject of improved storage, handling, and distribution of food. There is the need for further liberalization of trade in foodstuffs and in goods that are exchanged for foodstuffs. These, however, are issues that arise after food is produced—not before. We are not here to talk about what to do with less food. We are here to talk about what to do with more food.

There is enormous opportunity to produce more. During the two decades of the 1950's and 1960's, grain yields increased 63 percent in developed nations and only 32 percent in developing countries. Yet many of the developing countries have enormous potential, and many are making great progress in improving yields and building the rural institutions necessary for continued advancement.

Many of the answers to world food problems in the future—10 or 20 or 50 years from now—lie in yet-unknown methods that await discovery in laboratory and test plot. Some of the world's most spectacular achievements will come from such research, as they have in the past.

Much, however, remains to be done in

employing the technology we already have. We have at hand tremendous knowledge—of plant and animal breeding and nutrition, disease and pest control, mechanization, farm management, marketing, and other farm sciences. Merely stopping unnecessary waste in harvesting and storage and losses to insects and other pests would buy the world a large amount of time as we seek to increase production.

Finally, as we address ourselves to increasing production, there is the continuing challenge of identifying those factors that cause a farmer to produce. Farm production is not a constant. There is a world of difference in the way farmers utilize their productive ability. There is a difference from country to country, from region to region, from farm to farm, from season to season—the human differential. It is costly to produce food—costly in human effort, in capital investment, and increasingly in the purchase of production inputs. To produce at high cost requires incentive.

In my country, farmers respond to the incentive of profit. The opportunity for farmers to own and operate their own farms is an incentive. The desire for better living, a better home, and education for the children is an incentive. Pride in being a farmer is an incentive. The opportunity to share in the progress of community and nation is an incentive. In modern societies, these incentives are closely related to the ability to earn a fair return from one's investment—a decent reward for one's labor.

I strongly suspect that this is true in other countries as well as my own. I do not pretend to be an expert in the ways of other nations and peoples. But I ask each of you: Is it not true that your farmers respond best when they are rewarded with the means to live better and provide better for their families? Call it profit. Call it by another name. It's still a response to economic rewards.

In our own country, we believe that the opportunity to gain increased returns from the market will result in substantially larger production in the year ahead. The freeing of cropland from our former system of production controls has already had a great im-

pact on our agriculture. As recently as 1972, our farmers were holding out of production, under government programs, about one hectare for every five hectares that were in crops. Government programs have released all of this land, and farmers had returned well over half of this "set-aside" cropland into production by 1974.

We expect much additional land will be planted for harvest in 1975. The incentive is there in the form of market opportunity, the opportunity to profit.

Of course this takes time. At best an increase in production requires months. Often it requires years. Meantime people must eat. In a year like 1974 the subject of food aid becomes very important. This conference will spend a good deal of time on the question of food aid—how best to administer it and where best to assign the responsibility.

The United States welcomes the increased attention that other developed countries are giving to their own national food aid programs. We applaud the food programs of the Food and Agriculture Organization and other U.N. organizations. We support a further broadening of food aid responsibility among nations and international organizations. At the same time, the United States promises to increase its own commitment to international food aid.

Even in this year of short supplies and budget restraints, the United States expects that total programming under its Public Law 480 (Food for Peace) program will exceed the value level of last year. In the current year, we will be shipping more wheat and more rice than last year, but less feed grains and vegetable oils, due to availabilities. The United States has responded to world needs in the past. We are doing so again in the current year. We are trying to be flexible with the program to meet real needs in a time when supplies are tight and costly.

The other subject that has come to the fore, along with food aid, is the question of food reserves. As I have already noted, the best assurance of food security is increased production. We cannot conjure a reserve out of something we don't have. To lock away a part of current short food supplies in order

that the future might be more secure would call for less consumption this year, higher food prices, and more inflation. These are consequences that few nations would wish to entertain at the present time.

Our attitude on food reserves was outlined by President Ford in his speech to the U.N. General Assembly on September 18. He said:

... to insure that the survival of millions of our fellow men does not depend upon the vagaries of weather, the United States is prepared to join in a worldwide effort to negotiate, establish, and maintain an international system of food reserves. This system will work best if each nation is made responsible for managing the reserves that it will have available.

Thus we favor an internationally coordinated but nationally held system of reserves. We will cooperate in reasonable international efforts to sustain food reserves to meet emergencies. We do not favor food reserves of a magnitude that would perpetually depress prices, destroy farmer incentives, mask the deficiencies in national production efforts, or substitute government subsidies for commercial trade.

If a reserve system is to succeed, it requires a free exchange of adequate production, stocks, and trade information. In fact, such an exchange is essential to the whole objective of improved food security in the world. If grain-producing nations are to succeed in meeting world needs for both trade and aid, they must have adequate information on those needs. Importing nations must share information on food stocks and needs. Exporting nations must share information on production and supplies.

We must improve our methods of forecasting world crop yields, measuring global harvests, and monitoring national food needs and utilization. The United States stands ready to make such information readily available and to share freely the techniques of information gathering and forecasting.

The exchange of technology—really the sharing of people, their skills, and ideas—contributes enormously to world understanding as well as material betterment. The 400 U.S. agriculturalists assigned annually to

other countries, the 1,200 farm scientists who come to my country, the thousands of foreign students in U.S. colleges—these represent an incalculable contribution to the American experience. At Purdue University, where I was associated for so many years, we have had 100 to 120 foreign students in agricultural college at any given time. Today, wherever I travel in the world I meet former Purdue students at work in their own countries. To an educator, nothing could be more satisfying.

In closing, may I emphasize that the objectives of this great conference will require sustained effort—through years of plenty as well as in years of tight supply. Historically the concern over hunger has tended to wane and wax with the rise and fall in world production. The subject is too serious for that; it deserves continued high-level effort on all fronts, and I hope that this conference will be the beginning of such a sustained drive.

This conference must be remembered as a new dawn of hope and opportunity in man's age-old struggle against hunger and malnutrition.

TEXTS OF RESOLUTIONS ²

Resolution I

Objectives and strategies of food production

The World Food Conference,

Recalling General Assembly resolution 3201 (S-VI) and 3202 (S-VI) of 1 May 1974, concerning the Declaration and the Programme of Action on the Establishment of a New International Economic Order and the subsequent ECOSOC resolution 1911 (LVII) on its implementation, as adopted.

Recalling General Assembly Resolution 3180 (XXVIII) of 17 December 1973 on the World Food Conference,

Recognizing that past trends in food production and productivity in the majority of developing countries have been unsatisfactory, for reasons, among others, of inadequate socio-economic structures, insufficient investment funds, paucity of trained manpower, and unfavourable trade relations,

Noting that if these trends were to continue the

² Adopted by the conference without vote on Nov. 16 (texts from U.N. doc. E/5587, report of the World Food Conference (provisional)).

expected increase in the demand for food in these countries will raise their import requirements to unmanageable proportions, aggravate malnutrition and intensify human suffering,

Expressing concern at the inadequate performance of agriculture, including livestock and fisheries, in many developing countries in relation to the targets of the Second United Nations Development Decade and their own national objectives, at the new constraints created by the scarcity of inputs and at the inadequacy of the present level of resources including development assistance flowing to agriculture in these countries,

Considering that agricultural production in the developing countries requires the availability of inputs at reasonable prices,

Stressing that an increase in agricultural productivity and sustained expansion of food production in these countries at a rate much faster than in the past is essential in order to meet the rapidly growing demand for food, due to rising population and incomes, the requirements for security stocks and the need to raise the consumption by undernourished people to universally accepted standards,

Recognizing the importance of fish products for the improvement of quality of human diet and the potential for increased fish production especially in developing countries,

Recognizing that in many developing countries there is considerable scope for increased production through bringing new land under cultivation or through more intensive use of land already under cultivation,

Recognizing that in many developing countries large quantities of food are lost between the farm field and the consumer and that the deterioration in the nutritional value of food before it reaches the consumer is a serious problem,

Considering that conditions in certain developed countries are favourable for the rapid increase of food production and recognizing that some countries can produce more food than they need and thus are able to export; that reliance on this production to supply the growing needs of the developing countries and some developed countries is increasing; that for years these exporting countries have been concerned that production at full capacity could create undesirable surpluses and thus depressed markets, which would deprive farmers of incentives to invest and to produce, and that in view of the present and prospective demand for food in the world, such a concern may no longer be relevant,

Stressing the urgent need for greater efforts by the developing countries themselves and for increased regional, sub-regional and international co-operation for agricultural³ development in these

countries, as part of the International Development Strategy for the Second United Nations Development Decade,

Stressing the importance, in selecting the measures to be taken to achieve the urgently needed increases in food output, of taking into account the need for the most efficient use of land and water resources, the short and long-term effects of alternative technologies on the quality of the environment,

Affirming that in order to solve the food problem, highest priority should be given to policies and programmes for increasing food production and improving food utilization in developing countries, so as to achieve a minimum agricultural growth rate of 4 per cent per annum, placing appropriate emphasis on (i) providing adequate supplies of essential inputs, such as fertilizers, pesticides, quality seeds, farm and fishery equipment and machinery, fuel, breeding stock and water; (ii) ensuring sufficient incentives to farmers; (iii) developing rural infrastructures, including storage, processing, transportation, marketing, input supply systems, credit and educational and social amenities; (iv) conservation and improvement of existing cultivated and cultivable land; (v) reclamation and development of new land; (vi) promoting research training and extension; (vii) progressive social and structural transformation of agriculture; (viii) active participation of the rural population, particularly small farmers and landless workers in the development process, and (ix) providing the necessary financial resources,

1. *Resolves* that all governments should accept the removal of the scourge of hunger and malnutrition, which at present afflicts many millions of human beings, as the objective of the international community as a whole, and accept the goal that within a decade no child will go to bed hungry, that no family will fear for its next day's bread, and that no human being's future and capacities will be stunted by malnutrition,

2. *Calls on* the government of each developing country to:

(i) accord a *high* priority to agricultural and fisheries development;

(ii) formulate food production and food utilization objectives, targets and policies, for the short, medium and long-term, with full participation of producers, their families, and farmers' and fishermen's organizations, taking into account its demographic and general development goals and consistent with good environment practices;

(iii) take measures for agrarian reform and a progressive change in the socio-economic structures and relationships in rural areas; and

(iv) develop adequate supporting services for agricultural and fisheries development, including those for education, research, extension and training, marketing, storage and processing, transport, as well as

³ Including livestock and fisheries. [Footnote in original.]

credit facilities and incentives to enable producers to buy the required inputs;

3. *Calls on all governments* able to furnish external assistance to substantially increase their official development assistance to agriculture in developing countries, especially the least developed and the most seriously affected countries, including capital assistance on soft terms, technical assistance, transfer of appropriate technology and programme loans for imports of essential inputs;

4. *Requests governments* to make arrangements whereby developing countries will have access to inputs such as fertilizer, pesticides, agricultural machinery and equipment in sufficient quantity and at reasonable prices;

5. *Urges governments* to respond to the appeal of the Secretary-General of the United Nations for contributions to the Special Programme, the urgent implementation of which is essential for ensuring progress in resolving the food problem of the developing countries seriously affected by the economic crisis, and to contribute generously to the International Fund for Agricultural Development proposed by the Conference;

6. *Urges* the developed countries concerned to adopt and to implement agricultural policies which encourage the early expansion of food production while taking into account a satisfactory level of income for producers and world food requirements and the need of maintaining reasonable prices for consumers, such policies should not impede or delay the increase in food production by developing countries, both for domestic consumption and for export;

7. *Requests* all countries to reduce to a minimum the waste of food and of agricultural resources, in particular land, water and all forms of energy; and to ensure the rational utilization of fisheries resources;

8. *Calls on* the regional economic commissions to continue their important contribution to the task of stimulating co-ordinated economic development in their respective regions, by co-operating in the efforts in this direction that the countries in those regions are making;

9. *Urges* FAO [Food and Agriculture Organization] in consultation with UNDP [United Nations Development Program] and other relevant international institutions, with due regard for national sovereignty:

(a) to formulate economic, social, physical and biological criteria for selecting suitable additional areas for food production,

(b) to make an inventory, on the basis of these criteria, of the areas most suitable for additional production,

(c) to make an inventory of resources available for financing additional production, and

(d) to indicate ways and means for carrying out programmes and projects for additional food production;

10. *Requests* the World Bank, Regional Banks, UNDP, FAO, UNIDO [United Nations Industrial Development Organization] and other international agencies, through modification of their existing policies and criteria as appropriate, to substantially increase their assistance for agriculture and fisheries in developing countries giving priority to programmes and projects aimed at benefiting the poorest groups of the population and placing equal emphasis on both economic and social benefits; simplify and streamline the procedures for the granting of such assistance; and mobilize the support of the entire international community including non-governmental organizations, for the urgent task of overcoming hunger and malnutrition.

Resolution XVII

International Undertaking on World Food Security

The World Food Conference,

Stressing the urgent need for ensuring the availability at all times of adequate world supplies of basic food-stuffs particularly so as to avoid acute food shortages in the event of widespread crop failure, natural or other disasters, to sustain a steady expansion of food consumption in countries with low levels of per capita intake, and offset fluctuations in production and prices,

Recognizing that very low levels of world food stocks, primarily cereals, pose a serious threat to consumption levels and make the world too dependent on the vagaries of weather,

Welcoming the progress already made through FAO [Food and Agriculture Organization] towards developing a common approach for attaining the objectives of world food security, and noting that all major food producing and consuming countries support these objectives,

Reaffirming the common responsibility of the entire international community in evolving policies and arrangements designed to ensure world food security, and in particular in maintaining adequate national or regional stocks as envisaged in the proposed International Undertaking on World Food Security,

Recognizing that universal participation of all producing and consuming countries is essential for the achievement of the global objectives of world food security, and stressing the importance of adherence to the objectives, policies and guidelines of the proposed International Undertaking by all Governments, taking account of its voluntary nature and the sovereign rights of nations,

Recognizing the difficulties currently faced especially by the developing countries in building up

stocks through lack of adequate domestic supplies in excess of current consumption needs, the present high prices of foodgrains in world markets and the constraints imposed by serious balance of payments difficulties, which require an immediate increase in the food production of the developed countries while the developing countries are simultaneously assisted to increase their food production and build up their own stocks,

1. *Endorses* the objectives, policies and guidelines as set out in the text of the proposed International Undertaking on World Food Security,⁴ *invites* all Governments to express their readiness to adopt them and *urges* all Governments to co-operate in bringing into operation the proposed International Undertaking as soon as possible;

2. *Calls for* the early completion by the FAO bodies of the operational and other practical arrangements required for the implementation of the proposed International Undertaking, including the examination of practical economic and administrative problems involved;

3. *Invites* Governments of all major food, primarily cereals, producing, consuming and trading countries to enter as soon as possible into discussion in appropriate international fora, with a view to accelerating the implementation of the principles contained in the proposed International Undertaking on World Food Security, and also with a view to studying the feasibility of establishing grain reserves to be located at strategic points;

4. *Urges* Governments and the concerned international and regional organizations to provide the necessary technical, financial and food assistance in the form of grants or on specially favourable terms to develop and implement appropriate national food stocks policies in developing countries, including the extension of storage and transport facilities, within the priorities of their national development programme, so that they are in a position to participate effectively in a world food security policy.

Resolution XVIII

An improved policy for food aid

The World Food Conference,

Recognizing that, while the ultimate solution to the problem of food shortages in developing countries lies in increased production in these countries, during the interim period food aid on grant basis and any additional food transfers on concessional or agreed-upon terms to developing countries will continue to be needed, primarily for meeting emergency and nutritional needs, as well as for stimulating rural employment through development projects,

Stressing the importance of evolving a longer-term

food aid policy to ensure a reasonable degree of continuity in physical supplies,

Noting that contrary to earlier expectations, the year 1974 has failed to bring the good harvest needed for the replenishment of stocks and re-establishment of a reasonable degree of security in world food supplies, and expressing concern that most developing countries will not be able to finance their increased food import bills in the immediate period ahead,

Stressing that food aid should be provided in forms consonant with the sovereign rights of nations, neither interfering with the development objectives of recipient countries nor imposing the political objectives of donor countries upon them,

Emphasizing further the paramount importance of ensuring that food aid is provided in forms which are voluntary in nature and are consistent with the agricultural development plans of recipient countries with the ultimate aim of promoting their long-term development efforts and ensuring that it does not act as a disincentive to local production and cause adverse repercussions on the domestic market or international trade, in particular of developing countries,

Taking note with interest of the work of the General Assembly at its twenty-ninth session on the subject of strengthening the Office of the United Nations Disaster Relief Co-ordinator, in particular in relation to disaster preparedness and pre-disaster planning,

Recognizing the need to increase the resources of the World Food Programme, so as to enable it to play a greater and more effective role in rendering development assistance to developing countries in promoting food security and in emergency operations, and also recognizing the need to increase the resources of UNICEF [United Nations Children's Fund], to enable it to play a greater role in meeting the food needs of children in emergency operations,

1. *Affirms* the need for continuity of a minimum level of food aid in physical terms, in order to insulate food aid programmes from the effects of excessive fluctuations in production and prices;

2. *Recommends* that all donor countries accept and implement the concept of forward planning of food aid, make all efforts to provide commodities and/or financial assistance that will ensure in physical terms at least 10 million tons of grains as food aid a year, starting from 1975, and also to provide adequate quantities of other food commodities;

3. *Requests* that interested cereals-exporting and importing countries as well as current and potential financial contributors meet as soon as possible to take cognizance of the needs and to consider ways and means to increase food availability and financing facilities during 1975 and 1976 for the affected developing countries and, in particular, for those most seriously affected by the current food problem;

4. *Urges* all donor countries to (a) channel a

⁴U.N. doc. E/CONF.65/4, chapter 14, annex A. [Footnote in original.]

more significant proportion of food aid through the World Food Programme, (b) consider increasing progressively the grant component in their bilateral food aid programmes, (c) consider contributing part of any food aid repayments for supplementary nutrition programmes and emergency relief, (d) provide, as appropriate, additional cash resources to food aid programmes for commodity purchases from developing countries to the maximum extent possible;

5. *Recommends* that the Intergovernmental Committee of the World Food Programme, reconstituted as recommended in Conference resolution XXI [XXII] on arrangements for follow-up action, be entrusted with the task of formulating proposals for more effective co-ordination of multilateral, bilateral and non-governmental food aid programmes and of co-ordinating emergency food aid;

6. *Recommends* that Governments, where possible, earmark stocks or funds for meeting international emergency requirements, as envisaged in the proposed International Undertaking on World Food Security, and *further recommends* that international guidelines for such emergency stocks be developed as a part of the proposed Undertaking to provide for an effective co-ordination of emergency stocks and to ensure that food relief reaches the neediest and most vulnerable groups in developing countries;

7. *Recommends* that a part of the proposed emergency stocks be placed at the disposal of the World Food Programme, on a voluntary basis, in order to increase its capacity to render speedy assistance in emergency situations.

Resolution XXII

Arrangements for follow-up action, including appropriate operational machinery on recommendations or resolutions of the Conference

The World Food Conference,

Recognizing that an assurance of adequate world food supplies is a matter of life and death for millions of human beings,

Appreciating the complex nature of the world food problem, which can only be solved through an integrated multi-disciplinary approach within the framework of economic and social development as a whole,

Considering that collective world food security within the framework of a world food policy should be promoted and its concept further defined and elaborated, so that it should foster the acceleration of the process of rural development in developing countries as well as ensure the improvement of international co-operation,

Appreciating the need to co-ordinate and strengthen the work of the international agencies concerned, and to ensure that their operational ac-

tivities are co-ordinated in an effective and integrated world food policy,

Recognizing in particular the need for improved institutional arrangements to increase world food production, to safeguard world food security, to improve world food trade, and to ensure that timely action is taken to meet the threat of acute food shortages or famines in the different developing regions,

1. *Calls upon* the General Assembly to establish a World Food Council, at the ministerial or plenipotentiary level, to function as an organ of the United Nations reporting to the General Assembly through the Economic and Social Council, to serve as a co-ordinating mechanism to provide over-all, integrated and continuing attention for the successful co-ordination and follow-up of policies concerning food production, nutrition, food security, food trade and food aid, as well as other related matters, by all the agencies of the United Nations system;

2. *Takes note* of the fact that interagency meetings between the Secretary-General of the United Nations and the heads of the specialized agencies provide an opportunity for considering necessary constitutional amendments to improve the functioning of the United Nations system;

3. *Requests* that the present resolution be taken into account in such consultations with a view to facilitating its early implementation;

4. *Recommends* that:

(a) The World Food Council should consist of _____ members, nominated by the Economic and Social Council and elected by the General Assembly, taking into consideration balanced geographical representation. The Council should invite the heads of United Nations agencies concerned to attend its sessions;

(b) The Council should elect its President on the basis of geographical rotation and approve its rules of procedure. It should be serviced within the framework of FAO [Food and Agriculture Organization], with headquarters at Rome;

(c) The Council should review periodically major problems and policy issues affecting the world food situation, and the steps being proposed or taken to resolve them by Governments, by the United Nations system and its regional organizations, and should further recommend remedial action as appropriate. The scope of the Council's review should extend to all aspects of world food problems in order to adopt an integrated approach towards their solution;

(d) The Council should establish its own programme of action for co-ordination of relevant United Nations bodies and agencies. While doing so, it should give special attention to the problems of the least developed countries and the countries most seriously affected;

(e) The Council should maintain contacts with,

receive reports from, give advice to, and make recommendations to United Nations bodies and agencies with regard to the formulation and follow-up of world food policies;

(f) The Council should work in full co-operation with regional bodies to formulate and follow-up policies approved by the Council. Committees to be established by these regional bodies should be serviced by existing United Nations or FAO bodies in the region concerned;

5. *Recommends* further that the FAO establish a Committee on World Food Security as a standing committee of the FAO Council. The Committee should submit periodic and special reports to the World Food Council. The functions of the Committee on World Food Security should include the following:

(a) to keep the current and prospective demand, supply and stock position for basic food-stuffs under continuous review, in the context of world food security, and to disseminate timely information on developments;

(b) to make periodic evaluations of the adequacy of current and prospective stock levels, in aggregate, in exporting and importing countries, in order to assure a regular flow of supplies of basic food-stuffs to meet requirements in domestic and world markets, including food aid requirements, in time of short crops and serious crop failure;

(c) to review the steps taken by Governments to implement the proposed International Undertaking on World Food Security;

(d) to recommend such short-term and long-term policy action as may be considered necessary to remedy any difficulty foreseen in assuring adequate cereal supplies for minimum world food security;

6. *Recommends* further that the Intergovernmental Committee of the World Food Programme be reconstituted so as to enable it to help evolve and co-ordinate short-term and longer-term food aid policies recommended by the Conference, in addition to discharging its existing functions. The reconstituted Committee should be called, and function as, the Committee on Food Aid Policies and Programmes. The Committee should submit periodical and special reports to the World Food Council. The functions of the Committee on Food Aid Policies and Programmes should include the following:

(a) to provide a forum for intergovernmental consultations on national and international food aid programmes and policies, with particular reference to possibilities of securing improved co-ordination between bilateral and multilateral food aid;

(b) to review periodically general trends in food aid requirements and food aid availabilities;

(c) to recommend to Governments, through the World Food Council, improvements in food aid poli-

cies and programmes on such matters as programme priorities, composition of food aid commodities and other related subjects;

7. *Recommends* further that the Governing Board of the proposed International Fund for Agricultural Development should submit information periodically to the World Food Council on the programmes approved by the Board. The Board should take into consideration the advice and recommendations of the Council;

8. *Recommends* that the World Food Council should receive periodic reports from UNCTAD [United Nations Conference on Trade and Development], through the Economic and Social Council, on the world food trade situation, as well as on the effective progress to increase trade liberalization and access to international markets for food products exported by developing countries. UNCTAD should take into consideration the advice and recommendations of the Council on these matters. The Council should also seek to arrange for the receipt of relevant information from the GATT [General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade]. In its recommendation on food trade matters, the Council should pay particular attention to the resolutions and recommendations of the Conference;

9. *Requests* the FAO to initiate urgent steps, through its Commission on Fertilizers, for following up on Conference resolution [III] on Fertilizers, and to take appropriate initiatives with respect to fertilizers, pesticides, fungicides and herbicides, working in close co-operation with UNIDO and IBRD [United Nations Industrial Development Organization; International Bank for Reconstruction and Development], and other agencies. The FAO Commission on Fertilizers should submit periodic reports to the World Food Council, and should be guided by the advice and recommendations of the Council;

10. *Requests* FAO to examine its ability to follow up on Conference resolution XVI on the Global Information System and Early-Warning System in Food and Agriculture, with a view to recommending to the FAO Council, at its sixty-fifth session in 1975, any new arrangements which may be necessary with respect to its activities in this field, and to initiate whatever other arrangements may be necessary to facilitate global coverage as called for by the above-mentioned resolution, drawing upon the help in this regard of ECOSOC, if necessary, as well as that of the International Wheat Council and other organizations. Periodic reports on progress should be submitted to the World Food Council;

11. *Requests* the Economic and Social Council to consider on an urgent basis, and make recommendations whether or not rearrangements in the United Nations system or new institutional bodies may be justified in order to ensure effective follow-up on Conference resolution V on nutrition, examining nu-

tritional activities within bodies such as the United Nations, the specialized agencies, in particular FAO and WHO [World Health Organization], UNICEF [United Nations Children's Fund], and the World Food Programme, and also giving appropriate attention to nutritional programmes being conducted on a bilateral basis;

12. *Requests* the Consultative Group on International Agricultural Research (CGIAR) and the Technical Advisory Committee to assume leadership in following up on the research aspect of Conference resolution IV on research;

13. *Requests* FAO, IBRD, UNDP [United Nations Development Program] and other relevant international organizations and interested Governments to investigate the desirability of introducing an organizational approach, along the lines of the Consultative Group-Technical Advisory Committee for Agricultural Research, for other sectors such as extension, agricultural credit and rural development;

14. *Requests* the IBRD, FAO and UNDP to organize a Consultative Group on Food Production and Investment in Developing Countries (CGFPI), to be composed of bilateral and multilateral donors and representatives of developing countries, chosen as in the case of the CGIAR, to be staffed jointly by the IBRD, FAO and UNDP, and *invites* this Consultative Group to keep the World Food Council informed of its activities to increase, co-ordinate, and improve the efficiency of financial and technical assistance to agricultural production in developing countries;

15. *Recommends* that the main functions of the CGFPI should be (a) to encourage a larger flow of external resources for food production, (b) to improve the co-ordination of activities of different multilateral and bilateral donors providing financial and technical assistance for food production and (c) to ensure a more effective use of available resources;

16. Anticipating the possibility that such measures as may be agreed to provide financial assistance to developing countries for procurement of food and necessary food production inputs, particularly fertilizers and pesticides, and for investment in food production and distribution systems, may not fulfil all needs, *requests* the Development Committee established by the IBRD and IMF [International Monetary Fund] to keep under constant review the adequacy of the external resources available for these purposes, especially to the less advantaged countries, and to consider in association with the CGFPI new measures which may be necessary to achieve the required volume of resources transfers.

U.S.-Yugoslav Scientific Cooperation Board Meets at Washington

*Joint Statement*¹

The U.S.-Yugoslav Joint Board on Scientific and Technological Cooperation met at Washington, D.C. November 19–21, 1974.

The Board reviewed a number of projects in a wide range of fields and approved a number of them for financing from the U.S.-Yugoslav Joint Fund established in accordance with the Agreement between the United States and Yugoslav Governments on May 18, 1973.

The Board noted that the U.S.-Yugoslav Scientific and Technological Research Program has made a tangible contribution in a number of fields and stressed the importance that new sources of funding be developed. The Board noted with pleasure the intention of a number of United States Government agencies to make additional funds available for the program.

The United States was represented by Dr. Oswald H. Ganley, Director, Office of Soviet and Eastern European Scientific and Technological Programs, Bureau of Oceans and International Environmental and Scientific Affairs, Department of State, and Chairman of the Board; and Mr. William H. Mills, Scientific Attache, American Embassy, Belgrade. Yugoslavia was represented by Dr. Edo Pirkmajer, Secretary General of the Scientific Unions of Slovenia and a Member of the Federal Coordinating Committee for Science and Technology; and Mr. Milos Rajacic, Scientific Counselor, Embassy of the Socialist Federal Republic of Yugoslavia.

The Board agreed that its next meeting would take place in Yugoslavia in the Spring of 1975.

¹ Issued at Washington Nov. 22 (press release 510 dated Nov. 22).

Southern Africa Five Years After the Lusaka Manifesto

Address by Donald B. Easum

*Assistant Secretary for African Affairs*¹

As you well know, black American interest in and concern for Africa are not of recent vintage. This interest and concern span many years. They can be found in the various, often philosophical, "Back to Africa" themes that date to the 18th century.

One of the first black American scholars to focus on Africa was the late Dr. W. E. B. Dubois. He gave expression to many of his views while serving as editor of the *Crisis*, the organ of the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People. In 1916, for example, Dr. Dubois proposed to the NAACP board that an *Encyclopedia Africana* be published in 1919 to mark the 300th anniversary of the permanent landing of black slaves at Jamestown, Virginia. Dr. Dubois suggested in 1917 that the association take steps at the Versailles Peace Conference to secure recognition of the rights of Africans.

The NAACP was in the vanguard of organized efforts to help the African peoples. The organization supported the various Pan-African Congresses organized by Dr. Dubois. A manifesto issued at the second such Congress, held in London in 1921, contained these words:

This is a world of men, of men whose likenesses far outweigh their differences, who mutually need each other in labor and thought and dream, but who can successfully have each other only on terms of equality, justice and mutual respect.

The decades since World War II have witnessed a dramatic flowering of these concepts

of equality and justice. For black Americans, this period saw important advances in making a reality for all Americans of the statements and goals of our Declaration of Independence and our Constitution. For Africans, this was a period of great transition as colonialism gave way to independent nationhood in most of the vast African continent.

The period of the sixties saw a remarkable growth and strengthening of programs of black studies and African studies on American campuses. These programs have served to broaden both the base and the scope of black American interest in Africa, as well as to substantially inform the American white community regarding the black experience in both the Old and the New Worlds. This rising awareness of the black experience has brought a greater knowledge of and interest in the issues of racial equality and decolonization in Africa.

It has been in the southern tier of Africa that Dubois' prescription of "equality, justice and mutual respect" was least observed. This is where—in Mozambique and Angola—14 million blacks were ruled by 600,000 whites and the basic decisions concerning peoples' lives were being made thousands of miles away in Lisbon. This is where—in Rhodesia—a white minority regime representing 250,000 whites refused to provide more than 5 million blacks with adequate human and civil rights in the society. This is where—in South West Africa, or Namibia, as it is properly called—South Africa defied U.N. demands to permit self-determination for a territory in which blacks constitute 88 percent of a total population of some 750,000.

¹ Made before a symposium on black America and Africa at the Patterson School of Diplomacy and International Commerce, University of Kentucky, Lexington, Ky., on Nov. 26.

And this is where—in South Africa—21 million non-whites (18 million blacks, 2.5 million coloreds, 700,000 Indians) are relegated to the separate and unequal status of apartheid by the decisions of a government representing 4 million whites.

At a meeting in Lusaka in April 1969 the leaders of 13 independent east and central African states issued a statement of their position on this state of affairs. The countries were Burundi, the Central African Republic, Chad, Congo, Ethiopia, Kenya, Rwanda, Somalia, Sudan, Tanzania, Uganda, Zaïre, and Zambia. Their unanimous affirmation of certain principles was to be called the Lusaka Manifesto on Southern Africa. In this manifesto the 13 countries declared:

... the principle of human equality, and all that flows from it, is either universal or it does not exist. The dignity of all men is destroyed when the manhood of any human being is denied.

Before addressing themselves to the particular condition of equality and freedom in the Portuguese African territories, Rhodesia, South West Africa, and the Republic of South Africa, the signers of the manifesto had this to say concerning their commitment to these principles:

By this Manifesto we wish to make clear, beyond all shadow of doubt, our acceptance of the belief that all men are equal, and have equal rights to human dignity and respect, regardless of colour, race, religion, or sex. We believe that all men have the right and the duty to participate, as equal members of the society, in their own government. We do not accept that any individual or group has any right to govern any other group of sane adults, without their consent, and we affirm that only the people of a society, acting together as equals, can determine what is, for them, a good society and a good social, economic, or political organisation.

... We recognise that at any one time there will be, within every society, failures in the implementation of these ideals. We recognise that for the sake of order in human affairs, there may be transitional arrangements while a transformation from group inequalities to individual equality is being effected. But we affirm that without an acceptance of these ideals—without a commitment to these principles of human equality and self-determination—there can be no basis for peace and justice in the world.

None of us would claim that within our own States we have achieved that perfect social, economic and political organisation which would ensure a reason-

able standard of living for all our people and establish individual security against avoidable hardship or miscarriage of justice. On the contrary, we acknowledge that within our own States the struggle towards human brotherhood and unchallenged human dignity is only beginning. It is on the basis of our commitment to human equality and human dignity, not on the basis of achieved perfection, that we take our stand of hostility towards the colonialism and racial discrimination which is being practised in Southern Africa. It is on the basis of their commitment to these universal principles that we appeal to other members of the human race for support.

If the commitment to these principles existed among the States holding power in Southern Africa, any disagreements we might have about the rate of implementation, or about isolated acts of policy, would be matters affecting only our individual relationships with the States concerned. If these commitments existed, our States would not be justified in the expressed and active hostility towards the regimes of Southern Africa such as we have proclaimed and continue to propagate.

The truth is, however, that in Mozambique, Angola, Rhodesia, South-West Africa, and the Republic of South Africa, there is an open and continued denial of the principles of human equality and national self-determination.

It was five years ago that the Lusaka Manifesto was issued. What is the situation today?

I have just returned—only two days ago—from a five-week trip to the countries of southern Africa. Three of these countries were signers of the Lusaka Manifesto; three were among its targets.

In Lusaka, I attended Zambia's 10th independence anniversary celebrations as an official guest of President Kaunda. In Zaïre, I visited one of the world's largest hydroelectric power installations, located downstream from Kinshasa in the gorges of the Zaïre River near the sea. In Tanzania, I participated in discussions of U.S. assistance programs in education and transportation. In Malawi, President Banda invited me to attend the opening of his Parliament and tour the new capital city of Lilongwe. In Botswana, I examined one of the world's largest beef slaughterhouses and packing plants. In Lesotho, government officials reviewed with me the status of joint U.S.-World Bank efforts to help combat erosion and solve the rural employment problem. In Swaziland, I discussed Peace Corps assistance in teaching

and health and looked at new possibilities for U.S. private investment.

I spent a week in the Republic of South Africa, visiting Cape Town, Johannesburg, Pretoria, and Durban—including areas where blacks and coloreds are assigned to live in the outskirts of Johannesburg and Cape Town, respectively. And I have just come from Mozambique and Angola, the last two stops on my trip, both of which are moving to full independence from Portugal.

I met with the Presidents or Prime Ministers of every country I visited, but I also talked with traditional chiefs and village mayors, with trade union leaders and churchmen, with students and civil servants, with businessmen and politicians, and with teachers and farmers.

I can report to you that two major issues dominated the thoughts of my hosts. They concerned, first of all, human dignity and racial equality in southern Africa, and, secondly, decolonization and national self-determination. And these same issues were dominant daily themes in the press, the radio, and—where it existed—the television output in these countries during the period of my visits.

It was as if the Lusaka Manifesto had been issued only yesterday, rather than five years ago.

Human Dignity and Racial Equality

Why were human dignity and racial equality of such important concern to the people with whom I met? Let me illustrate why.

In the Republic of South Africa today, the life of every citizen of whatever race or color is controlled by a system—which is also a philosophy—called apartheid or separateness. This apartheid concept is institutionalized and endorsed by an elaborate set of laws, regulations, and practices that imposes separate status on the almost 21 million members of the South African society that the government classifies as non-white. Within what are called their Bantustans or homelands, South African blacks will be able to vote, own property, and move freely from one place to another. They will not have such

rights elsewhere. These homeland areas constitute 13 percent of the national territory. Some 70 percent of the nation's population is being assigned to live in these areas. This is a system legislated by the South African Parliament, where seats are held only by whites. The other racial groups are not represented in this Parliament.

This is what many of the people I met on this trip wanted to talk about. Remember that of the nine countries I visited outside the Republic of South Africa, six border on the Republic or on South West Africa. One of these, Lesotho, is totally surrounded by the Republic of South Africa. Another, Swaziland, is bordered on three sides by South Africa. Hundreds of thousands of workers from these countries are employed in South African mines, farms, and factories, where they learn about and are subject to apartheid.

South Africa's system of separateness restricts both whites and non-whites to designated living areas, strictly circumscribes the rights of blacks to own property or engage in trade, and excludes blacks from entering white urban areas unless they are required to be there to serve white employers. The system excludes blacks from most skilled jobs and does not allow them to join registered trade unions or to bargain collectively.

The South African Government says that these practices are necessary to protect and advance its policy of "separate development." Separate development, as currently defined by South African Government officials, means the creation of a bloc of black states that are to be politically independent and economically interdependent. One of these eight homelands, the Transkei, is scheduled to become at least nominally independent within the next few years.

This vast program requires moving masses of people, both black and white, but primarily black, from the places they now inhabit to new locations. If you are black, you are assigned to the homeland designated for the particular racial group to which you belong—or "tribe," to use the term one encounters in South Africa.

The theory behind the elaborate structure of rules and regulations designed to keep the

racism apart in the Republic of South Africa is that the separation is necessary in order to avoid ethnic frictions and thus preserve harmony and stability in the society. These conditions are believed to be essential for the protection of traditional cultures, including white culture, and for the continuance of the economic growth that is bringing increasing prosperity to both the white and non-white populations.

The Issue of Decolonization

The second major preoccupation of black leaders in the countries I visited was decolonization and national self-determination. This is no new concern. Ever since the full tide of self-determination in the 1960's, which brought many of these countries to full independence, African leaders have worked to bring about the decolonization of these parts of Africa where self-determination was still denied. With regard to the choice they made between force or peaceful means for achieving decolonization, the Lusaka Manifesto was once again instructive. It spoke as follows:

We have always preferred, and we still prefer, to achieve [liberation] without physical violence. We would prefer to negotiate rather than destroy, to talk rather than kill If peaceful progress to emancipation were possible, or if changed circumstances were to make it possible in the future, we would urge our brothers in the resistance movements to use peaceful methods of struggle even at the cost of some compromise on the timing of change. But while peaceful progress is blocked by actions of those at present in power in the States of Southern Africa, we have no choice but to give to the peoples of those territories all the support of which we are capable in their struggle against their oppressors.

Thus it was that the independent countries of black Africa and their Organization of African Unity encouraged and gave support to a variety of liberation movements—sometimes called terrorists, sometimes called freedom fighters, depending on one's point of view—in an effort to bring freedom from continued colonial rule.

But African leaders remained open to the possibility of dialogue and peaceful persua-

sion if circumstances were to permit. And, indeed, following the change of government in Lisbon in April of this year, circumstances did so permit in three of the territories to which the Lusaka Manifesto addressed itself; that is, Portuguese Guinea, Mozambique, and Angola. With the assistance of such countries as Senegal, Algeria, Zaïre, Tanzania, and Zambia—to name only the principal ones—talking replaced fighting.

As a result of negotiations between the new Portuguese Government and the leaders of the PAIGC [African Party for the Independence of Portuguese Guinea and Cape Verde] liberation movement, Portugal recognized the independence of the new Republic of Guinea-Bissau in September. The United States warmly welcomed the Portuguese action.

In Mozambique, where I had conversations with the Portuguese High Commissioner, Admiral Crespo, and with the Prime Minister of the Transitional Government, Joaquim Chissano of the FRELIMO [Liberation Front of Mozambique] liberation movement, independence is scheduled for June of next year. In Angola, where I met with members of the junta, the Portuguese have offered independence to the territory and have begun discussions with the liberation movements on ways to bring it about.

These developments in Portuguese-speaking Africa have been greeted with great enthusiasm and gratification throughout black Africa, where they are viewed as a giant leap forward toward complete decolonization in southern Africa. But those with whom I spoke insisted that the effort could not be slackened so long as self-determination was not yet a fact in Rhodesia and in Namibia. Let's look at those two cases for a moment.

You will recall that the minority white government in Rhodesia unilaterally declared its independence of the United Kingdom in 1965. The United Kingdom has never accepted this action, and the United Nations has imposed economic sanctions against the illegal regime. Negotiations have consistently faltered because of the Rhodesian regime's unwillingness to offer terms acceptable to the black majority and the United Kingdom.

As for Namibia, the United Nations in 1966 terminated South Africa's mandate from the League of Nations to administer this territory. The World Court in 1971 affirmed the validity of the U.N. decision and held that South Africa's continued administration of the territory is illegal. But South Africa has refused to give up its control of the area.

Black African leaders with whom I met, without exception, stressed their conviction that self-determination in Namibia and Rhodesia is now more than ever a pillar of their countries' policies in southern Africa. They see South Africa as holding the key to solutions of both problems. They believe these solutions can and must be achieved by peaceful persuasion and negotiation rather than by force or violence.

They want South Africa to withdraw from Namibia and permit the area to decide its own future. They want South Africa to remove its police forces from Rhodesia and to cease all support of the Smith regime and apply economic sanctions against it as provided for by U.N. decisions. Finally, they want South Africa to abandon its present racial policies and take prompt steps to assure full dignity and equality for all South Africans, of whatever race or color.

U.S. Position on Southern Africa

What is the position of the U.S. Government on these issues?

With regard to Rhodesia, the United States continues to look to the United Kingdom as responsible for achieving a constitutional solution to Rhodesia's illegally declared independence, which is not recognized by any nation. The U.S. Government would welcome a negotiated solution that would be acceptable both to the United Kingdom and to the black majority of the Rhodesian population. We are convinced that a solution to the Rhodesian problem can and must be found through peaceful rather than violent means. We believe the Lusaka Manifesto still speaks to this point.

Economic sanctions voted by the United

Nations are intended to provide Rhodesians with an incentive to reach a peaceful settlement. With the exception of imports of chrome and certain other Rhodesian minerals under the Byrd amendment, the record of U.S. adherence to these sanctions has been good. In December of last year the Senate voted repeal of this amendment. President Ford has expressed his support for repeal, and we are hopeful of a favorable vote soon in the House.

The United States has supported the U.N. call for withdrawal of South African police and armed personnel from Rhodesia. We note with interest Prime Minister Vorster's recent statement that "all who have influence" on the Rhodesian problem "should bring it to bear upon all parties concerned to find a durable, just and honorable solution."

With regard to Namibia, the United States accepts the conclusions of the World Court advisory opinion of 1971 affirming the U.N. decision of 1966, which declared terminated the South African mandate from the League of Nations for South West Africa. This decision obliges all states to avoid acts that would imply recognition of the legitimacy of South Africa's administration of the territory. The U.S. Government carefully avoids any such actions. The U.S. Government discourages U.S. investment in Namibia, has cut off official commercial facilities for trade with Namibia, and has made clear that it will not intervene on behalf of the interests of any American investor who engaged himself in Namibia after October 1966. The United States closely follows developments in the territory and has protested South African violations of the rights and well-being of the inhabitants.

We hope that a formula may soon be found that would provide for prompt and peaceful self-determination by the people of Namibia. We are heartened by recent public indications that the South African Government is willing to accept the principle of self-determination in the territory, with all options open.

I need not remind this audience of the U.S. Government's position concerning South Af-

rica's racial policies. We have many times, in many forums, condemned South Africa's approach to the question of race and color. Apartheid, or enforced separation of the races, is utterly repugnant to us.

South Africa's racial policies continue to inhibit our official relationships with that government. We have since 1962 maintained a strict embargo on the sale or shipment of arms or military equipment of any sort to South Africa. This is despite contrary military supply policies of certain other governments and continuing pressure, for balance of payments and other reasons, for resumption of U.S. sales. We continue to maintain the ban instituted seven years ago on U.S. naval visits to South Africa. We have no intention of embarking on any kind of military or naval collaboration with South Africa.

While we impose these and other constraints on our relationship with South Africa, we maintain lines of communication open to all elements of South Africa's population—non-white as well as white—in our continuing efforts to elicit understanding of our policies and to contribute to a nonviolent resolution of South Africa's racial problems.

We, with Britain and France, recently vetoed the expulsion of South Africa from the United Nations in the belief that South Africa should continue to be exposed, as Ambassador Scali said, "to the blunt expressions of the abhorrence of mankind for apartheid." Furthermore, expulsion was opposed because it would set a precedent which could gravely damage the U.N. structure.

Basic to U.S. policy are efforts to encourage positive change in South Africa. Consequently, the U.S. Government encourages American firms in South Africa to adopt, maintain, or expand enlightened employment practices in their dealings with all their employees.

It is a matter of record that non-white workers in South Africa are not accorded equal treatment with white workers, a condition that has led some American citizens and organizations to demand that American firms, which now total more than 300, withdraw from South Africa.

The U.S. Government does not control decisions by American firms to invest in South Africa. Such decisions rest entirely with the companies and their shareholders. Withdrawing from or remaining in South Africa is an issue to be weighed by the companies and shareholders concerned. The U.S. Government has no legal authority to take action in either direction.

Many South Africans of all racial groups have made it clear that they want American firms to remain and to take the lead in raising the level and quality of employment and in increasing educational and training opportunities for non-white employees.

The U.S. Government shares this view. About two years ago, the Bureau of African Affairs sent to American firms doing business in South Africa a message which discussed employment practice goals that would improve the working conditions of their non-white employees in South Africa. This message suggested mechanisms that could be used or were being used by American companies to achieve these goals.

The industrial relations picture in South Africa is undergoing change. We have recently asked American companies in South Africa to give increased attention to improving their channels of communication with their employees of all races, including being prepared to engage in collective bargaining with representatives of unregistered black trade unions. Our request stresses the desirability of discussions and negotiations with legitimate representatives of black workers. It was read by a U.S. official at the annual meeting two months ago of the Trade Union Council of South Africa. It has been well received. The Johannesburg Star called this development "a commendable step" and the Rand Daily Mail observed that "once again the stimulus to change in South Africa's labor field is coming from abroad."

All this supports our belief that American trade and investment can be useful in improving the lot of non-white South Africans.

We welcome recent statements by Prime Minister Vorster concerning South Africa's desire to work for peace and stability in

southern Africa. We welcome the words of the South African Permanent Representative, Ambassador Botha, at the United Nations when he stated:

Let me put it very clearly: The whites of South Africa as well as the Government of South Africa are as much concerned about the implementation of human rights, human freedoms, human dignity and justice as any other nation or government of the world.

We and all the world await news of the implementation of these declarations.

The talk of change in South Africa was being heard on all sides during my recent visit there. Many South Africans cited a variety of changes that they said had already taken place over the past few years. Many of these changes had to do with what South Africans themselves call "petty apartheid," such as separate beaches, park benches, buses, and elevators for different racial groups. Some people argued that these changes in fact presage the eventual end of the apartheid structure. But how far away is this eventuality?

Whatever the answer to that question, there is an air of expectancy in southern Africa today. Black African leaders in the Republic and outside are watching carefully for actions by the South African Government that will match words.

Just a week ago the President of Botswana, Sir Seretse Khama, made the following statement before the opening of his Parliament (I remind you that Botswana is a country whose southern border joins South Africa across a distance of more than 800 miles):

We have always made clear that before there can be any prospect of a peaceful solution to the problems of this region of Africa, the governments of the white-ruled states of the region should first demonstrate positively a willingness to change their racial policies. Without such a commitment to change, violence will remain the only way to bring about change in white-ruled Southern Africa. This is the message which we put out to the world in the Lusaka Manifesto.

Now, at last, there are indications that the South African Government is not only ready to bring about the desired changes in South Africa itself, but is prepared to use its influence to bring about similar

changes in Rhodesia. This, indeed, as President Kaunda recently observed, is the voice of reason for which we have long been waiting. Given this attitude on the part of Mr. Vorster's government, there is every hope that the problems of Rhodesia, Namibia, and South Africa will be resolved without further bloodshed. This, in turn, will open up unlimited prospects of stability, cooperation, and development in Southern Africa. For these reasons, I welcome the recent indications of possible change in this part of Africa.

The United States has many times both privately and publicly made it clear that it, too, welcomes these indications.

Southern Africa is a region of vast resources, rich and diverse, human and physical. Their alchemy could be uniquely contributive to the growth and prosperity of all of Africa and beyond, provided the warning of 53 years ago by the Second Pan-African Congress is heeded. Let me remind us all of just what that warning was:

This is a world of men, of men whose likenesses far outweigh their differences, who mutually need each other in labor and thought and dream, but who can successfully have each other only on terms of equality, justice and mutual respect.

In closing, I would like for you to journey with me back to the England of 1647, an England that had experienced civil war. In the parish church of St. Mary's in Putney, England, representatives of the army gathered to hold one of the most important political debates of all times. Men of the stature of Oliver Cromwell met to discuss the future of their country, with debate centered mainly on human rights versus property rights.

Cromwell's son-in-law, Henry Ireton, argued persuasively that unless a man owned property he should not have a voice in government. This view was rejected by Col. Thomas Rainborough, who countered with an argument as persuasive and as valid today as then: "I think that the poorest He that is in England hath a life to live as well as the greatest He; and, therefore, truly, sir, I think it clear that every man that is to live under a government ought, first, by his own consent, to put himself under that government."

U.N. Commends Outer Space Registration Convention

Following is a statement made in Committee I (Political and Security) of the U.N. General Assembly by U.S. Representative Thomas H. Kuchel on October 15, together with the texts of resolutions adopted by the committee on October 18 and by the Assembly on November 12.

STATEMENT BY MR. KUCHEL

USUN press release 134 dated October 15

Mr. Chairman [Carlos Ortiz de Rozas, of Argentina]: It is a pleasure and an honor for me to participate in the deliberations of this committee under your distinguished leadership, and I look forward to a constructive and meaningful debate on the peaceful uses of outer space.

I believe it is an auspicious beginning for us to discuss recent developments in the peaceful uses of outer space. This is an area of exciting new promise for us, an area in which we have already shown that the combined intellectual and scientific genius of men can accomplish feats which were not so long ago thought quite impossible. And now it is an area to which we are increasingly looking for help in solving many of the practical daily problems of this planet. This has been an important year both in context of experiments undertaken and in the context of our discussions about how we as an international community might better go about organizing ourselves to develop further the peaceful uses of outer space.

We wish to join with the other members of this committee in appreciation of the work which the Outer Space Committee and its Legal Subcommittee have done in com-

pleting the draft Convention on Registration of Objects Launched into Outer Space. This is the fourth treaty negotiation successfully concluded by the Legal Subcommittee and approved by the full committee in less than a decade. In 1966 the Outer Space Treaty was completed. In 1967 the Astronaut Assistance and Return Agreement was finalized, in 1971 the Outer Space Liability Convention, and now in 1974 the Registration Convention.

My government is pleased to have been a major participant in the negotiation of each of these agreements, and we welcome the completion of the Registration Convention as a useful formalization on a mandatory basis of the voluntary U.N. registration system which has been followed since 1961.

When the voluntary system was first adopted, we and others considered that it could be useful for the international community to have available a central census of objects launched into outer space. Under that voluntary system the United States adopted the practice of reporting on its launchings at approximately two- to three-month intervals; and in order to help keep the central registry current, we have from the very beginning also reported when U.S. space objects have deorbited or when such objects have split into several fragments with different orbits.

Nearly all U.N. member states that have conducted space activities have reported at least on the fact of launchings. Registration statements have been filed by Canada, France, Italy, Japan, the Soviet Union, the United Kingdom, and the United States. Now that we are about to cross the threshold of adopting a mandatory prescribed system, we

hope that participation in this system will become universal.

The U.S. Representative to the Legal Subcommittee session in May gave a detailed statement on our interpretation of the Registration Convention, and so I will not attempt to go through the agreement article by article.¹ Many difficult compromises were reached in the negotiation of this convention, and we believe the agreement which resulted is a reasonable one accommodating diverse interests, which will prove to be a useful addition to the developing body of international law relating to the peaceful exploration and use of outer space.

We are also at an advanced stage of negotiations on a new treaty which will elaborate on the provisions of the 1967 Outer Space Treaty regarding exploration of and activities on the Moon and other celestial bodies. We hope that acceptable solutions will be found to the few remaining issues, particularly that concerning the natural resources of celestial bodies, and that this agreement will soon be successfully completed and approved by the United Nations.

Beyond acknowledging our satisfaction with completion of the Registration Convention, we also look forward to the other future work of the Outer Space Committee, work which is obviously filled with a great deal of challenge as we again address a number of issues of far-reaching significance.

Direct Broadcasting by Satellites

At the request of the General Assembly, the Outer Space Committee, through its Legal Subcommittee, is engaged in a serious effort to draft guiding principles which should be followed in future direct international broadcasting of television signals by satellite. Considerable attention has been focused for several years on the complex questions raised by the possibilities of such broadcasting; and the Working Group on Direct Broadcast Satellites held a number of

constructive sessions addressing technical, economic, political, and legal issues.

Reviewing the situation in light of our previous consideration of direct broadcasting problems, early this year my government concluded that the most productive course for us to follow would be to attempt at this time to reach agreement on the considerable range of issues on which agreement now seems possible and to allow ourselves more time to work out the fundamental differences that continue to exist in some of the other, much more difficult areas.

In March of this year at the fifth session of the Working Group on Direct Broadcast Satellites the United States introduced a set of voluntary principles which we believe represent a realistic area of agreement in line with the views expressed by the members of the Outer Space Committee.² These proposed guidelines include among others that international direct television broadcasting should be conducted in accordance with international law, including in particular the U.N. Charter and the Outer Space Treaty, and in light of the Friendly Relations Declaration and the Universal Declaration of Human Rights. Such broadcasting should be within the technical parameters and procedures of the ITU [International Telecommunication Union] and its radio regulations.

In addition, those draft principles seek to encourage the free and open exchange of information and ideas while respecting the differences among cultures and maximizing the beneficial use of new space communications technologies. We would envisage that the sharing among states of the benefits from direct broadcasting should increasingly include, as practical difficulties are overcome, opportunities for access to the use of this technology for the purpose of sending as well as receiving broadcasts.

We believe that states and international organizations and other appropriate entities should cooperate in strengthening the capability of interested states, in particular the

¹ For a U.S. statement made in the Legal Subcommittee on May 31, see BULLETIN of July 8, 1974, p. 68.

² For a U.S. statement and text of a U.S. working paper, see BULLETIN of Apr. 22, 1974, p. 445.

developing countries, to make use of this technology as it may become available. We believe that such efforts should include increased training in technical and program production fields, with consideration being given to the establishment of regional centers and to the expanded exchange of programs and personnel. In addition, it is our belief that international professional associations such as those in the fields of medicine, agriculture, engineering, education, the arts, and law may have a great contribution to make thorough use of international direct broadcasting in solving social development problems.

In the U.S. draft principles we did not attempt to resolve all outstanding issues relating to future direct television broadcasting. Instead, we attempted to suggest acceptable formulations of principles which we felt could be generally agreed in the near future so that some meaningful progress could be made in developing international standards for conduct in this area.

In consonance with this approach, at least to the extent of deciding on the order of priority in which issues should be addressed, the Legal Subcommittee began last May to draft specific language for principles relating to direct broadcasting. That subcommittee made a beginning in an extremely complex field, and we look forward to a continuation of these thorough and constructive negotiations when that subcommittee meets again this coming February.

The Issue of Prior Consent

The United States did not, either in our own draft principles on direct broadcasting or so far in our debates in the Legal Subcommittee, address what is probably the most controversial and vexatious issue involved: that of prior consent. There were two primary reasons for our position. First, it has become apparent from our discussions in the direct broadcasting working group that there is not anything close to agreement even on the definition of the issue itself. Second, we do not believe that the consider-

able differences which separate members of the Outer Space Committee can readily be closed without a good deal more work.

One of several points which must be seriously considered in the context of a system of prior consent is that such a principle could rule out direct broadcasting for entire regions. Because a satellite beam would usually cover many states, one country's objection to international broadcasts could prohibit many others from receiving such broadcasts, even if they specifically desired to receive them. This is a point which we believe must be seriously considered and a point the implications of which must be addressed by each state in light of its own regional context.

My government, for its part, does not believe that the international community's interests would be well served by establishing a right to prohibit an international direct television broadcast by withholding advance consent, through whatever means, to such broadcasts. Any such broadcasts would need to be conducted with sensitivity to the receiving audiences, but in our view this would be strongly in the interests of potential broadcasters as well as those of the potential listeners, and an appropriate and effective way to insure such sensitivity would be through voluntarily agreed performance standards among broadcasters.

We recognize that there are many legitimate concerns about the possible international impact of direct broadcasting technology, and we believe that these concerns must be addressed in a direct and open manner. However, our strongly held view is that the solution to those concerns lies in the future development and use of this new technology in an effective and constructive way, rather than in the inhibition of what contains at least the potential for great contributions; for example, in the educational and social communications fields. We would all benefit, I believe, from an increased and open exchange of ideas, rather than from less. In this world of rapidly increasing contacts and interaction among states we need to know and understand more about each other,

rather than less; indeed, we can hardly afford not to take whatever steps are possible to clarify and understand our differences as well as our common areas of agreement.

This kind of understanding obviously must involve an exchange of ideas, not simply a one-way conveyance. Thus my government proposed that there should be increased opportunity, as practical difficulties are overcome, for access to the use of this technology for sending as well as for receiving broadcasts. We must obviously be realistic about the practical limitations on initial participation, but at the same time we must keep in focus the necessity for increasing this participation as it becomes possible.

Remote Sensing by Satellite

Another major area to which the Outer Space Committee and its subsidiary bodies have paid considerable attention during this past year is that of remote sensing of the earth and its environment by satellite. The Legal Subcommittee in its 13th session was able for the first time to focus significantly on the legal aspects of such remote sensing. The views of many states, including my own, were expressed in some detail at that meeting, and a number of proposals for international guidelines or instruments were introduced. That subcommittee had the benefit of the extensive and productive discussions in recent meetings of the Working Group on Remote Sensing.

The U.S. remote sensing program has from the very start been based on a system of extensive international cooperation, both in developing the experiments to be used and in interpreting the data which are derived. We have since the beginning of our National Aeronautics and Space Administration's (NASA) program insisted that the data derived from all of these experiments be made available to all interested parties so that the maximum amount of scientific investigation and the maximum range of potential benefits from our space program could be realized. We have participated in complex and fascinating international efforts to learn more about the world in which we live by

utilizing the unique point of view from a platform in outer space. The information derived can be of tremendous value to all of us and to our common welfare. Hence we have established a system in which no one is barred on political or any other grounds from the opportunity to obtain as much of this data about our earth and our environment as anyone else who inhabits this planet.

We believe that our policy of providing open access to the data derived from remote sensing activities is in specific conformity with a major goal of the 1967 Outer Space Treaty; namely, that states should conduct activities in outer space for the benefit and in the interests of all countries, irrespective of their degree of economic or scientific development. In addition, article XI of that treaty calls on states to inform the Secretary General of the nature, conduct, locations, and results of such activities. The Outer Space Treaty was foresighted in covering not only freedom of exploration but also the use of outer space. The primary focus, in fact, was on the possibility that space technology could be used as a new tool to improve certain conditions on earth. Our remote sensing experiments are specifically and directly oriented toward fulfilling that principle by developing our ability to acquire useful and beneficial data about the world in which we live.

Recently, however, some states have questioned whether a system of open data availability should be maintained on the international level. A number of suggestions have been made that data concerning one state should not be made available to another state without the first state's advance permission. In the view of the United States, such a policy would not only fail to protect the states who have expressed such concerns; it would also be likely to exacerbate any imbalance which might exist among different states as they endeavor to interpret and use this data.

It is technologically and economically infeasible to separate the images from these satellites along the lines of political borders; and hence we would here, too, be faced with a situation in which data for a region might

not be available because of the lack of consent from one state in that region. In addition, as our own experience and that of others who have participated in the ERTS [Earth Resources Technology Satellite] experiments have shown, perhaps the greatest advantage which a satellite-borne sensing system gives us is the ability to observe and study the earth on a regional and global basis. It would be most unfortunate for the international community not to be able to benefit from the broader approach.

An open system of data dissemination guarantees that all states can be assured of access to any data that any other state may have obtained from such a program. If a state which conducts remote sensing were unable to share freely the data obtained with all other interested parties, as a practical matter a system of irregular and hence discriminatory data dissemination would be virtually inevitable. Only a launching state might be able to obtain the most important benefits from this unique means of gathering information, and we for one would find this most unnecessary and most regrettable.

The United States has no intention of imposing our data on anyone who does not desire it. But, on the other hand, we do not wish to deny to our own citizens the data derived from a possible future U.S. program. Because of our open political system and because of certain universal aspects of human nature, it seems to us as a practical matter that even with restricted dissemination some states would obtain data while others would not. This would inevitably lead to imbalanced dissemination, whereas at the present time we have attempted to maintain a system in which all countries, rich or poor, would have an equal opportunity for access to such data.

In any case, these and other related questions will be the subject of our continued discussions in the Outer Space Committee and its subsidiary bodies, and we look forward to those further exchanges of views.

The Outer Space Committee has requested that we endorse two recommendations on this particular subject: First, that the Legal Subcommittee should consider the legal im-

plications of remote sensing at its next session, and second, that the Secretary General should undertake studies of the organizational and financial requirements of possible global and regional centers for dissemination of remote sensing data. We support these recommendations and believe that a practical understanding of the organizational and financial aspects of disseminating remote sensing data constitutes an essential basis for fruitful consideration of the legal aspects.

The role of the United Nations itself in the outer space area, in particular the work of the U.N. space applications program, conducted under the leadership of the Expert on Space Applications, was reviewed this past spring by the Scientific and Technical Subcommittee. That subcommittee decided to approve the substance of the program proposed for 1975, with the understanding that the Expert will seek all possible ways to carry it out within the same financial limitations as the 1974 program.

My government believes that, taking into account the serious financial situation facing all U.N. programs and activities, the need is great to focus on ways to increase the effectiveness of the space applications program by channeling its limited resources into activities that will be of the greatest benefit to the most countries, particularly the developing countries. In this connection, we fully share the feeling expressed by the subcommittee at its last session that the whole purpose of the space applications program and its proper and effective coordination should be given in-depth review by the subcommittee in 1975.

Cooperation in Space Programs

Finally, I would like to say a few words about the actual programs which the United States has undertaken this year in the peaceful exploration and use of outer space. International cooperation in space has become a fact of life, and a new fabric of international scientific and technical relationships has emerged, rich in present value and bright with prospects for the future.

I am proud of the part that the United

States has played in developing the scientific and technical means for the exploration and use of outer space. I am even more proud of the efforts we have undertaken to promote bilateral and multilateral cooperation in this field, cooperation which is based on common interests among many nations. We have undertaken that cooperation through a system of free and open associations to which nations contribute according to their interests, skills, and means.

The Skylab program, completed last February, struck the world as a demonstration of what man can do in space, particularly in overcoming adversity. Less dramatic but perhaps even more significant was its demonstration of how manned orbiting laboratories can serve as international research facilities. Four foreign experiments flew on Skylab: Belgian, French, Japanese, and Swiss. In addition, a British scientist acted as a consultant in a NASA welding experiment, and physicians from the Federal Republic of Germany and the United Kingdom joined the Skylab biomedical team to evaluate effects of long-duration space flight on crews. Correlated astronomical sounding rocket programs were conducted with Germany and the United Kingdom, and foreign guest investigators from France, Japan, and the United Kingdom participated in the Skylab solar telescope programs.

One of Skylab's most significant payload components was its Earth Resources Experiment Package (EREP), a complement to ERTS-1, launched in 1972. Using data from both ERTS-1 and EREP, some 140 foreign investigations have involved scientists from 37 countries and two international organizations. In addition, Brazil and Canada have established their own ERTS data acquisition and processing facilities, and plans for similar stations are underway in Europe, Africa, and Asia. Last June, the Government of Italy, acting through the Italian company Telespazio, agreed to build a ground station to receive data from NASA experimental earth resources satellites.

Cooperative satellite launchings, one of the oldest and most productive cooperative activities in space, continued last August with the NASA launching of the Netherlands Astronomy Satellite, an ultraviolet telescope for the study of stars and stellar objects. Earlier in the year, an Italian crew successfully launched from the San Marco platform a NASA Scout rocket to place in equatorial orbit a joint Italian-U.S. satellite which will investigate the upper atmosphere. On this very day, October 15, an Italian crew is scheduled to use a NASA Scout launcher to orbit a United Kingdom satellite which will continue studies of stellar X-ray sources. If this trilateral project is successful, it will bring to 21 the number of satellites launched in NASA cooperative programs.

In addition to cooperative satellite projects, NASA launches on a cost-reimbursable basis satellites which other countries have developed as parts of their national programs. This assistance is provided on a nondiscriminatory basis for projects with peaceful purposes which are consistent with obligations under relevant international arrangements. There have been two such launchings so far this year. In March NASA launched the United Kingdom's X-4 satellite, an experimental satellite dedicated to demonstrating some new approaches to small satellite subsystems. In July NASA launched Aeros-B, a German satellite which will investigate the upper layers of the Earth's atmosphere. In mid-December NASA expects to launch Symphonie, the French-German experimental communications satellite. This will bring the total number of international reimbursable satellite launchings to 10. In addition, NASA has launched 18 communications satellites on behalf of Intelsat.

Last year we reported that after almost four years of negotiations, NASA and the European Space Research Organization (ESRO) had agreed to the development in Europe of a manned orbital laboratory, designated Spacelab. It would be used with the U.S. Space Shuttle in manned missions for

space science in the 1980's. NASA and ESRO have continued and expanded their planning efforts for the use of Spacelab, enlisting representatives of a broad variety of disciplines, including physics and astronomy, life sciences, communications and navigation, earth observations, and materials processing.

A quick look at some of the major events in the years ahead suggests the momentum and continuity of international space cooperation.

Before the next cycle of U.N. Outer Space Committee meetings begins early next year, we will have launched Helios-A, the first of two solar probes developed in cooperation with the Federal Republic of Germany. The spacecraft, developed in our largest cooperative satellite project to date, will carry seven German and three U.S. experiments to within 28 million miles of the sun, closer than any spacecraft has flown before. We expect these experiments to yield data on solar behavior which will help us better understand solar effects on Earth.

Early in 1975 NASA will launch a second Earth Resources Technology Satellite. Essentially the twin of ERTS-1, it will permit investigators throughout the world to continue their experimentation with remotely sensed data. Thirty-six countries and four international organizations have been assured data for their proposed studies.

Next summer will see the start of the Satellite Instructional Television Experiment (SITE), conducted in cooperation between NASA and the Indian Space Research Organization. The satellite, ATS-6, is already in geostationary orbit and is being employed in instructional and medical data transmission experiments to remote areas of the United States. In the coming months the satellite will also be used in educational broadcasts to schools in Brazil. Next summer the satellite will be moved eastward to a station over eastern Africa from where it will be able to relay a television signal to viewers in India. The Indian Government will then use it for about four hours a day

to conduct the SITE experiment.

In this experiment, India is developing its own programs on improved agricultural methods, family planning and hygiene, school instruction and teacher education, and occupational skills. The program will originate from Indian ground stations and will be received by augmented television sets of Indian design and manufacture. The U.S. contribution is to make the satellite available as a relay station for one year. We share the eagerness with which nations throughout the world look forward to the results of their effort to apply space technology to problems of economic and social development.

And last, permit me to mention the Apollo-Soyuz Test Project, the joint U.S.-U.S.S.R. flight to test compatible rendezvous and docking systems for future manned spacecraft. We expect the flight to take place on schedule in July 1975. The necessary compatible hardware is undergoing final testing, and the flight crews and flight controllers of both countries are well into their intensive joint training. A successful mission will contribute to a rescue capability for future manned space flights and broaden opportunities for U.S. and Soviet space cooperation in the years ahead. At this stage, joint manned flight operations of necessity fall to the nations with manned flight programs. We believe, however, that the flight has a broader significance, not simply just for what men may accomplish together in space but for what they may accomplish together on earth.

Cooperation in space is obviously a present reality. This cooperation has yielded practical benefits to both developed and developing countries. Projects now scheduled to fly justify the hope of more gains to come. Let us be alert in maintaining an international environment which encourages nations to work together in their common interest, to the limits of human imagination and skill, to the ends of the universe and beyond.

*International Co-operation in the Peaceful Uses
of Outer Space*

The General Assembly,

Recalling its resolution 3182 (XXVIII) of 18 December 1973,

Having considered the report of the Committee on the Peaceful Uses of Outer Space,⁴

Reaffirming the common interest of mankind in furthering the exploration and use of outer space for peaceful purposes,

Recalling its resolution 1721 B (XVI) of 20 December 1961, in which it expressed the belief that the United Nations should provide a focal point for international co-operation in the peaceful exploration and use of outer space,

Reaffirming further its belief that the benefits deriving from space exploration can be extended to States at all stages of economic and scientific development, if Member States conduct their space programmes with a view to promoting maximum international co-operation, including the widest possible exchange of information in this field, and the expansion of international programmes for the practical applications of space technology to development,

Reaffirming the importance of international co-operation in developing the rule of law in the peaceful exploration and use of outer space,

1. *Endorses* the report of the Committee on the Peaceful Uses of Outer Space;

2. *Invites* States which have not yet become Parties to the Treaty on Principles Governing the Activities of States in the Exploration and Use of Outer Space, including the Moon and Other Celestial Bodies, the Agreement on the Rescue of Astronauts, the Return of Astronauts and the Return of Objects Launched into Outer Space and the Convention on International Liability for Damage Caused by Space Objects to give early consideration to ratifying or acceding to those international agreements, so that they may have the broadest possible effect;

3. *Notes with satisfaction* that the Committee on the Peaceful Uses of Outer Space has completed the text of the draft Convention on Registration of Objects Launched into Outer Space;

4. *Notes with appreciation* the useful work carried out by the Legal Sub-Committee of the Committee on the Peaceful Uses of Outer Space in the field of the progressive development and of the

codification of the law of outer space;

5. *Notes* that, in responding to the request of the General Assembly, the Legal Sub-Committee and the Committee itself have achieved further progress towards the completion of the draft treaty relating to the Moon;

6. *Recommends* that the Legal Sub-Committee should consider at its fourteenth session, with the same high priority:

(a) The draft treaty relating to the Moon with a view to completing it as soon as possible;

(b) The elaboration of principles governing the use by States of artificial satellites for direct television broadcasting with a view to concluding an international agreement or agreements, in accordance with General Assembly resolution 2916 (XXVII);

(c) The legal implications of remote sensing of the earth from space, taking into account the various views of States expressed on the subject, including proposals for draft international instruments;

7. *Notes*, in this context, that the delegations of Argentina and Brazil have introduced, during the present session of the General Assembly, draft basic articles of a Treaty on Remote Sensing of Natural Resources by Means of Space Technology for the consideration of the Legal Sub-Committee at its fourteenth session;

8. *Also recommends* that the Legal Sub-Committee should consider at its fourteenth session, as time permits, matters relating to the definition and/or delimitation of outer space and outer space activities;

9. *Notes with appreciation* the useful work carried out by the Working Group on Direct Broadcast Satellites, *inter alia*, in facilitating the work of the Legal Sub-Committee in elaborating principles governing the use by States of artificial earth satellites for direct television broadcasting;

10. *Recommends* that the Committee on the Peaceful Uses of Outer Space, bearing in mind the useful contribution that the Working Group on Direct Broadcast Satellites can make to its work, should consider reconvening the Working Group if or when it deems it useful;

11. *Notes with satisfaction* that, in promoting international co-operation in the application of space technology, the Scientific and Technical Sub-Committee and its Working Group on Remote Sensing of the Earth by Satellites have given considerable attention to the potential use of remote sensing of the earth by satellites in development programmes of all countries, especially of developing countries;

12. *Welcomes* the various efforts envisaged with a view to making more readily available the benefit

³ Adopted by the Assembly on Nov. 12 (text from U.N. doc. A/9812).

⁴ *Official Records of the General Assembly, Twenty-ninth Session, Supplement No. 20 (A/9620). [Footnote in original.]*

of this new technology to all countries, especially developing countries;

13. *Welcomes further*, as a valuable step in the efforts to find appropriate patterns for the possible international organization of an operational remote-sensing system or systems, the request of the Committee on the Peaceful Uses of Outer Space that the Secretary-General undertake studies on the organizational and financial requirements of global and regional centres for remote sensing;

14. *Endorses* the opinion that further studies by the Scientific and Technical Sub-Committee of organizational and financial questions relating to remote sensing of the earth from space should progress, together with consideration by the Legal Sub-Committee of the legal aspects of remote sensing of the earth from space as a matter of priority;

15. *Commends* the Working Group on Remote Sensing of the Earth by Satellites for its accomplishment in assessing the current stage of development of remote sensing and in facilitating understanding of the potential benefits of this new space application for development, especially that of the developing countries;

16. *Notes with approval* that the Committee on the Peaceful Uses of Outer Space, having considered the various recommendations made by its Scientific and Technical Sub-Committee with regard to the work of the Working Group on Remote Sensing of the Earth by Satellites, as set out in the final report of the Working Group,⁵ agreed to the recommendation that the Scientific and Technical Sub-Committee, at its twelfth session in 1975, should give to remote sensing the priority accorded to it in paragraph 49 of the Committee's report;

17. *Welcomes* the continuing progress achieved in developing the United Nations programme on space applications into a significant means of promoting international co-operation in this field, as set out in paragraphs 35 to 41 of the report of the Committee on the Peaceful Uses of Outer Space and in paragraph 29 of the report of the Scientific and Technical Sub-Committee,⁶ and recommends that, in order to facilitate further progress in space applications, the Committee should explore the desirability of expanding the programme in the future, including the possibility of improving its effectiveness, taking especially into account the needs of the developing countries;

18. *Endorses* the United Nations programme on space applications, as referred to in paragraph 41 of the report of the Committee on the Peaceful Uses of Outer Space and in paragraph 29 of the report of the Scientific and Technical Sub-Committee, and recommends the continuing development of the pro-

gramme, taking especially into account the needs of the developing countries;

19. *Notes with appreciation* that several Member States have offered educational and training facilities, under United Nations sponsorship, in the practical application of space technology and draws the attention of Member States, particularly the developing countries, to those opportunities as outlined in paragraphs 35 to 38 and 40 of the report of the Committee on the Peaceful Uses of Outer Space;

20. *Further notes with appreciation* the actions, as mentioned in paragraph 37 of the report of the Committee, of several Member States in serving as hosts to the United Nations-sponsored panels, seminars and workshops in 1973 and 1974, and in agreeing to serve as hosts to the United Nations-sponsored panels, seminars and workshops in 1975;

21. *Further notes* the value of United Nations panels and training seminars in various fields of space application and hopes that Member States will continue to offer to serve as hosts to these panels and training seminars with a view to the widest possible spread of information and sharing of costs in this new area of development, especially that of the developing countries;

22. *Commends* to the attention of Member States the questionnaire, recently communicated to them for their reply, which has been prepared for the purpose of facilitating future planning of a more effective United Nations programme on space applications with particular regard to the needs of the developing countries for assistance in this field;

23. *Recommends* that, in accordance with paragraph 57 of the report of the Committee on the Peaceful Uses of Outer Space, the specialized agencies, such as the International Telecommunication Union, the International Civil Aviation Organization and the Inter-Governmental Maritime Consultative Organization, having existing responsibilities or programmes of studies pertaining to the geostationary orbit, should provide the Scientific and Technical Sub-Committee at its next session with background information brought up to date on the subject;

24. *Approves* continuing sponsorship by the United Nations of the Thumba Equatorial Rocket Launching Station in India and the CELPA Mar del Plata Station in Argentina, expresses its satisfaction at the work being carried out at those ranges in relation to the use of sounding rocket facilities for international co-operation and training in the peaceful and scientific exploration of outer space, and recommends that Member States should continue to give consideration to the use of those facilities for space research activities;

25. *Recalls* the principles governing the operation of such United Nations-sponsored facilities as set forth in the report of the Committee on the Peaceful

⁵ U.N. doc. A/AC.105/125. [Footnote in original.]

⁶ U.N. doc. A/AC.105/131. [Footnote in original.]

Uses of Outer Space in 1962⁷ and originally endorsed by the General Assembly in resolution 1802 (XVII);

26. *Agrees* with the Committee on the Peaceful Uses of Outer Space, as set out in paragraph 45 of its report, that proper co-ordination is necessary for activities within the United Nations system relating to the peaceful uses of outer space;

27. *Recalls* its interest in receiving information concerning discussions in the Inter-Governmental Maritime Consultative Organization regarding the use of maritime satellites, particularly in view of the International Conference on the Establishment of an International Maritime Satellite System, scheduled to take place in 1975;

28. *Reiterates* its request to the World Meteorological Organization to pursue actively the implementation of its tropical cyclone project, while continuing and intensifying its other related action programmes, including the World Weather Watch and, especially, the efforts being undertaken towards obtaining basic meteorological data and discovering ways and means to mitigate the harmful effects of tropical storms and to remove or minimize their destructive potential, and looks forward to its report thereon in accordance with General Assembly resolutions 2914 (XXVII) of 9 November 1972 and 3182 (XXVIII) of 18 December 1973;

29. *Notes with appreciation* that the specialized agencies, in particular the World Meteorological Organization, the International Telecommunication Union, the United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization, the Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations and the Inter-Governmental Maritime Consultative Organization, have continued to take an active part in the United Nations programme for the promotion of international co-operation in the peaceful uses of outer space, including the practical application of space technology;

30. *Requests* the specialized agencies and the International Atomic Energy Agency to continue, as appropriate, to provide the Committee on the Peaceful Uses of Outer Space with progress reports on their work relating to the peaceful uses of outer space and to examine, and report thereon to the Committee, the particular problems that may arise from the use of outer space in the fields within their competence and that should, in their opinion, be brought to the attention of the Committee;

31. *Requests* the Committee on the Peaceful Uses of Outer Space to continue its work, as set out in the present and previous resolutions of the General Assembly, and to report to the Assembly at its thirtieth session.

⁷ *Official Records of the General Assembly, Seventeenth Session, Annexes, agenda item 27, document A/5181. [Footnote in original.]*

RESOLUTION 3235 (XXIX)^{*}

Convention on Registration of Objects Launched into Outer Space

The General Assembly,

Reaffirming the importance of international co-operation in the field of the exploration and peaceful uses of outer space, including the Moon and other celestial bodies, and of promoting the law in this new field of human endeavour,

Desiring, in the light of the Treaty on Principles Governing the Activities of States in the Exploration and Use of Outer Space, including the Moon and Other Celestial Bodies, the Agreement on the Rescue of Astronauts, the Return of Astronauts and the Return of Objects Launched into Outer Space and the Convention on International Liability for Damage Caused by Space Objects, to make provision for registration by launching States of space objects launched into outer space with a view, *inter alia*, to providing States with additional means and procedures to assist in the identification of space objects,

Bearing in mind its resolution 3182 (XXVIII) of 18 December 1973, in which it requested the Committee on the Peaceful Uses of Outer Space to consider as a matter of priority the completion of the text of the draft Convention on Registration of Objects Launched into Outer Space,

Having considered the report of the Committee on the Peaceful Uses of Outer Space,

Noting with satisfaction that the Committee on the Peaceful Uses of Outer Space and its Legal Sub-Committee have completed the text of the draft Convention on Registration of Objects Launched into Outer Space,

1. *Commends* the Convention on Registration of Objects Launched into Outer Space, the text of which is annexed to the present resolution;

2. *Requests* the Secretary-General to open the Convention for signature and ratification at the earliest possible date;

3. *Expresses its hope* for the widest possible adherence to this Convention.

ANNEX

CONVENTION ON REGISTRATION OF OBJECTS LAUNCHED INTO OUTER SPACE

The States Parties to this Convention,

Recognizing the common interest of all mankind in furthering the exploration and use of outer space for peaceful purposes,

Recalling that the Treaty on Principles Governing the Activities of States in the Exploration and Use of Outer Space, including the Moon and Other

^{*} Adopted by the Assembly on Nov. 12 (text from U.N. doc. A/9812).

Celestial Bodies of 27 January 1967 affirms that States shall bear international responsibility for their national activities in outer space and refers to the State on whose registry an object launched into outer space is carried,

Recalling also that the Agreement on the Rescue of Astronauts, the Return of Astronauts and the Return of Objects Launched into Outer Space of 22 April 1968 provides that a launching authority shall, upon request, furnish identifying data prior to the return of an object it has launched into outer space found beyond the territorial limits of the launching authority,

Recalling further that the Convention on International Liability for Damage Caused by Space Objects of 29 March 1972 establishes international rules and procedures concerning the liability of launching States for damage caused by their space objects,

Desiring, in the light of the Treaty on Principles Governing the Activities of States in the Exploration and Use of Outer Space, including the Moon and Other Celestial Bodies, to make provision for the national registration by launching States of space objects launched into outer space,

Desiring further that a central register of objects launched into outer space be established and maintained, on a mandatory basis, by the Secretary-General of the United Nations,

Desiring also to provide for States Parties additional means and procedures to assist in the identification of space objects,

Believing that a mandatory system of registering objects launched into outer space would, in particular, assist in their identification and would contribute to the application and development of international law governing the exploration and use of outer space,

Have agreed on the following:

Article I

For the purposes of this Convention:

(a) The term "launching State" means:

(i) A State which launches or procures the launching of a space object;

(ii) A State from whose territory or facility a space object is launched;

(b) The term "space object" includes component parts of a space object as well as its launch vehicle and parts thereof;

(c) The term "State of registry" means a launching State on whose registry a space object is carried in accordance with article II.

Article II

1. When a space object is launched into earth orbit or beyond, the launching State shall register the space object by means of an entry in an appropriate registry which it shall maintain. Each launch-

ing State shall inform the Secretary-General of the United Nations of the establishment of such a registry.

2. Where there are two or more launching States in respect of any such space object, they shall jointly determine which one of them shall register the object in accordance with paragraph 1 of this article, bearing in mind the provisions of article VIII of the Treaty on Principles Governing the Activities of States in the Exploration and Use of Outer Space, including the Moon and Other Celestial Bodies, and without prejudice to appropriate agreements concluded or to be concluded among the launching States on jurisdiction and control over the space object and over any personnel thereof.

3. The contents of each registry and the conditions under which it is maintained shall be determined by the State of registry concerned.

Article III

1. The Secretary-General of the United Nations shall maintain a Register in which the information furnished in accordance with article IV shall be recorded.

2. There shall be full and open access to the information in this Register.

Article IV

1. Each State of registry shall furnish to the Secretary-General of the United Nations, as soon as practicable, the following information concerning each space object carried on its registry:

(a) Name of launching State or States;

(b) An appropriate designator of the space object or its registration number;

(c) Date and territory or location of launch;

(d) Basic orbital parameters, including:

(i) Nodal period,

(ii) Inclination,

(iii) Apogee,

(iv) Perigee;

(e) General function of the space object.

2. Each State of registry may, from time to time, provide the Secretary-General of the United Nations with additional information concerning a space object carried on its registry.

3. Each State of registry shall notify the Secretary-General of the United Nations, to the greatest extent feasible and as soon as practicable, of space objects concerning which it has previously transmitted information, and which have been but no longer are in earth orbit.

Article V

Whenever a space object launched into earth orbit or beyond is marked with the designator or registration number referred to in article IV, paragraph 1 (b), or both, the State of registry shall notify the

Secretary-General of this fact when submitting the information regarding the space object in accordance with article IV. In such case, the Secretary-General of the United Nations shall record this notification in the Register.

Article VI

Where the application of the provisions of this Convention has not enabled a State Party to identify a space object which has caused damage to it or to any of its natural or juridical persons, or which may be of a hazardous or deleterious nature, other States Parties, including in particular States possessing space monitoring and tracking facilities, shall respond to the greatest extent feasible to a request by that State Party, or transmitted through the Secretary-General on its behalf, for assistance under equitable and reasonable conditions in the identification of the object. A State Party making such a request shall, to the greatest extent feasible, submit information as to the time, nature and circumstances of the event giving rise to the request. Arrangements under which such assistance shall be rendered shall be the subject of agreement between the parties concerned.

Article VII

1. In this Convention, with the exception of articles VIII to XII inclusive, references to States shall be deemed to apply to any international intergovernmental organization which conducts space activities if the organization declares its acceptance of the rights and obligations provided for in this Convention and if a majority of the States members of the organization are States Parties to this Convention and to the Treaty on Principles Governing the Activities of States in the Exploration and Use of Outer Space, including the Moon and Other Celestial Bodies.

2. States members of any such organization which are States Parties to this Convention shall take all appropriate steps to ensure that the organization makes a declaration in accordance with paragraph 1 of this article.

Article VIII

1. This Convention shall be open for signature by all States at United Nations Headquarters in New York. Any State which does not sign this Convention before its entry into force in accordance with paragraph 3 of this article may accede to it at any time.

2. This Convention shall be subject to ratification by signatory States. Instruments of ratification and instruments of accession shall be deposited with the Secretary-General of the United Nations.

3. This Convention shall enter into force among the States which have deposited instruments of ratification on the deposit of the fifth such instrument

with the Secretary-General of the United Nations.

4. For States whose instruments of ratification or accession are deposited subsequent to the entry into force of this Convention, it shall enter into force on the date of the deposit of their instruments of ratification or accession.

5. The Secretary-General shall promptly inform all signatory and acceding States of the date of each signature, the date of deposit of each instrument of ratification of and accession to this Convention, the date of its entry into force and other notices.

Article IX

Any State Party to this Convention may propose amendments to the Convention. Amendments shall enter into force for each State Party to the Convention accepting the amendments upon their acceptance by a majority of the States Parties to the Convention and thereafter for each remaining State Party to the Convention on the date of acceptance by it.

Article X

Ten years after the entry into force of this Convention, the question of the review of the Convention shall be included in the provisional agenda of the United Nations General Assembly in order to consider, in the light of past application of the Convention, whether it requires revision. However, at any time after the Convention has been in force for five years, at the request of one third of the States Parties to the Convention and with the concurrence of the majority of the States Parties, a conference of the States Parties shall be convened to review this Convention. Such review shall take into account in particular any relevant technological developments, including those relating to the identification of space objects.

Article XI

Any State Party to this Convention may give notice of its withdrawal from the Convention one year after its entry into force by written notification to the Secretary-General of the United Nations. Such withdrawal shall take effect one year from the date of receipt of this notification.

Article XII

The original of this Convention, of which the Arabic, Chinese, English, French, Russian and Spanish texts are equally authentic, shall be deposited with the Secretary-General of the United Nations, who shall send certified copies thereof to all signatory and acceding States.

IN WITNESS WHEREOF the undersigned, being duly authorized thereto by their respective Governments, have signed this Convention, opened for signature at New York on _____.

U.S. Opposes U.N. Resolutions on Question of Palestine

Following is a statement made in the U.N. General Assembly by U.S. Representative John Scali on November 21, together with the texts of resolutions adopted by the Assembly on November 22.

STATEMENT BY AMBASSADOR SCALI

USUN press release 176 dated November 21

The question of Palestine, as the speakers who have preceded me have amply demonstrated, has commanded more attention from the United Nations than almost any other single issue. The United Nations has not resolved the basic conflict in the Middle East, but it has limited the terrible consequences of this dispute. As we once again confront this issue, it is fitting that we remind ourselves of the long and honorable history of the U.N.'s efforts to maintain the peace. We also should pay tribute to those who serve in the U.N. peace forces in the area and to those who provide humanitarian assistance to the victims of war.

We must not forget the thousands of human beings who have suffered and who continue to suffer from this conflict.

Those who seek a genuine resolution of the Middle East problem must keep ever in mind the continuing plight of people who have left their homes because of this conflict and have been unable to return. Continuing efforts by the international community to alleviate the hardships of these people are essential, but these efforts alone are not a solution.

Only a just and lasting solution of the Arab-Israeli dispute can halt the killing, stop the suffering, and heal the wounds. The goal of this organization must be to seek ways to promote movement to that end while

avoiding any measure which might make such movement more difficult.

Last year's outbreak of war in the Middle East demonstrated for the fourth time in a quarter century that military force cannot resolve the issues which divide Arab and Israeli. It must be clear by now that more violence cannot bring peace. It will only intensify hatreds, complicate differences, and add to the sum of human misery.

The sole alternative to the sterile pursuit of change through violence is negotiation. This path is less dramatic, but in the end it is far more likely to produce acceptable change. The great achievement of the past year has been that the parties to the conflict have at last accepted this alternative and that they have for the first time begun to make it work. A landmark in this effort, and in Arab-Israeli relations, is set forth in Security Council Resolution 338, in which the Security Council for the first time called for immediate negotiations "between the parties concerned under appropriate auspices aimed at establishing a just and durable peace."

The acceptance by the parties of the negotiating process set in motion by Resolution 338 has led to the convening of the Geneva Peace Conference and to the subsequent, successful efforts to negotiate separate disengagement agreements between the forces of Egypt and Israel, and Syria and Israel. In each of these disengagement agreements the parties reaffirmed their acceptance of the principle of a step-by-step negotiated settlement. They did so by agreeing to include the following statement as the final paragraph of each accord:

This agreement is not regarded . . . as a final peace agreement. It constitutes a first step toward a final, just and durable peace according to the provisions of Security Council Resolution 338 and within the framework of the Geneva Conference.

The consequences of a possible breakdown in this negotiating process cannot be over-emphasized. War has ravaged the Middle East four times in 26 years because people did not believe that constructive dialogue between the parties was possible. A fifth war would threaten the security of every country and produce no permanent gains for any.

The primary objective of the U.S. Government therefore has been to maintain the momentum of the negotiating process. Secretary Kissinger recently returned from a visit to the Middle East where he explored with every leader he consulted in the area the vital question of how to continue building on the progress already achieved. The answer to this paramount question still hangs in the balance.

If the negotiating process is to continue, each party must remain committed to negotiating. Each must be prepared to accept a negotiated peace with the others, and each must be prepared to see decisions on how to proceed evolve through understandings among the parties. This is how the Geneva Peace Conference was convened, under the cochairmanship of the Soviet Union and the United States. This is why, when the parties agreed to attend that conference, they also agreed that the role of other participants would be discussed at the conference.

The foundation of such steps toward peace is the acceptance by all parties of the principles of Resolution 338—to engage in the give-and-take of negotiation with the objective of achieving a permanent peace settlement among them on a basis that all parties can accept. If any of the parties rejects this governing principle or questions the right to exist of any of the parties to the negotiation, our best hopes for negotiation and for peace are lost. Certainly it must be understood by all that Israel has a right to exist as a sovereign, independent state within secure and recognized boundaries.

In the course of this debate there have been speakers who have sought to equate terror with revolution, who profess to see no difference between the slaughter of innocents and a struggle for national liberation.

There are those who wish to compare the American Revolution and the many other wars of liberation of the past 200 years with indiscriminate terrorism.

If there were instances during the American Revolution where innocent people suffered, there was no instance where the revolutionary leadership boasted of or condoned such crimes. There were no victims, on either side, of a deliberate policy of terror. Those who molded our nation and fought for our freedom never succumbed to the easy excuse that the end justifies the means.

We hope that all member nations will reaffirm their support for a negotiated settlement in the Middle East and their support for Security Council Resolutions 242 and 338. We know that these resolutions are the basis on which progress so far has been possible. We believe they remain the best hope for continued progress. To seek to alter them not only risks dangerous delay but could destroy prospects for peace in the foreseeable future.

Certainly we can all accept the fact that negotiations can take place only when the parties are willing to negotiate. My government is convinced—and the successes of the past year strengthen our conviction—that the only way to keep the parties committed to negotiations is to move forward through a series of agreements, each substantial enough to represent significant progress, yet each limited enough for governments and peoples to assimilate and accept. Each of these steps helps attitudes to evolve, creates new confidence, and establishes new situations in which still further steps can be taken. With this approach, the parties have, over the past year, succeeded in taking the first substantial steps in decades toward reconciling their differences.

It is my government's firm conviction that the way to move toward a situation more responsive to Palestinian interests is not through new resolutions or dramatic parliamentary maneuvers, but by weaving the Palestinian interests into the give-and-take of the negotiating process. Through this evolutionary process, Palestinian interests can

be better reflected in the new situations which are created.

The U.S. Government thus believes that the most important contribution this Assembly can now make toward resolving the issue before us is to help establish an international climate in which the parties will be encouraged to maintain the momentum toward peace. We are equally convinced that the legitimate interests of the Palestinian people can be promoted in this negotiating process and that these negotiations will lead to a just and lasting peace for all peoples in the Middle East.

TEXTS OF RESOLUTIONS

Resolution 3236 (XXIX)¹

Question of Palestine

The General Assembly,

Having considered the question of Palestine,

Having heard the statement of the Palestine Liberation Organization, the representative of the Palestinian people,

Having also heard other statements made during the debate,

Deeply concerned that no just solution to the problem of Palestine has yet been achieved and recognizing that the problem of Palestine continues to endanger international peace and security,

Recognizing that the Palestinian people is entitled to self-determination in accordance with the Charter of the United Nations,

Expressing its grave concern that the Palestinian people has been prevented from enjoying its inalienable rights, in particular its right to self-determination,

Guided by the purposes and principles of the Charter,

Recalling its relevant resolutions which affirm the right of the Palestinian people to self-determination,

1. *Reaffirms the inalienable rights of the Palestinian people in Palestine, including:*

(a) *The right to self-determination without external interference;*

(b) *The right to national independence and sovereignty;*

2. *Reaffirms also the inalienable right of the Palestinians to return to their homes and property from*

which they have been displaced and uprooted, and calls for their return;

3. *Emphasizes that full respect for and the realization of these inalienable rights of the Palestinian people are indispensable for the solution of the question of Palestine;*

4. *Recognizes that the Palestinian people is a principal party in the establishment of a just and durable peace in the Middle East;*

5. *Further recognizes the right of the Palestinian people to regain its rights by all means in accordance with the purposes and principles of the Charter of the United Nations;*

6. *Appeals to all States and international organizations to extend their support to the Palestinian people in its struggle to restore its rights, in accordance with the Charter;*

7. *Requests the Secretary-General to establish contacts with the Palestine Liberation Organization on all matters concerning the question of Palestine;*

8. *Requests the Secretary-General to report to the General Assembly at its thirtieth session on the implementation of the present resolution;*

9. *Decides to include the item entitled "Question of Palestine" in the provisional agenda of its thirtieth session.*

Resolution 3237 (XXIX)²

Observer status

for the Palestine Liberation Organization

The General Assembly,

Having considered the question of Palestine,

Taking into consideration the universality of the United Nations prescribed in the Charter,

Recalling its resolution 3102 (XXVIII) of 12 December 1973,

Taking into account Economic and Social Council resolutions 1835 (LVI) of 14 May 1974 and 1840 (LVI) of 15 May 1974,

Noting that the Diplomatic Conference on the Reaffirmation and Development of International Humanitarian Law Applicable in Armed Conflicts, the World Population Conference and the World Food Conference have in effect invited the Palestine Liberation Organization to participate in their respective deliberations,

Noting also that the Third United Nations Conference on the Law of the Sea has invited the Palestine Liberation Organization to participate in its deliberations as an observer,

1. *Invites the Palestine Liberation Organization to participate in the sessions and the work of the General Assembly in the capacity of observer;*

¹ U.N. doc. A/RES/3236 (XXIX); adopted by the Assembly on Nov. 22 by a vote of 89 to 8 (U.S.), with 37 abstentions.

² U.N. doc. A/RES/3237 (XXIX); adopted by the Assembly on Nov. 22 by a vote of 95 to 17 (U.S.), with 19 abstentions.

2. *Invites* the Palestine Liberation Organization to participate in the sessions and the work of all international conferences convened under the auspices of the General Assembly in the capacity of observer;

3. *Considers* that the Palestine Liberation Organization is entitled to participate as an observer in the sessions and the work of all international conferences convened under the auspices of other organs of the United Nations;

4. *Requests* the Secretary-General to take the necessary steps for the implementation of the present resolution.

TREATY INFORMATION

Current Actions

MULTILATERAL

Energy

Agreement on an international energy program. Done at Paris November 18, 1974. Enters into force on the 10th day following the day on which at least six states holding at least 60 percent of the combined voting weights have deposited a notification of consent to be bound or an instrument of accession; applicable provisionally by all signatory states, to the extent possible not inconsistent with their legislation, as from 18th November, 1974.

Signatures: Austria, Belgium, Canada, Denmark, Federal Republic of Germany, Ireland, Italy, Japan, Luxembourg, Netherlands, Spain, Sweden, Switzerland, Turkey, United Kingdom, United States.

Telecommunications

International telecommunication convention with annexes and protocols. Done at Malaga-Torremolinos October 25, 1973.¹

Accession deposited: Bahrain, October 21, 1974.

Wheat

Protocol modifying and extending the wheat trade convention (part of the international wheat agreement) 1971. Done at Washington April 2, 1974. Entered into force June 19, 1974, with respect to certain provisions; July 1, 1974, with respect to other provisions.

Ratification deposited: Brazil, November 25, 1974.

Wills

Convention providing a uniform law on the form of an international will, with annex. Done at Washington October 26, 1973.¹

Signature: France, November 29, 1974.

BILATERAL

Egypt

Agreement amending the agreement for sales of agricultural commodities of June 7, 1974 (TIAS 7855). Effected by exchange of notes at Cairo November 10, 1974. Entered into force November 10, 1974.

Viet-Nam

Agreement amending the agreement for sales of agricultural commodities of August 29, 1972 (TIAS 7452). Effected by exchange of notes at Saigon November 11, 1974. Entered into force November 11, 1974.

Agreement amending the agreement for sales of agricultural commodities of November 9, 1973 (TIAS 7768). Effected by exchange of notes at Saigon November 11, 1974. Entered into force November 11, 1974.

¹ Not in force.

| | |
|---|-----|
| Africa. Southern Africa Five Years After the Lusaka Manifesto (Easum) | 838 |
| Food. World Food Conference Meets at Rome (Kissinger, Butz, texts of resolutions) | 821 |
| Foreign Aid. World Food Conference Meets at Rome (Kissinger, Butz, texts of resolutions) | 821 |
| Middle East. U.S. Opposes U.N. Resolutions on Question of Palestine (Scali, texts of resolutions) | 857 |
| Science. U.S.-Yugoslav Scientific Cooperation Board Meets at Washington (joint statement) | 837 |
| Space. U.N. Commends Outer Space Registration Convention (Kuchel, texts of resolutions) | 845 |
| Treaty Information. Current Actions | 860 |
| United Nations | |
| U.N. Commends Outer Space Registration Convention (Kuchel, texts of resolutions) | 845 |
| U.S. Opposes U.N. Resolutions on Question of Palestine (Scali, texts of resolutions) | 857 |
| World Food Conference Meets at Rome (Kissinger, Butz, texts of resolutions) | 821 |
| Yugoslavia. U.S.-Yugoslav Scientific Cooperation Board Meets at Washington (joint statement) | 837 |

Name Index

| | |
|--------------------------------|-----|
| Butz, Earl L | 821 |
| Easum, Donald B | 838 |
| Kissinger, Secretary | 821 |
| Kuchel, Thomas H | 845 |
| Scali, John | 857 |

Check List of Department of State

Press Releases: November 25–December 1

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

Releases issued prior to November 25 which appear in this issue of the BULLETIN are Nos. 477 of November 5, and 510 of November 22.

| No. | Date | Subject |
|-------|-------|---|
| †511 | 11/25 | Kissinger: news conference, Vladivostok, Nov. 24. |
| †511A | 11/25 | Kissinger: news conference, Vladivostok, Nov. 24. |
| †512 | 11/25 | Kissinger: remarks to press, Tokyo. |
| †513 | 11/26 | Kissinger, Chiao Kuan-Hua: exchange of toasts, Peking, Nov. 25. |
| †514 | 11/29 | Kissinger, Chiao Kuan-Hua: exchange of toasts, Peking, Nov. 28. |

† Held for a later issue of the BULLETIN.