



THE DEPARTMENT OF STATE BULLETIN

Volume LXXIII • No. 1905 • December 29, 1975

A PACIFIC DOCTRINE OF PEACE WITH ALL
AND HOSTILITY TOWARD NONE

Address by President Ford 913

PRESIDENT FORD VISITS THE PACIFIC BASIN 916

SECRETARY KISSINGER'S NEWS CONFERENCE AT PEKING
DECEMBER 4 926

U.S. DISCUSSES HUMAN RIGHTS IN SOUTH AFRICA

*Statement by Clarence M. Mitchell, Jr.,
in the U.N. General Assembly 935*

THE OFFICIAL WEEKLY RECORD OF UNITED STATES FOREIGN POLICY

For index see inside back cover

THE DEPARTMENT OF STATE BULLETIN

VOL. LXXIII, No. 1905

December 29, 1975

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

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

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

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

PRICE:

52 issues plus semiannual indexes,
domestic \$42.50, foreign \$53.15
Single copy 85 cents

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.

A Pacific Doctrine of Peace With All and Hostility Toward None

*Address by President Ford*¹

... it is good to be home again in the United States. I have just completed, as many of you know, a seven-day trip to the State of Alaska, to the People's Republic of China, to our good friends Indonesia and the Philippines, and now I am obviously happy to be home in our 50th State, Hawaii.

This morning I reflected on the past at the shrine of Americans who died on Sunday morning 34 years ago. I came away with a new spirit of dedication to the ideals that emerged from Pearl Harbor in World War II, dedication to America's bipartisan policy of pursuing peace through strength and dedication to a new future of interdependence and cooperation with all peoples of the Pacific.

I subscribe to a Pacific doctrine of peace with all and hostility toward none. The way I would like to remember or recollect Pearl Harbor is by preserving the power of the past to rebuild the future.

Let us join with new and old countries of that great Pacific area in creating the greatest civilization on the shores of the greatest of our oceans.

My visit here to the East-West Center holds another kind of meaning. Your center is a catalyst of America's positive concern for Asia, its people, and its rich diversity of cultures. You advance our hope that Asia will gain a better understanding of the United States.

¹ Made at the East-West Center at the University of Hawaii on Dec. 7 (text from Weekly Compilation of Presidential Documents dated Dec. 15; introductory paragraphs omitted).

Last year we were pleased to receive and to welcome nearly 54,000 Asian students to the United States while thousands upon thousands of American students went to Asian countries. I applaud your contribution to partnership in education. Your efforts represent America's vision of an open world of understanding, freedom, and peace.

In Hawaii, the crossroads of the Pacific, our past and our future join.

I was deeply moved when I visited Japan last year and when I recently had the honor of welcoming the Emperor and the Empress of Japan to America. The gracious welcome that I received and the warmth of the welcome the American people bestowed upon the Emperor and the Empress testify to a growing friendship and partnership between our two great countries. This is a tribute to what is best in man—his capacity to grow from fear to trust and from a tragedy of the past to a hopeful future.

It is a superb example of what can be achieved in human progress. It inspires our new efforts in Asia to improve relations.

America, a nation of the Pacific Basin, has a very vital stake in Asia and a responsibility to take a leading part in lessening tensions, preventing hostilities, and preserving peace. World stability and our own security depend upon our Asian commitments.

In 1941, 34 years ago today, we were militarily unprepared. Our trade in the Pacific was very limited. We exercised jurisdiction over the Philippines. We were preoccupied with Western Europe.

Our instincts were isolationist. We have

transcended that age. We are now the world's strongest nation. Our great commercial involvement in Asia is expanding. We led the way in conferring independence upon the Philippines. Now we are working out new associations and arrangements with the trust territories of the Pacific.

The center of political power in the United States has shifted westward. Our Pacific interests and concerns have increased. We have exchanged the freedom of action of an isolationist state for the responsibilities of a great global power.

As I return from this trip to three major Asian countries, I am even more aware of our interests in this part of the world. The security concerns of great world powers intersect in Asia. The United States, the Soviet Union, China, and Japan are all Pacific powers.

Western Europe has historic and economic ties with Asia. Equilibrium in the Pacific is absolutely essential to the United States and to the other countries in the Pacific.

The first premise of a new Pacific doctrine is that American strength is basic to any stable balance of power in the Pacific. We must reach beyond our concern for security; but without security, there can be neither peace nor progress.

The preservation of the sovereignty and the independence of our Asian friends and allies remains a paramount objective of American policy. We recognize that force alone is insufficient to assure security. Popular legitimacy and social justice are vital prerequisites of resistance against subversion or aggression. Nevertheless, we owe it to ourselves and to those whose independence depends upon our continued support to preserve a flexible and balanced position of strength throughout the Pacific.

The second basic premise of a new Pacific doctrine is that partnership with Japan is a pillar of our strategy. There is no relationship to which I have devoted more attention, nor is there any greater success story in the history of American efforts to relate to distant cultures and to people.

The Japanese-American relationship can be a source of great, great pride to every

American and to every Japanese. Our bilateral relations have never been better. The recent exchange of visits symbolized a basic political partnership. We have begun to develop with the Japanese and other advanced industrial democracies better means of harmonizing our economic policy.

We are joining with Japan, our European friends, and representatives of the developing nations this month to begin shaping a more efficient and more equitable pattern of North-South economic relations.

The third premise of a new Pacific doctrine is the normalization of relations with the People's Republic of China, the strengthening of our new ties with this great nation representing nearly one-quarter of mankind. This is another recent achievement of American foreign policy. It transcends 25 years of hostility.

I visited China to build on the dialogue started nearly four years ago. My wide-ranging exchanges with the leaders of the People's Republic of China—with Chairman Mao Tse-tung and Vice Premier Teng Hsiao-p'ing—enhanced our understanding of each other's views and each other's policies.

There were, as expected, differences of perspective. Our societies, our philosophies, our varying positions in the world, give us differing perceptions of our respective national interests.

But we did find a common ground. We reaffirmed that we share very important areas of concern and agreement. They say, and we say, that the countries of Asia should be free to develop a world where there is mutual respect for the sovereignty and territorial integrity of all states; where people are free from the threat of foreign aggression; where there is noninterference in the internal affairs of others; and where the principles of equality, mutual benefit, and coexistence shape the development of peaceful international order.

We share opposition to any form of hegemony in Asia or in any other part of the world.

I reaffirmed the determination of the United States to complete the normalization of relations with the People's Republic of

China on the basis of the Shanghai communique. Both sides regarded our discussions as significant, useful, and constructive.

Our relationship is becoming a permanent feature of the international political landscape. It benefits not only our two peoples but all peoples of the region and the entire world.

A fourth principle of our Pacific policy is our continuing stake in stability and security in Southeast Asia.

After leaving China, I visited Indonesia and the Philippines. Indonesia is a nation of 140 million people, the fifth largest population in the world today. It is one of our important new friends and a major country in that area of the world.

The Republic of the Philippines is one of our oldest and dearest allies. Our friendship demonstrates America's longstanding interest in Asia.

I spent three days in Jakarta and Manila. I would have liked to have had time to visit our friends in Thailand, Singapore, and Malaysia. We share important political and economic concerns with these five nations who make up the Association of Southeast Asian Nations.

I can assure you that Americans will be hearing much more about the ASEAN organization. All of its members are friends of the United States. Their total population equals our own. While they are developing countries, they possess many, many assets: vital peoples, abundant natural resources, and well-managed agricultures. They have skilled leaders and the determination to develop themselves and to solve their own problems. Each of these countries protects its independence by relying on its own national resilience and diplomacy. We must continue to assist them.

I learned during my visit that our friends want us to remain actively engaged in the affairs of the region. We intend to do so.

We retain close and valuable ties with our old friends and allies in the southwest Pacific, Australia on the one hand and New Zealand on the other.

A fifth tenet of our new Pacific policy is our belief that peace in Asia depends upon

a resolution of outstanding political conflicts. In Korea tension persists. We have close ties with the Republic of Korea; and we remain committed to peace and security on the Korean Peninsula, as the presence of our forces there attests.

Responding to the heightened tension last spring, we reaffirmed our support of the Republic of Korea. Today, the United States is ready to consider constructive ways of easing tensions on the peninsula, but we will continue to resist any moves which attempt to exclude the Republic of Korea from discussion of its own future.

In Indochina, the healing effects of time are required. Our policies toward the new regimes of the peninsula will be determined by their conduct toward us. We are prepared to reciprocate gestures of good will, particularly the return of remains of Americans killed or missing in action or information about them. If they exhibit restraint toward their neighbors and constructive approaches to international problems, we will look to the future rather than to the past.

The sixth point of our new policy in the Pacific is that peace in Asia requires a structure of economic cooperation reflecting the aspirations of all the peoples in the region.

The Asian-Pacific economy has recently achieved more rapid growth than any other region in the world. Our trade with East Asia now exceeds our transactions with the European Community. America's jobs, currency, and raw materials depend upon economic ties with the Pacific Basin. Our trade with the region is now increasing by more than 30 percent annually, reaching some \$46 billion last year. Our economies are increasingly interdependent as cooperation grows between developed and developing nations.

Our relations with the five ASEAN countries are marked by growing maturity and by more modest and more realistic expectations on both sides. We no longer approach them as donor to dependent. These proud people look to us less for outright aid than for new trading opportunities and more equitable arrangements for the transfer of science and technology.

There is one common theme which was

expressed to me by the leaders of every Asian country that I visited. They all advocate the continuity of steady and responsible American leadership. They seek self-reliance in their own future and in their own relations with us.

Our military assistance to allies and friends is a modest responsibility, but its political significance far surpasses the small cost involved. We serve our highest national interests by strengthening their self-reliance, their relations with us, their solidarity with each other, and their regional security.

I emphasized to every leader I met that the United States is a Pacific nation. I pledged, as President, I will continue America's active concern for Asia and our presence in the Asian-Pacific region.

Asia is entering a new era. We can contribute to a new structure of stability founded on a balance among the major powers, strong ties to our allies in the region, an easing of tension between adversaries, the self-reliance and regional solidarity of smaller nations, and expanding economic ties and cultural exchanges.

These components of peace are already evident. Our foreign policy in recent years and in recent days encourages their growth.

If we can remain steadfast, historians will look back and view the 1970's as the beginning of a period of peaceful cooperation and progress—a time of growing community for all the nations touched by this great ocean.

Here in the Pacific crossroads of Hawaii, we envision hope for a wider community of man. We see the promise of a unique republic which includes all the world's races. No other country has been so truly a free, multi-racial society.

Hawaii is a splendid example, a splendid showcase of America, and exemplifies our destiny as a Pacific nation.

America's Pacific heritage emerged from this remarkable state. I am proud to visit Hawaii, the island star in the American firmament which radiates the universal magic of Aloha.

Let there flow from Hawaii—and from all of the states in our Union—to all peoples, East and West, a new spirit of interchange to build human brotherhood.

President Ford Visits the Pacific Basin

President Ford visited the People's Republic of China December 1-5, the Republic of Indonesia December 5-6, and the Republic of the Philippines December 6-7. Following are remarks and toasts by President Ford and foreign leaders and joint communiques issued at Jakarta and Manila.¹

PRESIDENT FORD'S DEPARTURE REMARKS, ANDREWS AIR FORCE BASE, NOVEMBER 29

Weekly Compilation of Presidential Documents dated December 8

Good morning. Three times in our generation, wars in Asia disturbed the peace of

the world and drew America into serious conflict. On this Thanksgiving weekend, we give thanks that America—and Asia—are at peace.

Today I begin a mission to Asia to consolidate that peace and to visit our two newest States, Alaska and Hawaii, which are most mindful of the importance of peace in the Pacific.

I am traveling to the People's Republic of China to strengthen our new relationship with that great nation from whom we were

¹ Additional remarks during the trip are printed in the Dec. 8 and Dec. 15 issues of the Weekly Compilation of Presidential Documents.

isolated, in mutual suspicion, for almost a quarter of a century. Stability in Asia and international security benefit from this new relationship of mutual respect that we are developing between the United States and the People's Republic of China. We will stand for our own views, as we always have. But we will seek, in the American tradition, to foster mutual understanding.

I will also visit two important friends in Asia: the Philippines, one of our oldest partners, an ally which symbolizes America's historic link and commitment to Asia, and Indonesia, a nation of 120 million people, a good friend of the United States, and a country of tremendous potential and importance.

As I did last year on my visits to Japan and the Republic of Korea, I will reaffirm America's undiminished interest in the security and the well-being of Asia. That vast region is of vital importance to us and to the world.

I will bring to the people of Asia the good wishes and the friendship of the American people.

Thank you very, very much.

THE VISIT TO THE PEOPLE'S REPUBLIC OF CHINA

BANQUET GIVEN BY VICE PREMIER TENG, PEKING, DECEMBER 1

Weekly Compilation of Presidential Documents dated December 15

Toast by Vice Premier Teng Hsiao-p'ing²

Mr. President and Mrs. Ford, ladies and gentlemen, comrades and friends: We are very glad today that President and Mrs. Ford, traveling thousands of miles across the ocean, have arrived in China for an official visit. As the Republican leader of the House of Representatives, Mr. Ford visited China before, in June 1972, with Mrs. Ford;

²Vice Premier Teng spoke in Chinese on both occasions.

so they are already known to the Chinese people.

At this banquet, which I am entrusted by Premier Chou En-lai to host, I wish to express welcome on behalf of the Chinese Government to President and Mrs. Ford and the other American guests accompanying them on the visit.

The Chinese and American peoples are both great peoples. Our two peoples have always been friendly to each other. I would like to take this opportunity to convey the cordial greetings of the Chinese people to the great American people.

More than three years ago, President Nixon visited China, and the Chinese and American sides issued the famous Shanghai communique. This is a unique international document. It explicitly sets forth the fundamental differences between the policies of China and the United States, which are determined by their different social systems, and at the same time points out that in today's world our two countries have many points in common.

An outstanding common point is that neither should seek hegemony and that each is opposed to efforts by any other country or group of countries to establish hegemony.

The communique provides the basis for the development of Sino-U.S. relations and indicates its direction and goal. Its issuance accords not only with the common desire of our two peoples but also with the interests of the people of the world, and it has made a deep impact internationally.

Since the Shanghai communique, there have been, on the whole, an increase in the contacts and friendship between our two peoples and an improvement in the relations between our two countries.

Since he took office, President Ford has stated more than once that he will adhere to the principles of the Shanghai communique and work to promote Sino-U.S. relations, a statement which we welcome. To realize the normalization of relations between our two countries conforms to the common desire of the Chinese and American peoples.

We believe that, so long as the principles

of the Shanghai communique are earnestly observed, this desire will eventually be realized through the joint efforts of our two sides.

At present, a more important question confronts the Chinese and American peoples—that of the international situation. Our basic view is: There is great disorder under heaven, and the situation is excellent. The basic contradictions in the world are sharpening daily. The factors for both revolution and war are clearly increasing.

Countries want independence, nations want liberation, and the people want revolution. This torrential tide of our time is mounting. In particular, the Third World has emerged and grown in strength and has become a force that is playing an important role in the international arena, a force that must not be neglected.

On the other hand, the contention for world hegemony is intensifying, and strategically Europe is the focus of this contention. Such continued contention is bound to lead to a new world war.

This is independent of man's will. Today, it is the country which most zealously preaches peace that is the most dangerous source of war. Rhetoric about détente cannot cover up the stark reality of the growing danger of war.

The wind sweeping through the tower heralds a rising storm in the mountains. The wind is blowing harder and harder, and nothing can prevent the storm. In the face of this international situation, the crucial point is what line and policy to pursue.

We consider that it is in the interest of the people of the world to point out the source and danger of the war, dispel illusions of peace, fully arouse the people, make all preparations, unite with all the forces that can be united with, and wage a tit-for-tat struggle.

Hegemonism is not to be afraid of. It is weak by nature. It bullies the soft and fears the tough. Its expansion in all parts of the world bears the seed of defeat. The outcome of a war is decided by the people, not by one or two new types of weapon.

In this regard, the consistent policy of the

Chinese Government and people is dig tunnels deep, store grain everywhere, and never seek hegemony. We base ourselves on independence, self-reliance, and millet, plus rifles.

The people are the makers of history. Mankind always advances in storm and stress. The road is tortuous; the future is bright. We are full of optimism and confidence in the future of mankind.

President Ford's visit to China is a major event in the present international relations. It is beneficial for leaders of the two countries to have a direct exchange of views on issues of mutual interest. We wish President Ford a successful visit.

In conclusion, I propose a toast to the friendship between the Chinese and American peoples, to the health of President and Mrs. Ford, to the health of the other American guests, and to the health of all comrades and friends present here.

Toast by President Ford

Mr. Vice Premier, Mr. Foreign Minister, and all Chinese friends here tonight: On behalf of Mrs. Ford, our daughter, the members of our family, and the people of the United States, let me express appreciation for your very friendly reception. It is symbolized by this gracious banquet that you have accorded us tonight.

Although this is the second visit by me to the People's Republic of China, it is the first time that I have been in your country as President of the United States. In 1972 I had the opportunity to meet a number of your leaders, including Premier Chou En-lai. I learned something of their views and saw the impressive work of the people of China in developing their country, and I recall your hospitality with great pleasure.

It is now more than four years since our two countries started discussing how to build a more constructive relationship. Reality and common necessities brought us together in a bold and farsighted move.

In that Shanghai communique, our two governments recognized that there are essential differences between China and the United States in their social systems and

foreign policies; but more importantly, we also agreed that the normalization of relations would be in the mutual interests of our peoples and would contribute to the development of a more secure international order.

We therefore established certain principles to guide the growth of our relations and our approach to the international scene. The moves that were taken in 1971 and 1972 by the leaders of China and the United States were of historic significance, and I take this occasion to reaffirm my commitment to the objectives and to the principles that emerged from those first steps, and specifically to the normalization of our relations.

Developments since 1972 verify the wisdom of the Shanghai communique. We still differ on certain issues, but we have progressed toward a more normal relationship. Our many authoritative discussions have enabled our two nations to explore areas of mutual interest and to understand each other's views on the issues on which we disagree.

The two Liaison Offices which we established in our respective capitals facilitate our contact and understanding. The development of cultural and scientific exchanges, as well as trade, strengthens the ties between the Chinese and the American people.

In the international field, we have a mutual interest in seeing that the world is not dominated by military force or pressure, what in our joint statements we have called hegemony. In pursuing our objectives, each of us will, of course, determine our policy and methods according to our differing positions in the world and our perceptions of our respective national interests.

In the past four years, there have been many changes in the international situation. The world confronts us all with dangers, but it also offers opportunities. The United States will strive both to reduce the dangers and to explore new opportunities for peace without illusion.

The current situation requires strength, vigilance, and firmness. But, we will also continue our efforts to achieve a more peaceful world, even as we remain determined to

resist any actions that threaten the independence and well-being of others.

I look forward to our frank and beneficial discussions. We will explore areas of agreement and seek to foster understanding where our perspectives differ.

In that spirit, we remain firmly committed to the process of building a normal relationship between our two countries on the basis of the Shanghai communique and to enlarging the areas of cooperation on international issues of mutual concern.

So, as I begin my visit, I would like to propose a toast to the health of Chairman Mao, to the health of Premier Chou En-lai, to the health of Vice Premier Teng Hsiao-p'ing, to the health of other officials and friends here tonight, to the success of our discussions here this week, and to the further development of friendship and understanding between the peoples of China and the United States.

BANQUET GIVEN BY PRESIDENT FORD, PEKING, DECEMBER 4

Weekly Compilation of Presidential Documents dated December 15

Toast by President Ford

Mr. Vice Premier, Mr. Foreign Minister, and all our Chinese friends here this evening: On behalf of Mrs. Ford and all the Americans present, I extend to each and every one of you a very, very warm welcome.

Tomorrow morning we leave China with many regrets. It has been a significant visit. The wide-ranging talks that I have held with Chairman Mao and with Vice Premier Teng have been friendly, candid, substantial, and constructive. We discussed our differences, which are natural in a relationship between two countries whose ideologies, societies, and circumstances diverge. But we also confirmed that we have important points in common.

We reviewed our bilateral relationship. The visit confirmed that although our relations are not yet normalized they are good. They will be gradually improved because we

both believe that a strengthening of our ties benefits our two peoples.

I am confident that through our mutual efforts we can continue to build a relationship which advances the national interests of the United States and the People's Republic of China.

In our talks, I reaffirmed that the United States is committed to complete the normalization of relations with the People's Republic of China on the basis of the Shanghai communique.

Our bilateral ties are very important. But both of us attach even greater significance to the international aspects of our relationship. It was certain common perceptions and common interests which brought our countries together four years ago.

Among these is our agreement not to seek hegemony over others and our fundamental opposition to the efforts of others to impose hegemony in any part of the world. This reflects the realism which is a hallmark of our relationship. And realism is a firmer basis than sentiment for sound and durable ties.

It is only natural that the People's Republic of China and the United States will follow their own policies and tactics, governed by their perceptions of their own national interests.

The United States is firmly dedicated to an international order of peace, justice, and prosperity for all. The task which confronts us—which confronts all peoples of the world—is not easy. It requires both firmness of principle and tactics adapted to particular circumstances.

It requires national strength and the will to use it, as well as prudence, to avoid unnecessary conflict. It requires acceptance of peaceful change to accommodate human aspirations for progress. All must help to build a durable and equitable international system, though inevitably contributions will often be diverse.

I believe that our discussions this week have significantly promoted those objectives we share concerning both bilateral relations and the international scene. They will bene-

fit our two peoples as well as the peoples of the world.

In closing, I wish to express the sincere appreciation of Mrs. Ford and myself, and all of those traveling with us, for the very warm hospitality that we have received. Mr. Vice Premier, I hope that you will convey my personal thanks to all who have helped to make our visit so pleasurable.

I ask all of you to join me in a toast to the health of Chairman Mao, to the health of Premier Chou En-lai, to the health of Vice Premier Teng Hsiao-p'ing, to the health of all Chinese friends here tonight, and to the friendship between the American and the Chinese people.

Toast by Vice Premier Teng

Mr. President and Mrs. Ford, Mr. Secretary of State, ladies and gentlemen, comrades and friends: President Ford will conclude his visit to China tomorrow. Here, on behalf of my Chinese colleagues present, I would like to thank President Ford for giving this banquet on the eve of his departure.

In the last few days, our two sides have held several beneficial talks on matters of mutual interest. What is particularly important, Chairman Mao Tse-tung had an earnest and significant conversation with President Ford on wide-ranging issues in a friendly atmosphere.

China and the United States have different social systems; our two sides have different ideologies; and naturally there are differences of principle between us. At the same time, in the present international situation, our two countries face problems of mutual concern and share many common points.

The direct exchange of views between the leaders of our two countries on this occasion helps to increase mutual understanding and serves to promote efforts by both the Chinese and American sides toward the direction and goal defined in the Shanghai communique.

Both sides agree that the Shanghai communique is a document of historic significance and constitutes the basis of Sino-U.S.

relations. As facts prove, it remains full of vitality today.

President and Mrs. Ford and their party have also visited places of interest in Peking and come into contact with people of various circles in our capital. Our American guests must have found that the Chinese people are friendly to the American people.

On the eve of the departure of President and Mrs. Ford from China, I would like to take this opportunity to convey the best wishes of the Chinese people for the American people. I wish President and Mrs. Ford and their party a pleasant journey.

In conclusion, I propose a toast to the friendship between the Chinese and American peoples, to the health of President and Mrs. Ford, to the health of the other American guests, and to the health of our comrades and friends present.

THE VISIT TO THE REPUBLIC OF INDONESIA

TOAST BY PRESIDENT FORD, JAKARTA, DECEMBER 5³

Weekly Compilation of Presidential Documents dated December 15

Mr. President, Mrs. Suharto, distinguished hosts: Our two great nations enjoy a growing bond of friendship while reflecting differences that enrich humanity. We are on opposite sides of the world, with great contrasts in history, geography, and culture. But Indonesia and the United States also have very, very much in common.

We share a dedication to peace in Asia and in the world. We share a commitment to economic and social progress. We share the realization that international cooperation is essential for international stability and prosperity.

In recent years we have seen many dra-

matic changes in the world, transforming the international and political and economic affairs. But the last vestiges of colonial empires have disappeared. The cold war division of the world has broken down. We now live in a world of some 150 independent nations. It is a smaller world in which the destinies of nations are more clearly interdependent.

In this complex time of change, America, as always, looks to its relationships with friends. Indonesia is such a friend. Indonesia exemplifies strength and self-reliance, as well as international leadership and responsibility. We respect your nonalignment and your goal of "national resiliency." We admire your contribution to regional peace. We value very deeply your friendship.

Indonesia is one of the proud nations of Southeast Asia that are preserving independence. This is being done by meeting the aspirations of the people, seeking to reconcile differences, and building regional cooperation.

Just a few months ago, as you mentioned, Mr. President, we had a productive series of talks at Camp David. Tonight I am delighted to be in your country. The United States, as you know, regards itself as a Pacific nation. No area of the world is more important to us than Asia.

We remain firmly committed to peace and security in Southeast Asia and throughout Asia. We see our own prosperity and progress linked with vast populations, the dynamic economies, the abundant resources, and the rich cultures of this great region of the world.

I have come here, Mr. President, because of America's continuing interest in your country's security and well-being. I am delighted our two nations have developed a genuine and growing friendship based upon mutual respect and cooperation on many, many international issues.

Our relationship involves a common concern for the right of every nation to pursue its destiny on its own independent and sovereign course. And our ties go beyond security, embracing the challenges of economic

³ Given at a dinner, in response to a toast by General Suharto, President of the Republic of Indonesia.

and social development, the energy problem, and a whole new spectrum of interests and issues which require a continuing dialogue between developed and developing nations.

The spirit of partnership and friendship achieved by our two countries is example to others. The importance of our relationship increases with every passing year. This is our view, Mr. President. I know from our previous conversations that it is also yours.

On behalf of Mrs. Ford and myself and all of our delegation, I raise my glass and propose a toast: to you and your gracious wife, to the people of Indonesia, to our friendship and to our common goals.

JOINT COMMUNIQUE ISSUED AT JAKARTA DECEMBER 6

Weekly Compilation of Presidential Documents dated December 15

President and Mrs. Gerald Ford of the United States of America visited the Republic of Indonesia from December 5 to December 6, 1975, at the invitation of President Suharto. Accompanying the President and Mrs. Ford were Miss Susan Ford and Secretary of State Kissinger. The visit followed upon the informal July 1975 visit of President and Mrs. Suharto to the United States where they were entertained at Camp David by President and Mrs. Ford.

President and Mrs. Ford were the guests of honor at a State dinner given by President and Mrs. Suharto on December 5.

President Ford and President Suharto met on December 6 for a cordial and frank exchange of views on international, regional and bilateral issues of interest to the two governments. Secretary of State Kissinger, Foreign Minister Malik and Minister/Secretary of State Sudharmono participated in the meeting.

During this exchange of views President Ford expressed the intention of the United States to continue to provide substantial aid to Indonesia in support of Indonesia's development efforts.

Reflecting the many areas of interest shared by the two countries in Southeast Asia and elsewhere, President Ford and President Suharto agreed to an expanded dialogue between the two governments through periodic consultations at the ministerial level. Such consultations will be held as required, alternating between Washington and Jakarta at the level of the Foreign Minister of Indonesia and the Secretary of State of the United States with the host presiding over meetings.

Further consultations on specific issues as agreed by the two Foreign Ministers will be held between Ministers and other senior officials of the two governments. The process will be inaugurated with a meeting between Foreign Minister Malik and Secretary Kissinger in Washington in spring of 1976.

The two Presidents concluded that their meeting and their decision to establish an expanded dialogue at the ministerial level marked an important further step in developing increasingly close and friendly ties between the Governments and peoples of Indonesia and the United States.

President and Mrs. Ford and the members of the American party expressed their deep appreciation for the gracious hospitality shown them by President and Mrs. Suharto and by the Government and people of Indonesia.

JAKARTA, December 6, 1975.

THE VISIT TO THE REPUBLIC OF THE PHILIPPINES

BANQUET GIVEN BY PRESIDENT MARCOS, MANILA, DECEMBER 6

Weekly Compilation of Presidential Documents dated December 15

Toast by President Ferdinand Marcos

Mr. President, Mrs. Ford, Mr. Chief Justice, distinguished guests, Your Excellencies, ladies and gentlemen: It is indeed a great honor for the Filipino people and for ourselves, the First Lady and your humble servant, to have as guests at tonight's dinner the President of the United States of America and his lady and his daughter and the members of his party.

It is my hope that my words tonight will record, even but to a modest degree, the appreciation that we feel for the honor that you have bestowed upon our country and people, Mr. President, for visiting us at this momentous period of Asia's and the Philippines' history.

Our relations are not only deep-rooted; they have been constant. We have had our differences, but as you can see from the demonstration not only of good will but of affection, almost of hysteria, in the effort to welcome you and Mrs. Ford and your

daughter and the members of your party, there is a deep reservoir of good will for America in the Philippines.

Our relations, the relations between the Philippines and the United States, are indeed different from any other relations between two countries. When, at the start of your historic journey, you said that your visit to the Philippines symbolizes the links and commitments of America to Asia, we took it as an affirmation that such a commitment to the peace of the world has not diminished, arising out of any changes in perceptions brought about by recent events.

The United States, in times past, has opened and adjusted its perspectives on Asia and the Pacific, but the American response to any changed situation has always been the improvement of the quality of relations with its Pacific and Asian allies.

We are encouraged, too, by the fact that the political leadership of America has often initiated the basic policy that if there be any changes and adjustments so by any of your allies, we will find America flexible.

Not only the occurrences in Viet-Nam, but the aspirations of the new nations of Asia, seem to have brought about a changed situation which challenges the historic commitment of the United States to the peace and stability of the region. All the new nations of Asia, ours included, now seek to fulfill a belated appointment with modernization.

All these nations now attempt to confront and change the conditions that have converted them into spawning grounds for conflict, dependent upon foreign assistance and susceptible to internal strife and, worst of all, foreign intervention.

We seek a new basis for order, for harmony, and for cooperation; and what we seek we seem to see symbolized in your leadership and in your effort at establishing a climate of global peace. For this we extend to you congratulations on behalf of our people and on behalf of the leadership of Asia.

The visit of any American President to Asia and, more particularly, to the Philippines, has often generated within the framework of our relationship great expectations.

We in the Philippines, Mr. President, see in your visit a similar and historic relation to those of your predecessors and also see in it the response of America to these new challenges of the new situation in Asia.

We have watched with admiration your efforts to establish this climate throughout the world, which would insure safety for each and every one. We think we understand the vision which has prompted you to go through this global itinerary that has brought you to many continents.

Your visit to Asia seems to be in this direction. By this visit you have raised to a new stage the program—the effort to build a new international order—and confirmed our faith that Asia retains and enjoys up to now a high priority in the American purpose abroad.

But, beyond the broader significance of your visit to the American links to the future of Asia is its significance to us; for it is of great moment to the Philippines. You come at a time when we seek readjustment of our relations. You come at a time when we must convert the weaknesses of such relations into areas of strength.

Again, we are encouraged by the candor and the generosity of spirit and of the mind with which you deal with these subjects.

We in the Philippines, Mr. President, are engaged in an earnest effort of social transportation, economic development, political modernization, and like any small developing country, of course we are sensitive to sovereignty, independence, dignity, national identity.

We seek to broaden our contacts with the world and yet we do not intend to diminish the ties that have sustained us for many generations, including the ties with the United States.

We seek to establish a self-reliant nation, hopefully strong in its defense and prosperous in its economy.

When we welcomed you this afternoon, Mr. President, I said, America's destiny is that, while she alone may not be able to solve the problems of the world, certainly there is no serious problem of the world that can be solved without America.

This is the burden of the American people, and this is the weight of responsibility upon your shoulders. We, the Filipino people, do not intend to add to your burdens. It is our hope that we shall be able to carry our own weight and contribute, no matter how modestly, to the solution of the problems that confront the world and America.

As it is that while we pursue our programs for economic development and for security, we do not seek any special advantages, but certainly we hope that we shall not be disadvantaged by the special positions of other trading nations.

If by virtue of any arrangements of treaties there should be deliveries to our country of foreign equipment and technology, we seek arrangements and understandings wherein we shall so build our capability that in the future this will render obsolete and unnecessary farther and future deliveries of military aid to our people.

If there is any valid and noble contribution that the United States can make to the small developing countries of Asia, perhaps it is the development of the indigenous capabilities of these nations in order that they may meet any threat to their security with honor and dignity.

Yes, Mr. President, it is our dream to establish a country that is self-reliant. It is our hope that as we do so, we can, with this same self-reliance, say our strongest and most dependable ally is still the United States; for our treaties of security we do not interpret to mean, nor is it the policy of our government, to call upon American foot soldiery to come to defend our soil.

It shall be the firm result of our government and of our people that we shall defend our own soil with our own troops. It is the firm resolve of the political leadership of this country and of our people that we shall so strengthen ourselves by the exercise of political will that we shall be able to meet any internal or external threat. In this manner do we see, can we contribute to the solution of the problems of the world and lessen the burdens of our ally and partner, the United States of America.

If we believe in the commitments of the

United States, it is not because America has not suffered any setbacks, for it has. But it is because whatever be those setbacks the new leaders have always sought to enrich and renew such commitments.

We see in your leadership, Mr. President, the constancy of such commitments, and the vigor of the American imagination to meet the complex problems that threaten the lives of nations and the survival of humanity itself.

We have listened to you. We have watched you. And you have proved this with your words and with your actions and shown the quality of the energy that you have imparted to this great endeavor.

It is therefore with great affection that we say, Mr. President, we, the Filipino people, pray for your success.

So, ladies and gentlemen, I now request you to join me, to rise and join me in a toast to the continued success and health of the President of the United States of America, the prosperity of the American people, and the strengthening friendship between the United States and the Philippines.

Toast by President Ford

President Marcos, Mrs. Marcos, distinguished guests, honored friends: I come to the Philippines at the end of a strenuous but very exciting journey. Two nations once regarded as distant but with the modern means of transportation are now our neighbors in a new and interdependent world.

On the way home, I have stopped here to visit America's old and very dearest friend and to be exposed to the very gracious and the world-renowned Philippine hospitality which is not exceeded in any place in the world.

Throughout this trip, we have been most graciously welcomed and warmly received; but the experience this afternoon, Mr. President, driving from the airport to the palace, was an exhilarating, unbelievable experience. To see the many, many traditions, the songs, the gowns, the actions of all of your people was a great experience. It showed a great diversity in your society, but it reminded me

of something I learned in Sunday school a good many years ago.

My then Sunday school teacher told me that the beauty of Joseph's coat was its many colors. So I say to you in the Philippines, the strength of your nation is its diversity, which has been woven into a strength that will forever be a pillar for your great country.

Mr. President, throughout this trip I have observed an international sense of community, a shared commitment to peace and a better life for all peoples. I found a common determination to have the leaders of the world, the leaders of the nations, to chart their own courses, to shape their own character. And I saw a growing awareness that this determination of individuals and of nations to be independent and self-reliant is a constructive force in the world in which we live today.

It encourages the sense of respect for oneself and for others. And that is the basis of a real community of nations in the world in which we live.

Today in the Philippines I find something far more. Our two nations have a most unique history of shared experiences and similarity of outlook. We have both known the pain of war.

President Marcos and myself are only two out of many, many thousands in both nations who fought together in earlier years, one in the forests and fields of Luzon and the other on the waters of the Philippine Sea.

As individuals and as nations, however, we have both tasted the bitterness of defeat, the satisfaction of joint devotion to a common goal, and the lesson that victory once achieved is only the beginning of a new challenge.

We have already observed the common determination of people throughout Asia and the rest of the world to achieve a more satisfying life. That determination is shared by you in the Philippines and by us in the United States.

We have learned as nations to recognize that we need not all be identical to survive. We have learned that we need to only treat

one another, different or similar as we may be, in a spirit of generosity and mutual benefit and respect.

This spirit which our nations share is the essence of real hospitality. It is one of the very special elements that strengthens our sense of common interests in each other's security and well-being. In that spirit, Mr. President, let me offer a toast to you, to Mrs. Marcos, to the people of the Philippines, and to the mutual respect and sense of community that unite us as two great republics.

JOINT COMMUNIQUE ISSUED AT MANILA, DECEMBER 7

Weekly Compilation of Presidential Documents dated December 15

During the visit of President and Mrs. Gerald R. Ford at the invitation of President and Mrs. Ferdinand E. Marcos, the two Presidents welcomed the opportunity to renew the bonds of friendship between their two nations and to review the status of their alliance in the light of changing circumstances in the Pacific region.

They affirmed that sovereign equality, territorial integrity and political independence of all states are fundamental principles which both countries scrupulously respect.

They confirmed the mutual respect for the dignity of each nation which characterizes their friendship as well as the alliance between their two countries.

The two Presidents discussed the measures which they agreed were desirable to enhance their relations, and to adjust them to current conditions and needs.

In the field of economic and commercial relations, they agreed that it was timely to conclude negotiations on a new agreement on trade, investment and related matters as a means to enhance economic cooperation between the two countries. This agreement would modernize the terms for conducting economic and commercial relations, taking account of the end of the Laurel-Langley agreement and giving due consideration to the requirements for the development of the Philippine economy. The Philippine Government stressed its urgent desires regarding United States tariff treatment for such significant Philippine products as mahogany and coconut oil.

In the field of security cooperation, they declared that the alliance between the United States and the Philippines is not directed against any country, but is intended to preserve the independence and promote the welfare of their two peoples, while at the same time contributing to peace and progress to all.

They considered that the treaty of August 30, 1951 enhanced the defense of both countries, strengthened the security of the Pacific region, and contributed to the maintenance of world peace. They agreed that the military bases used by the United States in the Philippines remain important in maintaining an effective United States presence in the Western Pacific in support of these mutual objectives.

They agreed that negotiations on the subject of United States use of Philippine military bases should be conducted in the clear recognition of Philippine sovereignty. The two Presidents agreed that there should be an early review of the steps necessary to conclude the negotiations through the two panels already organized for that purpose.

President Marcos explained his efforts to attain self-reliance for the Philippines and his policy not to allow introduction of foreign ground troops into

the Philippines for its defense except as a last resort. President Ford expressed support for these realistic policies and to this end indicated that the United States intended to continue to provide assistance to the Philippines within the framework of available resources.

The two Presidents reaffirmed their commitment to continue close association on all matters of mutual concern. They concluded that the ties between the Philippines and the United States remain strong and mutually beneficial.

President Ford thanked President Marcos for the magnificent hospitality extended to him and Mrs. Ford. President Marcos accepted President Ford's invitation to make a return visit to the United States at a mutually convenient time.

MANILA, December 7, 1975.

Secretary Kissinger's News Conference at Peking December 4

Weekly Compilation of Presidential Documents dated
December 15

Secretary Kissinger: Let me summarize what has gone on, and let me draw some conclusions.

There are three aspects of our relationship. There is the attitude of both the People's Republic and the United States toward international affairs. Secondly, there is the problem of the normalization of relations, and thirdly, there are the various bilateral arrangements that exist in such fields as trade, culture, and scientific exchanges.

As has been pointed out in all of the toasts and all of the public statements, the basic concern of both sides—what has brought us together and what has sustained the relationship—is the perception of the international environment, and the greater part of our conversations here concerned the international situation.

With respect to normalization, the Shanghai communique committed the United States to complete the process of normalization. This has been reaffirmed by the President here, both in public statements and toward the leaders of China.

With respect to the bilateral relationships, we have agreed to pursue them, and we will be improving them, and they will be improved steadily in the channels appropriate for them; that is to say, trade in the trade channels and the others in the channels that are appropriate.

There has been a great deal of speculation that relations between the People's Republic and the United States have cooled. This is not the perception of the United States, and I am confident it is not the perception of the Chinese leaders. We believe that the relations between the United States and the People's Republic of China are good, and we are confident that they will be improved steadily in the months and years ahead.

We reviewed the global situation in considerable detail, both in the talks between the President and the Vice Premier as well as in the rather searching and detailed talks that took place between Chairman Mao and the President.

While obviously there are some differences, there are also many common approaches, and the talks were extremely useful in enabling the leaders of both sides to under-

stand the perceptions of the other and to see where parallel policies can be pursued.

With respect to the process of normalization, there is really little to add to what has already been said in the Shanghai communique and to the fundamental statements which were made there, except to confirm that direction again.

As for trade exchanges, as I have said, they will be continued and developed in the forums that are appropriate for them.

We are very satisfied with the visit. We think the talks have been constructive. The atmosphere has been excellent. I was sometimes shaken when I read some accounts of the "local residents," but I was reassured again when I went to the meetings. So the atmosphere was good and the talks were, as I said, extremely useful.

I think with this, I would rather get to your questions and see what more I can say that is more specific.

I would like to mention one thing. During the course of today the Vice Premier, in conversation with the President this morning, responded to some requests we had made to the People's Republic over a period of months with respect to individuals that have been missing in action in or near China over the last decade, and we received some detailed information with respect to some of the requests that have been made and also information about the remains of two missing in action.¹

Obviously we will want to notify the next of kin, but we appreciate very much this gesture by the People's Republic.

Q. Will any of them turn up alive, Dr. Kissinger?

Secretary Kissinger: No. We are talking about two bodies and information about several others. The bodies will be returned.

Q. How many others?

Secretary Kissinger: I think the information concerned eight people all together.

Q. You will release information on the two dead?

¹ See p. 933.

Secretary Kissinger: Yes. As soon as the families are notified, we will release that information.

Q. How soon will they be notified?

Secretary Kissinger: Within the next 48 hours.

Q. What was the total?

Secretary Kissinger: Seven—two dead, five missing.

Q. If the 1972 visit by President Nixon was the week that changed the world, how would you characterize this one?

Secretary Kissinger: In 1972 we established a new relationship, and in 1975 the problem was to fit that relationship and to elaborate that relationship in an existing architecture. It therefore obviously, by definition, could not have the character of a new departure; but it is now a more mature relationship in which one now does not discuss how to begin, but how in the present international environment the United States and the People's Republic of China can pursue parallel policies where their interests converge.

Q. Can you, Dr. Kissinger, give us any examples to itemize this very last remark you have made, sir?

Q. May we have the question again, sir?

Secretary Kissinger: The question is, whether I could give examples of where we have parallel policies.

I would think that the U.S. perception and the Chinese perception of the importance of European unity and European cooperation and European cooperation with the United States would be one. I think the perception of both countries about their relationship with Japan would be very similar, and in many other parts of the world, there would be, as I said, parallel conceptions.

I just wanted to give some examples.

Q. Would you reject the suggestion that the parallel policies seem to converge primarily on a mutual fear of what the Soviet Union might be doing?

Secretary Kissinger: I would say that the parallel policies consist, or the parallel views consist, of the perceptions of what is needed to maintain world peace and equilibrium.

Q. Mr. Secretary, how much of the time that you spent negotiating with Chinese leaders was spent on the subject of U.S.-Soviet détente, and could you give us some information about what the Chinese were requesting of the United States and how the United States responded?

Secretary Kissinger: I do not interpret—first of all, the Chinese did not request anything of the United States with respect to détente, and we did not request anything of the People's Republic of China. The Chinese, as is known from their public statement—actually it cannot be avoided in their public statements—have some very firm views of the nature of the threat that they believe the world faces.

We are not as convinced of the inevitability of war. But should the Chinese interpretation be correct, and should there be military expansion, I believe that the United States would see the problem quite similarly.

The United States is opposed to military expansion, and were it to happen, the United States—as our whole record in the postwar period makes clear for 30 years—would resist it. We believe that we have an obligation to our people, to our allies, to seek to improve international relations.

But we have always made clear that we will not do so at the cost of vital interests or that we will not buy time by sacrificing other countries. So I think we can let the future determine whose prediction was right.

Not much time was spent on this. The statements of both sides have spoken for themselves; but it is not a contentious issue, and it is not one in which either side is trying to convince the other to adopt its preferred policy.

Q. Mr. Secretary, could you specify what other subjects the Chinese were interested in, besides impressing upon us the unwisdom of détente?

Secretary Kissinger: I would have to say that in the conversations that took place—you all heard the toast of the Vice Premier the first night. Beyond that statement, there was no other formal statement of this point of view.

There were obviously discussions—there have to be discussions when you talk about the world situation—about the Soviet role in various parts of the world. There was a great deal of discussion, as I said, on Europe, and indeed on each area of the world, but the debate about détente was not a central feature of the discussions.

Q. Did the Chinese discuss the new U.S. grain deal with the Soviet Union?

Secretary Kissinger: It was mentioned in passing.

Q. Were they critical of it?

Q. Question, please?

Secretary Kissinger: The question was whether the Chinese were critical of the grain deal with the Soviet Union.

I would suppose that if they were requested to sell grain, they might make a different decision; but since we are not telling the Chinese how to conduct their relations with the Soviet Union, you should not believe that the major thrust of these discussions is for either side to tell the other how they should conduct their relations with some third party.

So this was mentioned in passing as an illustration, but it was not a central feature.

Q. How much time was spent on Angola?

Secretary Kissinger: It was discussed.

Q. How much time, sir?

Secretary Kissinger: There was an analysis of the situation.

Q. Mr. Secretary, would that be an area this process of parallel interest could be included in?

Secretary Kissinger: I think it is not appropriate for me to speak for the Chinese side, but I think Angola is a question also of concern here.

Q. Mr. Secretary, how much of the time was spent in discussion of the Taiwan issue?

Secretary Kissinger: There was a review of the Taiwan issue. The Chinese side explained again its well-known position with respect to normalization. We made clear that we remain committed to the principles of the Shanghai communique and it is clear that some time will be needed to bring the process of normalization to a final conclusion but also that the process will be continued to a final conclusion.

Q. To follow that, we were told that you expected progress toward normalization, and you just mentioned this specific point. Specifically what progress was made, if any, toward normalization and with particular reference to Taiwan?

Secretary Kissinger: Of course until normalization is completed, there is always some progress still to be made. As I have said, I expect that over the months to come our relations will be improved in a number of areas. That improvement, by definition, will be a step toward normalization.

The United States—if you read the Shanghai communique, in which we stated certain expectations about our actions in the area, as tensions diminish, with respect to our troop levels, for example, we will continue that process. So I believe that the process of normalization can be said to continue.

Q. To what extent does the diplomatic position of the Chinese coincide with their public propaganda?

Secretary Kissinger: On what subject?

Q. On all subjects.

Secretary Kissinger: The question is, to what extent do the private positions coincide with their public propaganda?

Of course I do not follow the public propaganda as much as those of you who are here, and I am more familiar with the private comments; and therefore I am not a good witness on this subject.

Q. Sir, you are speaking in code words on

the subject of Taiwan. What does normalization mean? What do the Chinese expect us to do, and what is necessary before that issue can be normalized?

Secretary Kissinger: I think the Chinese have made clear that the general model that they want is something similar to the Japanese model. I think we have also made clear that it will take time for this process to mature and for certain circumstances to exist. We have pointed out our interests in a peaceful solution, in an ultimately peaceful solution to the problem.

Q. Mr. Secretary, did you have any discussion—

Secretary Kissinger: We made that clear in the Shanghai communique.

Q. —about possible U.S. assistance to the Chinese in development of their offshore oil?

Secretary Kissinger: Questions like that would be discussed in the trade channels.

Q. Did Korea come up at all?

Secretary Kissinger: Korea was discussed; but I would say our views on that subject are not identical but they are understood and we hope that both sides will exercise restraint in the Korean Peninsula.

Q. Were there policies before these meetings that seemed to be converging that are now back on what you call parallel tracks as a result of these talks, and if there were, can you be specific which ones?

Secretary Kissinger: I believe that even prior to this meeting there was a perhaps excessive emphasis on certain partial public statements, so I have never subscribed to some of the interpretations that were made, even prior to the meeting, but I would say whatever may have been the situation prior to the meeting, I maintain my position.

It is my firm impression that this is shared by our Chinese hosts, that our relations are good, and that in certain areas we will be pursuing parallel courses.

Q. Did you sense any concern on the part of the Chinese about the ability of the

American executive branch to carry out its foreign policy as planned by you and the President?

Q. Question, please?

Secretary Kissinger: The question is whether I noticed any concern on the part of our Chinese hosts in our ability to carry out our policy, or our declared policy.

I think you all will agree with me our Chinese hosts are extremely polite and they would not express such thoughts.

Q. In view of the fact so little seems to have happened here, could you explain the secretiveness over the past four days?

Secretary Kissinger: It depends on your definition of "little."

Q. Even if a good deal happened, could you explain the secretiveness on our part over the past four days?

Secretary Kissinger: We had agreed with our Chinese hosts, and we tend to follow in these matters the practices of our hosts, that the briefing should take place only at the end of the visit.

And this was appropriate because the discussions were in great detail and on a rather broad scope, and we could not have said more at the end of every day than I am saying tonight, and I think tonight we are in a better position to draw the results of it.

Q. Mr. Secretary, were there any agreements reached with the Chinese for positive actions in any field, on trade or international policy?

Secretary Kissinger: I think when the leaders of two countries review the international situation and approach a clearer understanding of what parallel interests they have, that this is bound to have practical results.

With respect to the specific issues like trade, as I pointed out, there was agreement reached to pursue those, to pursue possible intensification in the existing channels.

Q. Dr. Kissinger, I wonder if you could clarify one point, please. You talked about the Chinese making clear the Japanese posi-

tion vis-a-vis Taiwan. You said we made it clear it will take time for this process. Is that to suggest that there is some sort of calendar when the United States will break diplomatic relations with Taiwan?

Secretary Kissinger: No, there is no agreed calendar.

Q. In that respect, did our side, the American side, say anything about the fact that domestic politics, as developing over the next year, may have some delaying effect on this process?

Secretary Kissinger: Obviously all of these matters have domestic components on both sides, and both sides have to be sensitive to the—each side has to be sensitive to the necessities of the other.

Q. This is the end of the—

Q. Please finish that answer.

Secretary Kissinger: I have finished that answer.

Q. This is the end of the five-year plan. Did they speak about the next five-year plan or what it would concern?

Secretary Kissinger: Not in my hearing.

Q. Mr. Secretary, can you tell us when the decision was taken not to have a communique? Was it here or in Washington before you left?

Secretary Kissinger: The decision was taken in a preliminary way at the end of my last visit, and it was confirmed on the first day in my discussions with the Foreign Minister.

Q. Why was it decided there would be no communique?

Q. Question?

Secretary Kissinger: First of all, we have both said it in the various toasts.

Q. What was the question?

Secretary Kissinger: The question is, why was it decided to have no communique?

One reason, not necessarily in order of importance, was that the substance of what

I said here has already been said in various public statements. Secondly, we did not want to spend the time that is needed to prepare such a communique. But most importantly, since on the basic principles, especially on Taiwan, there really isn't much that can be added to what was said in the Shanghai communique as to the direction, it did not seem appropriate or worthwhile to try to find some nuances on that particular issue.

Q. Neither side seems prepared to change on the Taiwan issue. How can you say that there is hope that the relationship will in fact peacefully normalize in the future?

Secretary Kissinger: I have said this is our intention, which we have repeatedly reaffirmed in public statements, and that we will work out the modalities over time.

Q. Is there indication that either side is willing to change at all?

Secretary Kissinger: I said we will want to work this out over time.

Q. Did President Ford extend any invitation to the Chinese leaders you talked to to visit the United States?

Secretary Kissinger: They have a standing invitation, and they have reaffirmed a standing obstacle.

Q. Mr. Secretary, on the subject of Korea—

Q. What is the obstacle?

Secretary Kissinger: What is the obstacle? That they don't want to visit Washington until full normalization has been achieved.

Q. Mr. Secretary, can you elaborate on the Korean question? Was there any explicit request that the United States withdraw forces from South Korea?

Secretary Kissinger: I think the Chinese position on Korea has been stated repeatedly. I think it is clear that in the present international context, any exacerbation of the situation by either side would not serve common purposes, and we think that this is understood by both sides.

Q. Sir, in discussing the Korean question, was there a suggestion that China and the United States had a cooperative role in perhaps restraining their respective friends in the North and South?

Secretary Kissinger: I think I have pointed it out that our perceptions in Korea are not identical. What conclusion each side should draw from the need for restraint I think is for each side to determine.

If you don't let me out of here soon, I am going to be declared persona non grata. I hope you realize that.

Q. By whom?

Q. No matter how valuable an exchange of views might be, would you say this meeting amounted to an exchange of views and nothing more than that?

Secretary Kissinger: No. I would say this meeting amounted to a very detailed, to a very substantial, and in many areas very concrete discussions that went beyond an exchange of views, but given the scope of it, it is not necessarily something that can be encompassed in one document.

Q. Has the decision in fact been made now that when there will be normalization with Taiwan—I mean, normalization between Peking and Washington—that it will be conducted on the basis of the Japanese model?

Secretary Kissinger: I think that will have to be decided when the normalization in fact takes place.

Q. You suggested that before.

Secretary Kissinger: I suggested this is the Chinese position, which we understand.

Q. What do we do about the defense treaty?

Secretary Kissinger: I think China has made clear its view, and obviously, if we were prepared to answer all these questions now, we could have settled the issue right now.

Q. Dr. Kissinger, did the President indicate to the Chinese leaders that if he is still

in office in 1977, that the timing would be better toward making specific progress toward normalization?

Secretary Kissinger: The discussion did not reach that degree of concern with specific events on our domestic calendar. But as I said, both sides have to be sensitive to the domestic requirements of the other.

Q. Why does the United States disagree with the Chinese position on the inevitability of war?

Secretary Kissinger: Because we believe that war can be avoided by a combination of firmness, preparedness, and willingness to settle outstanding issues; and that is our policy.

Q. What is the date on which you are going to Moscow?

Secretary Kissinger: The decision about going to Moscow has not yet finally been made, but it will be decided within the next week or so. But there is a good chance that I will go.

Q. You said there will be some improvement—not toward normalization but some improvement in the relations between the two countries in the months to come. You mentioned broad areas like trade and cultural exchanges. Can you be a little bit more specific about what kinds of things can we expect?

Secretary Kissinger: That will still have to be worked out in detail.

Q. You said there was no coolness in the meetings. Did you discover any warmth in the speech of Mr. Teng Hsiao-p'ing to-night?

Secretary Kissinger: I think for those who understand the entire Chinese context, the requirements of the Chinese situation, and their method of expressing themselves, I believe it expressed what I have stated: the Chinese commitment to good relations to the United States.

I am confident our Chinese hosts, if you

are in contact with them, will confirm this.

Q. Mr. Teng devoted only one sentence of his toast to the talks. There is only one sentence in that toast in which he devoted himself to the talks.

Secretary Kissinger: I have not counted the number of sentences that the President devoted to the talks, and I have not analyzed what Mr. Teng said with that care. I can only tell you what our impression is, an impression which we took—obviously, since we are briefing here in China—we took some care to check with our Chinese hosts, and I am confident what I have said here reflects a view that will not be disputed.

Q. Before the trip you said Soviet-American relations were not a bar to better relations with China. Do you still feel that way?

Secretary Kissinger: I still feel that way, yes. Any more than we will permit—when we are in Moscow, we do not discuss our relations with China. But I would maintain what I have said.

Q. Is there anything more you can tell us about President Ford's meeting with Chairman Mao—that is, both as to attitude and substance—and can you tell us whether he himself made any expression on the Chinese position on détente?

Secretary Kissinger: The atmosphere—this was the fifth meeting with Chairman Mao that I have had an opportunity to attend. I would describe the atmosphere as friendly and cordial. The discussions did not concern détente except in a very minimal way, in a really minimal way.

Of course I had had the benefit of the Chairman's thinking on that subject a few weeks earlier. The overwhelming part of the conversation concerned a review of the world situation, but not of American détente policy, which played a very minimal role in the discussions.

Q. Can you give us an idea of what substantive areas were discussed in that meeting?

Secretary Kissinger: It was a general review of the world situation in almost every part of the world.

The press: Thank you.

Information on Americans Missing or Presumed Dead Given by P.R.C.

Following is a statement concerning information given to President Ford on Americans missing or presumed dead in or near the People's Republic of China, which was read to news correspondents on December 5 by John H. Trattner, Deputy Director, Office of Press Relations, at Washington.

The information was given by Vice Premier Teng to President Ford on December 4. Some of you may recall that during Secretary Kissinger's visit to the People's Republic of China in November 1973, the Chinese told us that they had been carrying out investigations and searches based on the information that we had provided them up to that time, that they were continuing their investigations, and that they would let us know if they discovered anything more. Secretary Kissinger said that the Chinese have now done so and offered to return the remains of two persons. The Chinese said that procedures for the transfer are to be handled by the Chinese and American Red Cross societies at the Hong Kong-Kwangtung border. The American Red Cross has cabled the Chinese Red Cross to confirm its readiness to cooperate in such arrangements.

The information covers a total of 27 persons, 23 of whom are U.S. military personnel. The Defense Department will brief on the military personnel, which includes the two whose ashes are to be returned.

The civilians are Norman A. Schwartz and Robert C. Snoddy. They were copilot and pilot of a C-47 aircraft which crashed in the People's Republic on November 29, 1952. Mr. John Downey and George Fecteau

survived this crash and were released from China March 12, 1973, and December 13, 1971, respectively.

The information from the P.R.C. indicates that Schwartz and Snoddy were found dead and burned in the crash and that their bodies were buried on the spot. The Chinese said that owing to passage of time it is impossible to locate the bodies now.

Mr. Snoddy's home town was Roseburg, Oreg., and Mr. Schwartz's home town was Louisville, Ky.

Bill of Rights Day, Human Rights Day and Week

A P R O C L A M A T I O N ¹

As the United States of America looks forward to the two hundredth anniversary of our Nation's independence next July, it is appropriate that we pause and reflect on the principles of self-government that underlie our society and continue to nourish it.

Embodied in our great national documents—the Declaration of Independence, the Constitution and the Bill of Rights—are the imperishable ideas that all men are created equal, that they are endowed with unalienable rights of life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness, and that it is the people of the United States themselves who have ordained and established the government which serves us all.

The Founding Fathers could not foresee in detail the threats to liberty that might arise as the Republic grew, but they had the wisdom to know that threats would appear and that the people must be protected against them. When the new Constitution was being discussed in 1787, Thomas Jefferson complained in a letter to James Madison of the absence of a Bill of Rights, saying: "Let me add that a bill of rights is what the people are entitled to against every government on earth, general or particular; and what no just government should refuse, or rest on inferences."

Madison became convinced of the need for a Bill of Rights and wrote Jefferson: "The political truths declared in that solemn manner acquire by degrees the character of fundamental maxims of free government, and as they become incorporated with the National sentiment, counteract the impulses of interest and passion." In the First Congress, Madison, the principal proponent of those amendments to the Constitution known as the Bill of Rights, defended them in these words: "If they are incorporated into the

constitution, independent tribunals of justice will consider themselves in a peculiar manner the guardians of those rights; they will be an impenetrable bulwark against every assumption of power in the legislative or executive. . . ."

This has truly been our national experience. So also in the international community have we come to respect and rely on the Universal Declaration of Human Rights as a fundamental statement of principles reaffirming faith in the dignity and worth of the human person and in the equal rights of men and women as the foundation of freedom, justice and peace in the world.

On December 15 we mark the one hundred eighty-fourth anniversary of the adoption of the Bill of Rights and on December 10 we observe the twenty-seventh anniversary of the Universal Declaration. It is fitting that in 1975, which is International Women's Year, we should recognize especially the contributions of women to political and social progress and underline our commitment to remove promptly such barriers that still remain in the way of their full participation in our Nation's life.

NOW, THEREFORE, I, GERALD R. FORD, President of the United States of America, do hereby proclaim December 10, 1975, as Human Rights Day and December 15, 1975, as Bill of Rights Day. I call upon the American people to observe the week beginning December 10, 1975, as Human Rights Week. Further, I urge all Americans during the coming bicentennial year to contemplate the principles of liberty and justice enunciated in the Bill of Rights and the Universal Declaration of Human Rights and to draw on them as the best means to assure our Nation's continued progress.

IN WITNESS WHEREOF, I have hereunto set my hand this fifth day of November, in the year of our Lord nineteen hundred seventy-five, and the Independence of the United States of America the two hundredth.

GERALD R. FORD.

Congressional Documents Relating to Foreign Policy

94th Congress, 1st Session

Peace and Stability in the Middle East. A report by Senator Howard H. Baker, Jr., to the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations. August 1975. 19 pp.

Portugal in Transition. A report by Senator Mike Mansfield to the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations. September 1975. 15 pp.

Export Licensing of Private Humanitarian Assistance to Vietnam. Hearing before the Subcommittee on International Trade and Commerce of the House Committee on International Relations. September 9, 1975. 46 pp.

Sale of Hawk Missiles to Jordan. Communication from the President of the United States transmitting information concerning the sale of Hawk anti-aircraft missiles to Jordan. H. Doc. 94-256. September 17, 1975. 2 pp.

To Authorize Appropriations for the Board for International Broadcasting for Fiscal Year 1976; and To Promote Improved Relations Between the United States, Greece, and Turkey, To Assist in the Solution of the Refugee Problem on Cyprus, and To Otherwise Strengthen the North Atlantic Alliance. Report of the House Committee on International Relations, together with opposing, separate, supplemental, and additional views, to accompany S. 2230. H. Rept. 94-500. September 22, 1975. 43 pp.

Welcoming Their Majesties the Emperor and Empress of Japan. Report of the House Committee on International Relations to accompany H. Con. Res. 402. H. Rept. 94-516. September 25, 1975. 2 pp.

Impact of Russian Grain Purchases on Retail Food and Farm Prices and Farm Income in the 1975 Crop Year. A study prepared for the use of the Joint Economic Committee by G. E. Brandow, professor of agricultural economics, Pennsylvania State University. September 29, 1975. 8 pp.

Winds of Change: Evolving Relations and Interests in Southeast Asia. A report by Senate Majority Leader Mike Mansfield to the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations. October 1975. 47 pp.

¹ No. 4408; 40 *Fed. Reg.* 51617.

U.S. Discusses Human Rights in South Africa

Following is a statement made in plenary session of the U.N. General Assembly by U.S. Representative Clarence M. Mitchell, Jr., on November 28.

The U.S. delegation has voted in the plenary Assembly as it did in the Special Political Committee on the draft resolutions before us relating to the discussion on the item "Policies of apartheid of the Government of South Africa."¹

On October 23, 1975, when speaking on behalf of my government before the Special Political Committee on the subject of apartheid, I made the following statement:

The United States deplores the detention of persons whose only act is outspoken opposition to the system of apartheid. The South African Government is courting disaster when such repressive measures have the effect of closing off all avenues for peaceful change.

Prime Minister Vorster of South Africa has called the first sentence of that quoted portion of my speech a "downright lie." He has also called for the name of just one individual in South Africa who was arrested and detained only because of his outspoken opposition to apartheid.

If the Prime Minister wants to establish credibility at the United Nations on the matter of repressive laws and policies in his country, he cannot do so by trying to narrow the issue to one point or by calling for the

name of one victim. He would be better off if he could give positive assurance that his government will stop making arrests and stop holding people on vague charges. His indignation would seem more plausible if it were accompanied by an announcement of full equality under the laws of his country for all South Africans without regard to race or color.

One useful opportunity emerges from the heated response of the Prime Minister. At last he has shown that he is paying attention to the much-deserved criticism being voiced against the racial politics and policies of South Africa. Some of the members of the U.S. delegation to the United Nations have made extensive studies of South African racial policies and the method of enforcing those policies. Congressman Donald M. Fraser, a colleague of mine who is on the U.S. delegation and in Congress is a member of the Committee on International Relations in the United States House of Representatives, is deeply interested in these matters. But I wish to emphasize that in making this statement, on which he and I have had many discussions, I am speaking for the United States and on behalf of the entire U.S. delegation.

First, I want to point out that the South African Government has the form but—for over 80 percent of its people—it has little of the substance of democracy. To understand this, one should consider this brief comment. South Africa is governed by a white minority which runs the affairs of the nation through an all-white Parliament chosen by an all-white electorate. In that Parliament, the Nationalist Party, dedicated to apartheid, or separate development, has enjoyed

¹The Assembly on Nov. 28 adopted six of the resolutions recommended by the Special Political Committee in its report on agenda item 53, Policies of apartheid of the Government of South Africa (U.N. doc. A/10342). Three of the resolutions (A/RES/3411 A, 3411 B, and 3411 E) were adopted without vote; the United States abstained on three resolutions (A/RES/3411 C, 3411 D, and 3411 F).

a decisive majority since 1948. In 27 years it has introduced a system of police and administrative control of the black, colored, and Asian people who constitute 83 percent of the population. Government controls have eliminated these people's political organizations and cut off the growth of new political organizations representative of what the Nationalists euphemistically label the "non-European" or "non-white" people. Indeed, the majority party of South African's white minority has made these people political non-persons by forbidding even their participation in the affairs of the white political parties. They are permitted political activity only in the tightly circumscribed segregated bodies existing on sufferance of the white South African Parliament.

In 1948, when the Nationalists came to power, the Constitution entrenched only a limited privilege of vote for the colored and equality of the English and Afrikaans languages. A little over a decade later, the Nationalists deprived the colored of the vote, and today only the two white languages enjoy constitutional protection. Thus the judiciary of South Africa has no constitutional basis on which to protect the individual against violations of internationally recognized human rights, such as freedom of movement, freedom of expression, freedom from arbitrary arrest and detention, and—it goes without saying—freedom from discrimination on the basis of race or color.

Moreover, although its supporters say that it enjoys a fine old tradition of independence and integrity, the South African judiciary has repeatedly been frustrated in the exercise of that tradition which its supporters attribute to it. Judgments giving the benefit of the doubt to liberty and freedom have been overruled by express legislative amendment. The judiciary itself has also changed with the new appointments made by the Nationalists.

In any society it is possible for law enforcement agencies to pervert just laws by using them for repressive purposes. Being aware of that possibility, my own country has established safeguards in our Constitu-

tion and laws to guard against acts which officials might use to deprive persons of their rights. While I do not pretend that we are perfect in that respect, I am pleased to say that these important laws exist and are enforced, and I am proud that I have played a part in getting some of these laws enacted. I have spent 30 years of my life in that kind of activity, and I am pleased to say that we have written into the lawbooks of the Government of the United States legislation that protects the rights not only of blacks and other racial groups but also of people who might be discriminated against because of their language origin, sex, or religion. We have written those laws because we know that, human frailty being what it is, it is necessary to establish the great safeguards that we have put in our Constitution and to continue to undergird those safeguards with appropriate and current legislation.

On the other hand, in South Africa the laws are written to repress and stifle free expression or lawful activity to change such statutes. Thus, while there is abundant evidence of repressive acts by those who enforce the law in that country, it must be remembered that what these officials do is sanctioned by the law instead of being prohibited. For that reason it is important that some statement be made about the nature of South African laws and the policies that implement those laws.

The South African system of detention and repression is built into the legal structure of that country itself. There is a system of political laws, which are designed to stifle and intimidate political opposition—laws which make criminal acts which are not criminal in any free society. Indeed, such acts as form the rough give-and-take that is the lifeblood of democracy are considered criminal in South Africa.

The statutes employed to stifle opposition to South Africa's racial policy are numerous. These include the so-called Suppression of Communism Act; the so-called Terrorism Act; the Bantu Administration Act; the Unlawful Organizations Act; the Public

Safety Act; the Criminal Law Amendment Act; the Riotous Assembly Act; the General Law Amendment Act (No. 76 of 1962), section 21 (also known as the Sabotage Act); the General Law Amendment Act (No. 37 of 1963), section 17 (also known as the 90-day law); the Criminal Procedure Act (No. 56 of 1955), section 215 *bis* (also known as the 180-day law); and the General Law Amendment Act (No. 62 of 1966), section 22, which is a detention law for Namibia.

Consider the so-called Suppression of Communism Act. This act, together with its complement, the Unlawful Organizations Act, is one of the most important elements employed by the South African Government to limit individual opposition to apartheid and to destroy political organizations which oppose apartheid. It seeks to conceal its real nature by drawing on the emotional response attached to the term "Communist."

The act starts out by declaring the South African Communist Party to be an unlawful organization. It then authorizes the State President to declare unlawful organizations other than the Communist Party if he is satisfied that those organizations engage in activities which are calculated to further the achievement of any of the objectives referred to in the statute's definition of communism. That definition includes any doctrine or scheme "which aims at bringing about political, industrial, social or economic change within the Republic by the promotion of disturbance or disorder." Thus all that is necessary for a political organization to be declared illegal is that the State President be satisfied that it aims at bringing about change through disorder or disturbance. No definition of "disturbance" or "disorder" is given. Because no definition exists, the police have full discretion. As a result, even passive resistance campaigns and sit-ins can be, and have been, treated as disturbances, and thus declared "communistic."

It should be noted that no judicial process is necessary to make the political activity of any organization illegal. All that is necessary is that the State President issue a proclamation. In the case of *South African Defence*

and Aid Fund vs. Minister of Justice, the Appellate Division held that the organization has no right to be heard at any stage. And I might add that in that unhappy decision the court said that, while there might be certain provisions that would require that a committee submit a report, actually those who made the decision could go outside the committee's report in order to justify what they would do under that law.

Once an organization has been declared illegal, there are far-reaching penalties imposed upon it and its members. For the organization, its legal life is ended, and its property is vested in a liquidator appointed by the Minister. After debts are paid, any surplus is given to charitable and scientific organizations designated by the Minister.

When an organization has been declared unlawful, the liquidator may compile a list of persons who were, whether before or after the commencement of the act, office bearers, officers, members, or active supporters of the organization. An individual has only 12 months to institute judicial proceedings to get himself removed from the list. It is up to him to prove that "he neither knew nor could reasonably have been expected to know that the purpose or any of the purposes of the organization were of such a nature or that it was engaged in such activities as might render it liable to be declared an unlawful organization." Thus, purely by administrative action, not only the organization but the individual as well is found guilty and is put to the expense of an unpromising attempt to clear himself.

On the basis of this listing, the individual may be prohibited from joining an organization of any type specified by the Minister. There is a blanket prohibition against belonging to any organization "which in any manner propagates, defends, attacks, criticizes, or discusses . . . any . . . policy of the Government of a state." I have quoted this from paragraph 2 of part II of the annexure to Government notice 2130.

The act further restricts the individual's civil liberties by making it a crime to record, reproduce, print, publish, or disseminate

nate any statement made by a listed person. A listed person is almost without exception disqualified from practice as an advocate, attorney, or notary. It is a criminal offense for a listed person to change his residence without giving notice to the police. He is disqualified from holding various elective offices and commits a criminal offense if he accepts nomination for election. I repeat that: He commits a criminal offense if he accepts nomination for election.

Thus, in a variety of ways, a net of new criminal offenses is thrown around the individual. Without trial he is precluded from participating in political life.

The act does more than create new political crimes and treat individuals unjustly. It serves the general and more basic purpose of discouraging, as both dangerous and futile, all political criticism of the system.

The system of apartheid includes not only this system of political repression; it includes also, as one of its elements, a *system* of detention. Detention is so thoroughly a part of South African life that it is impossible to imagine apartheid without it.

In my original statement, I spoke of the detention of opponents of apartheid, but there is an even more basic form of detention which is the heart of the apartheid system. It requires no act and is not conditioned on any belief. It applies to South Africans who are black, simply because they are black. It is carried out through the operation of the notorious pass laws which restrict the freedom of movement of black South Africans. They require that every black South African carry, at all times, a pass which specifies the one place in South Africa where the black is allowed to be, to remain, to reside, and to work. Failure to carry the pass or contravention of the terms of the pass are criminal offenses. It is as though one were restricted forever to a specified place merely because one had been born there. Even married couples from different areas are not permitted to live together without special permission.

The pass laws aside, there are several different forms of detention in South Africa,

and these result in various classes of detainees. There are:

—First, those who are under banning orders, including house arrest;

—Secondly, those who are being detained without charges; and

—Thirdly, those who have been charged and are either awaiting trial or serving sentences.

Banning orders are issued under the so-called Suppression of Communism Act. They vary in form and degree. The most severe are those which include 24-hour house arrest. They may be less severe and permit movement within a particular neighborhood or district. They restrict the person from attending any gathering of more than two persons, whether of a political or a purely social nature; in other words, a man could not meet with his wife and his mother-in-law, because that would involve three, not two, persons. They may further restrict his right to engage in various occupations. They often result in loss of employment. As we have seen, banning orders are imposed without trial. Their intent is to restrict the freedom of movement and political participation of individuals who are political opponents of the régime. They are applied to people against whom the government can prove no offense as well as to those political prisoners who have been convicted and have completed their sentences. Violation of these orders itself constitutes a crime and may result in imprisonment.

A typical banning order starts with these words:

Whereas I (followed by the Minister's name) the Minister of Justice, am satisfied that you engage in activities which are furthering or may further the achievement of the objects of communism, I hereby . . . prohibit you . . . from . . .

What follows is a long list of prohibitions which force the individual to choose between abstention from all political activity and violation of South African law. Let me make it clear at this point that, in criticizing the arbitrary use of banning orders, I am not implying support for any ideology but,

rather, pointing out that all opponents of apartheid have their basic freedoms abridged without due process of law.

The most recent information published in the South African Government Gazette of July 11, 1975, lists banned persons by name. I have the list annexed to my text, but it would take too long to read it. Those of you who have received the printed document will also have those names.²

The second category of detainees are those who are actually held by government authorities but who are not charged with any offense. Most of those detainees are held under section 6 of the Terrorism Act. Section 6 of the Act provides for indefinite detention incommunicado of persons believed to be terrorists or to have information about terrorism.

Terrorism is defined in the act in terms broad enough to include as terrorist acts any of a variety of peaceful protests against state policy. Thus section 2(2) states that if it is proved that the accused committed an act which had or was likely to have results such as the obstruction of traffic, the hindrance of administration of the affairs of state, or "to cause, encourage or further feelings of hostility between white and other inhabitants of the Republic," then the accused shall be presumed to have committed "such act with intent to endanger the maintenance of law and order in the Republic, unless it is proved beyond a reasonable doubt that he did not intend any of the results aforesaid." Section 2(1) makes any such act committed with intent a "terroristic act."

To understand the awful implications of that, imagine leaving this building late in the evening when there is a terrific traffic jam. Let us suppose that some taxi driver obstructs the traffic so that it cannot move. If such a law existed in this country, that taxi driver would have to prove that he did not do

that for the purpose of creating a disturbance and obstructing the affairs of government. Thus, acts ranging from the writing of poetry about the suffering of blacks under apartheid—I know some poets have written some awful poetry, but I do not think they should be put in jail for it—to engaging in hunger strikes or carrying out a peaceful sit-in may be described as acts of terrorism.

If a person is believed to have information about such acts of so-called "terrorism," section 6 not only provides for unlimited detention but specifies that the person may be arrested without a warrant and then explicitly states that "no court of law shall pronounce upon the validity of any action taken under this section, or order the release of any detainee."

Finally, and this may explain Mr. Vorster's challenge to name names, section 6(6) states that:

No person, other than the Minister or an officer in the service of the state acting in the performance of his official duties, shall have access to any detainee, or shall be entitled to any official information relating to or obtained from any detainee.

In other words, only the law enforcement people can see them and only the law enforcement people can get the information.

It is interesting to note that an exchange between Mrs. Helen Suzman, a member of the House of Assembly of the Republic of South Africa, and the Minister of Police in that country gives enlightening details on how the detention system works. The colloquy is printed in the weekly edition of February 8, 1974, of the House of Assembly debates on pages 34 to 38.

In response to questions, the Minister of Police revealed that during 1973, 69 males and 13 females were arrested and detained under Regulation 19 of Proclamation R.17 of 1972. Those persons were held for periods ranging from 1 to 92 days. Most of them were held for periods of 20 to 65 days. Of those held, only 27 were charged with any offense. For these, the charges were contravention of regulations 3 and 11 of Proclamation R.17 of 1972. According to the Minister, 26 of the 27 were convicted.

² A list of persons under banning orders as published in South African Government Gazette, July 11, 1975—26 blankes/whites and 122 nie-blankes/non-whites—was attached to the prepared text of Mr. Mitchell's statement (USUN press release 162 dated Nov. 28).

At another point in the exchange, the Minister gave a racial breakdown of the number of persons detained during the period March 1, 1973, to December 31, 1973. Of these, 49 were white, 16 were Asians, 34 were coloreds, and 117 were what South Africa calls Bantu. I think I should note in an aside that since this group includes whites, Asians, coloreds, and what they call Bantu, that apparently is about the only case in which the Government of South Africa does not discriminate; it will arrest anybody without regard to race, creed, or national origin. These were detained under section 13 of the Abuse of Dependence-Producing Substances and Rehabilitation Act. The period of detention lasted from 1 day to 113 days, with most of those arrested being held from 5 to 50 days.

The Suzman questioning also revealed that in 1969, 26 persons were detained under the South African Proclamation No. 400 of 1960. Twenty-two of these persons were held for periods ranging from 2 to 125 days and then released without charge. Four were charged after being detained from 56 to 103 days. The record does not show whether any of those four were ever convicted of anything.

On May 27, 1975, Mrs. Suzman asked the Minister of Police: "whether any persons detained in September 1974 in terms of Section 6 of the Terrorism Act, as a result of investigations in connection with meetings planned in support of the Frelimo Movement of Mozambique, are still in detention . . . if so, how many?" The Minister replied, yes, but he was not permitted to disclose that information.

Mrs. Suzman then asked: "whether any of the persons detained have been charged; if so (a) with what offenses?" The Minister said that they had been charged. Mrs. Suzman asked "with what offenses?" And the Minister said "contravention of Section 2 of the Terrorism Act." She said, "when were they so charged?" And he said "January 31, 1975." Section 2, of course, is a blanket section that they use as a kind of net to catch almost everyone. He then indicated that there were 12 persons who were being so held.

Mrs. Suzman then asked: "whether any of them have not been charged and are in detention in terms of other legal provisions; if so (a) how many, and (b) in terms of what legal provisions?" The Minister of Police responded: "I am not prepared to disclose this information." This police power to arrest people without charge, to hold them in detention for six months or a year, goes unchecked, and the police are responsible, I presume, only to their superiors as regards disclosing reasons why they act or whether those acts are justified.

On October 23, 1975, the Rand Daily Mail, one of the great newspapers of South Africa, commented as follows:

Eight more Terrorism Act arrests during the past week have been reported. Are these all the arrests that have taken place? Why is there this continuing series of arrests? Why are people disappearing for days or up to a year and then being released without trial or explanation? How can anyone having concern for the welfare of our country countenance the official silence?

With respect to those individuals who have been detained without charge, it is not the responsibility of the United States to prove that the detainees are innocent of any wrongdoing. On the contrary, we stand behind their right to be presumed innocent, with the burden of proving guilt resting on the state.

The situation is only too clear. The South African Government holds these individuals. The South African Government knows their names. It is South African Government laws which countenance official secrecy. It is South African officials who refuse to divulge this information. It is the South African system which operates under a shroud of secrecy.

After Prime Minister Vorster's statement, the Cape Times, a respected South African newspaper, in its lead editorial for November 3, 1975, said that the controversy over my statement:

. . . illustrates how indefensible the present system of detention is in South Africa. The fact is that unless Mr. Vorster is prepared to reveal reasons for detentions, he will be unable to answer convincingly the United States Government charge that people are

detained whose only act is outspoken opposition to apartheid. To term this a "downright lie" as Mr. Vorster has, might sound impressive for domestic consumption, but it is not really satisfactory.

He did not convince that newspaper and he did not convince me either.

The editorial concluded:

For a start, Mr. Vorster should abolish the iniquitous Terrorism Act if he wants to deal effectively with the U.S. charge. The act provides for indefinite detention incommunicado and without trial, on the mere say-so of a police officer. There are no effective judicial reviews or guarantees. While the system remains on the statute books, charges such as the recent U.S. delegate's remarks in the U.N. will persist; and they cannot be answered convincingly. South Africa, moreover, will remain in the dubious company of countries which bypass the due process of law as part of the ordinary routine.

There is a third category of detainees: those who have actually been charged with criminal offenses and are either awaiting trial or have been sentenced and are now in prison.

We must examine these cases within the unique South African context.

As we have seen, there exists a series of laws that are designed and are consistently used to stifle political opposition. Individuals may be convicted under these laws for performing acts which would not constitute criminal behavior in a free society. Within this category I include violation of the bans restricting the individual's right to exercise traditional political freedoms, such as writing and speaking on matters of public policy. The so-called Suppression of Communism Act makes it a crime to publish anything said or written by a banned person. The Gatherings and Demonstrations Act authorizes the Minister of Justice, at his own discretion, to prohibit demonstrations or meetings, however peaceful and otherwise law abiding, in any area he designates, for as long as he designates. Violations of such prohibitions may carry criminal penalties.

The Publications Act of 1974, the basic censorship statute of South Africa, makes it a criminal offense to publish books and articles or to show films that are deemed "contrary to the public interest." The list of such banned books includes the works of out-

standing African writers and even includes the writings of the late civil rights leader Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr.

The Customs and Excise Act makes it a crime to bring into the country material which would be unproblematic in a free society.

There are laws restricting strikes, demonstrations, and meetings. These include the Bantu Labor Act (No. 48 of 1953), the Suppression of Communism Act, the General Law Further Amendment Act (No. 92 of 1970), section 15, the Gatherings and Demonstrations Act, the Riotous Assemblies Act (No. 17 of 1956).

In addition there are special laws designed to prevent other forms of peaceful protest. Thus, the Criminal Law Amendment Act (No. 8 of 1953) provides special, harsher penalties for any person who commits any offense, however minor, "by way of protest" or in a campaign to repeal or modify any law or affect its administration. Instead of the normal penalty originally imposed for the same offense under nonpolitical circumstances, he may be punished by special penalties, including fines, imprisonment for up to three years, and whipping. Section 2 of the same act makes it an offense to commit any act calculated to cause anyone to commit an offense by way of protest or in support of a protest campaign. Penalties include fines, up to five years in prison, and whipping. Can anyone imagine a civilized nation or a nation which claims to be civilized agreeing to have a human being stripped and flogged with a whip? But that is a part of the South African law.

In view of the underlying fact that blacks are not permitted to vote in any of the elections for those officials with the power to eliminate or alter the system of apartheid, it may safely be said that any political effort which has any realistic likelihood of mobilizing opposition to the system of apartheid will fall under one or other criminal statute in South Africa.

This has two consequences for anyone committed to democracy and human rights. First, it means that a distinction must be drawn between those acts which are only

criminal by virtue of this body of repressive legislation and acts which would be criminal in any free society. But, secondly, and more to the point, it means that the system of apartheid has made peaceful change not only criminal and thus personally dangerous, but next to impossible. This is the point I was stressing in my October 23 speech when I stated that the South African Government is courting disaster when it closes off avenues for peaceful change. No people will forever bear deprivation of the basic elements of human dignity.

The South African Government continues to employ its legislation to stifle the opponents of apartheid. At present there is an effort to destroy the unity movement among the blacks. Nine young men are charged with participation in terroristic activities. As I noted before, we must not be misled by such words as "terroristic activities." Although these young men, if convicted, will face sentences ranging from five years' imprisonment to execution, the indictment mentions no act of violence, whether against persons or property, that these individuals are even alleged to have committed. Instead, the indictment and the accompanying documents contain page after page of essays, plays, and poems written by the accused. One of the so-called "terroristic acts" is a call for business interests to withdraw investment from South Africa.

The latest information I have on this is that those individuals were indicted sometime in the summer, during the month of August, I believe. They were brought to trial recently, and indeed the trial is now going on. I further understand that there is a possibility the trial will be recessed on December 15, only to be resumed in January of next year. Therefore, in all this period, for the simple act of writing poetry and essays, for the simple act of calling for withdrawal of investment in that country, those people are languishing in jail under the threat of punishments which, as I say, range from five years' imprisonment to execution. What kind of barbarism is that?

There are several other cases which merit special attention as illustrations. A shocking example of how far the South African regime is willing to go in detaining persons for their opposition to apartheid is offered by the case of Mrs. Winnie M. and 18 other Africans who were detained under the Terrorism Act in May 1969. In February 1970 they were acquitted of all charges under the Suppression of Communism Act. After the judge left the courtroom, they were immediately surrounded by the security police, who, with guns in hand, placed them under detention once again. After several months of detention, they were recharged with the very same offenses under the Terrorism Act.

They were acquitted a second time. Within a few days they were all served with five-year banning orders. In other words, they were put on trial and acquitted, but then the police were brought in to rearrest them; they were put on trial again, acquitted a second time and then told: "Well, you can go out on the street, but you cannot move from a certain neighborhood"—which is in effect a jail without bars.

An even more shocking example of the way the apartheid system corrupts the entire fabric of South African society is the case of Robert Sobukwe. No other case better illustrates the lengths to which the South African Government will go in its efforts to suppress opposition.

Mr. Sobukwe became the President of the Pan-Africanist Congress of Azania (PAC) in 1959. In March 1960, he announced a campaign against the pass laws. That campaign involved a refusal to comply with the pass laws and also required peaceful marches to police stations, at which time the demonstrators surrendered themselves for arrest. In the instructions given to all PAC branches, Mr. Sobukwe stated: "Our people must be taught now and continuously that in this campaign we are going to observe absolute non-violence."

On March 21, 1960, Mr. Sobukwe, accompanied by about 50 supporters, marched to

the Orlando police station and presented himself for arrest. At the same time, similar marches took place in many parts of South Africa. At Sharpeville, the police opened fire on the peaceful demonstrators, killing 68 of them. Imagine it—people who had announced beforehand that they would be non-violent, and who voluntarily surrendered themselves at the police station for arrest, were fired upon, and 68 of them were killed.

Mr. Sobukwe was charged with sedition and incitement to riot. He was sentenced to three years in prison. He served that sentence from May 1960 to May 1963. But before his term was up, Prime Minister Vorster, who was then the Minister of Justice, obtained passage of the 1963 General Laws Amendment Act in Parliament. This was enacted the day before Sobukwe was released. That act states that the "Minister may, if he is satisfied that any person serving any sentence of imprisonment"—under a variety of acts—"is likely to advocate, advise, defend or encourage the achievement of any of the objects of communism, prohibit such person from absenting himself, after serving sentence, from any place or area which is or is within a prison."

This clause, widely known as the "Sobukwe clause," was used only against Mr. Sobukwe. It was extended annually for five years. Mr. Sobukwe was detained under it on Robben Island until May 13, 1969. He was then put under banning orders, which placed him under partial house arrest and restricted him to the Kimberly municipality. Those same banning orders further prohibited Mr. Sobukwe from various forms of political expression, including the preparation of any "book, pamphlet, record, list, placard, poster, drawing, photograph or picture . . . in which . . . any form of state or any principle or policy of the Government of a state is propagated, defended, attacked, criticized, discussed or referred to."

On May 23, 1970, Mr. Sobukwe applied for an exit permit. Departure from South Africa on an exit permit involves loss of citizenship and prohibition against return to

the country. He was granted that permit on March 1, 1971. However, as his banning orders restricted him to Kimberly, he was not allowed to leave. Unbelievably, the courts of South Africa have upheld that refusal to allow him to leave. At present he still resides in the Kimberly area, although his wife and children are in the United States and he has been offered a teaching position at an American university. He is still under banning orders.

To sum up, the basic facts about human rights in South Africa are clear and may be stated in two propositions:

—First, the majority of South Africans live under an oppressive government which deprives them of their basic human rights; and

—Secondly, the South African system of laws is designed and administered so as to prevent that majority from taking effective action to alter that condition of fundamental deprivation.

If the South African Government has any difficulty in accepting these two propositions, then let me extend the following challenge to them: Allow the Human Rights Commission, or any commission of internationally known and respected jurists, to conduct a full examination to determine the truth of these two propositions. Allow them access to your prisons, to your detention centers. Allow them to take testimony from the people within your control. Allow them to make a full inquiry and then let the world know the truth.

I should like now to say the following: When this great institution—the United Nations—started, we thought of it within the concept of one world. It is distressing to note that in recent times we have tended to refer to the existence of other worlds, in other words, to fracture the concept of one world. It seems to me that South Africa offers us an opportunity to remember that the desire for freedom does not exist simply in the minds of people of any one color; because in South Africa today—as I stand here

before the Assembly—there are not only blacks who are fighting against that oppressive system; there are Asians, there are white people, there are the so-called coloreds, who are also fighting against that oppressive system. In other words, it is not a struggle of black people for freedom; it is a struggle of humans for freedom. And as we move forward, as we tackle these difficult problems in South Africa and elsewhere, let us not deprive ourselves of allies and supporters by saying that we shall confine the ranks only to those who are of one specific color.

I say to the gallant people of South Africa who are struggling against that system—to the whites, to the Asians, to the coloreds, to the blacks—that there lie between us miles of ocean and that there are forces which will keep us from knowing what you are doing; but your struggles, your sufferings, your cries for freedom are heard and noted by us, and we say to you that there will come a day when a trumpet will sound and the legions of the free will resume their place in seats of power in South Africa and change that system from the odious way in which it now operates to one in which free men and women of any color or religion may walk with dignity.

U.S. Commends UNHCR Efforts on Behalf of Refugees

Following is a statement made in Committee III (Social, Humanitarian and Cultural) of the U.N. General Assembly by U.S. Representative John H. Haugh on November 17.

USUN press release 150 dated November 17

My government wishes to commend the High Commissioner for his excellent report, which covers fully the wide-ranging activities of his office during the year under review.¹ The report is a chronicle of humanitarian action in behalf of refugees, victims of persecution, throughout the world.

The refugee flees from his homeland as an individual who has been deprived of his human rights, one who has suffered personal deprivation and sorrow not of his own making. It is noteworthy that the High Commissioner directs his program of international protection and material assistance to the refugee as an individual. While UNHCR projects may involve thousands of persons, each project is geared to the succor and rehabilitation of the individual refugee. The UNHCR effort is to insure safehaven for the refugee and to work unceasingly toward the complete restoration of the refugee's hope and faith in humanity and toward his rehabilitation on the basis of self-respect and self-support. In a real sense it may be said that the High Commissioner is engaged in promoting the implementation of the lofty principles of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights in the case of every single refugee within his concern.

During the past year the High Commissioner has been active in seeking to obtain more accessions to the principal international treaties governing assistance and protection for refugees: the 1951 Convention Relating to the Status of Refugees and the 1967 Protocol Relating to the Status of Refugees. As the committee knows, these are the chief legal instruments at the service of the High Commissioner in his efforts in behalf of refugees.

Of prime importance, the convention and protocol forbid the *refoulement* or forcible return of any refugee to a country where he would face persecution. Beyond that, the convention and protocol guarantee for refugees a host of rights which are essential to enable them to become self-sufficient, to live without fear of discrimination, and to cease being refugees.

We commend the High Commissioner for his ceaseless activities in furthering the acceptance of these treaties and for promoting their effective implementation by states

¹ U.N. doc. A/10012 and add. 1, report of the U.N. High Commissioner for Refugees.

which are already parties to them. In this connection we note the subvention by the UNHCR of a worldwide project by the World Peace Through Law Center which, operating through national committees of prominent judges and lawyers in many countries, is directed to the same purposes.

My government notes with deep concern that during the year under review there were many instances of forcible repatriation of refugees. It is extremely regrettable that nations have engaged in such inhumane practice, and the more especially since prohibition of *refoulement* of refugees has become ever more firmly embedded in international law. My government wishes to stress once again the overriding importance of the High Commissioner's manifold activities under his function of providing international protection for refugees. It is difficult to overemphasize the significance to refugees of insuring liberal asylum policies and practices.

My government pledges to the High Commissioner its continuing support of his efforts to bring about the complete acceptance of article 33 of the Refugee Convention with its unequivocal prohibition against the *refoulement* of refugees "in any manner whatsoever" to territories where their life or freedom would be threatened on grounds of race, religion, nationality, membership of a particular social group, or political opinion. In this connection we point out that the General Assembly, in unanimously adopting in 1967 the Declaration on Territorial Asylum, has endorsed the concept that the granting of asylum is a peaceful and humanitarian act and should not be regarded as an unfriendly act by any state.

Last year, and previously, the High Commissioner carried out his regular worldwide material assistance program in a highly constructive and imaginative manner. It was fitting that he devoted major financial emphasis under the program to Africa and Latin America, where the needs are greatest. At the same time the High Commissioner did not neglect the refugee problems

in Europe, the Middle East, and Asia. His responses to challenges in all areas were prompt and effective and were above all characterized by humanitarian concern. We pay tribute to the High Commissioner for his constructive and realistic performance in his material assistance program.

I wish especially to draw attention to the High Commissioner's efforts in behalf of handicapped refugees. These are refugees who have social, physical, or mental disabilities which make it extremely difficult to resolve their cases in a satisfactory manner. The UNHCR has continued to devote priority attention to finding permanent solutions for these unfortunate refugees, and through relentless efforts on a case-by-case basis he has repeatedly achieved success in doing so in the face of overwhelming odds. The UNHCR program for handicapped refugees is molded in the highest humanitarian traditions of the United Nations.

My government notes with deep satisfaction that the High Commissioner has also continued to attach great importance to bringing about the successful family reunion of refugees. It is a cruel commentary on our times that many refugee families are divided because some of the members are not permitted to avail themselves of freedom of movement, a right set forth in the Universal Declaration of Human Rights. It is heartening to know that the High Commissioner continues to pursue the objective of family reunion with great energy, determination, and resourcefulness.

During the year under review the High Commissioner has faced an unusual number of challenges of problems in which, under the authority of General Assembly resolutions, the UNHCR has exercised its "good offices" in behalf of refugees who would not come within the normal, mandatory concern of the UNHCR. The so-called special programs were carried out in the Mediterranean area, Africa, and Southeast Asia.

As a prime example of the UNHCR's role in lending its good offices in this respect, I should like to cite the outstanding perform-

ance of the UNHCR as the Coordinator of U.N. Humanitarian Assistance in Cyprus. Although the refugees in Cyprus are not within the UNHCR mandate, since they are displaced within their country of nationality, the High Commissioner has here shown once again that he has unique expertise and capability to deal cogently and effectively with the problems of persons who have been uprooted from their homes. The United States believes that the presence of the UNHCR in Cyprus in charge of relief has been highly beneficial and that his performance is worthy of commendation in humanitarian terms and as conducive to tranquility and hope for successful political settlement in that country. I should like to state that the U.S. Government's contribution for humanitarian assistance in Cyprus, from the start of the operation in September 1974 through July 31, 1975, totaled \$20,772,000 out of some \$26 million received by the UNHCR from all sources.

As noted by the High Commissioner, the UNHCR is faced with a grave challenge in Thailand, occasioned by the presence in that country of over 70,000 homeless refugees of Indochinese origin, with more arriving every day. The immediate emergency relief needs of those refugees is very great. Beyond that, although many of those refugees will be remaining in Thailand, there is a compelling need to locate resettlement opportunities in third countries for large numbers of the refugees whose local integration will not prove feasible. The UNHCR has a country team in Thailand which is undertaking to cope with this problem of staggering proportions.

My government considers that the problem in Thailand is one which can only be fully and satisfactorily resolved through the effective response of the international community. My government calls upon the UNHCR to intensify his efforts to secure adequate financial contributions from governments the world over toward the basic care and resettlement of the refugees in Thailand; and of equal importance, we urge

the UNHCR to leave no stone unturned in seeking to arrange the permanent reestablishment of the refugees. The situation clearly demands high-priority action under strong UNHCR leadership, and in this connection we hope and assume that the High Commissioner in his approaches to governments will bring to bear the full measure of the prestige of his office and of the United Nations.

My government also wishes to take this opportunity to express the ardent hope that governments throughout the world will respond promptly and generously to the UNHCR's financial needs in Thailand and to the needs of the refugees for opportunities to resettle in third countries. The United States for its part has already contributed or pledged \$8.6 million to the UNHCR for the Thailand program, and over 10,000 of the refugees in Thailand have been or are being accepted for permanent resettlement in our country.

In concluding my remarks I should like to make one more point. The increased scope of the regular material assistance program (especially in underdeveloped countries) and the repeated calls upon the UNHCR to use his good offices in special situations have thrown greater and greater burdens upon the UNHCR as an organization. But these added burdens should not be allowed to impede or to infringe upon the High Commissioner's first priority: to provide effective international protection for refugees.

I make no suggestion that the protection function has been neglected by the UNHCR. The United States simply wishes to stress once again the primary importance of protection among UNHCR activities. International protection is the guarantor that refugees shall find safehaven and asylum in the first instance and that thereafter they may rebuild their lives through hope and productive energy and take their places in new societies under conditions of dignity and self-respect. These are objectives to which we can earnestly subscribe, and to which the High Commissioner has addressed himself in truly dedicated fashion.

TREATY INFORMATION

Current Actions

MULTILATERAL

Biological Weapons

Convention on the prohibition of the development, production and stockpiling of bacteriological (biological) and toxin weapons and on their destruction. Done at Washington, London, and Moscow April 10, 1972. Entered into force March 26, 1975. TIAS 8062.

Accession deposited: Greece, December 10, 1975.

Coffee

Protocol for the continuation in force of the international coffee agreement 1968, as amended and extended, with annex. Approved by the International Coffee Council at London September 26, 1974. Entered into force October 1, 1975.

Ratifications deposited: Colombia, December 1, 1975; Panama, November 19, 1975.

Accession deposited: Dominican Republic, November 20, 1975.

Notification of provisional application deposited: Haiti, September 24, 1975.

Notification that it has assumed the rights and obligations of contracting party: Papua New Guinea, October 15, 1975.

Notification of separate membership: Angola and Timor, October 10, 1975.

Instrument of acceptance signed by the President: December 8, 1975.

Diplomatic Relations

Vienna convention on diplomatic relations. Done at Vienna April 18, 1961. Entered into force April 24, 1964; for the United States December 13, 1972. TIAS 7502.

Accession deposited: People's Republic of China, November 25, 1975.

Health

Amendments to articles 34 and 55 of the Constitution of the World Health Organization of July 22, 1946, as amended (TIAS 1808, 4643, 8086). Adopted at Geneva May 22, 1973.¹

Acceptance deposited: Dahomey, November 24, 1975.

Maritime Matters

Amendment of article VII of the convention on facilitation of international maritime traffic, 1965 (TIAS 6251). Adopted at London November 19, 1973.¹

Acceptances deposited: Norway, November 10, 1975; Poland, June 3, 1975; Yugoslavia, July 11, 1975.

Amendments to the convention of March 6, 1948, as amended, on the Intergovernmental Maritime Consultative Organization (TIAS 4044, 6285, 6490). Adopted at London October 17, 1974.¹

Acceptances deposited: Cuba, November 24, 1975; Federal Republic of Germany, Thailand, December 1, 1975.

Instrument of acceptance signed by the President: December 8, 1975.

Narcotic Drugs

Single convention on narcotic drugs, 1961. Done at New York March 30, 1961. Entered into force December 13, 1964; for the United States June 24, 1967. TIAS 6298.

Accession deposited: German Democratic Republic, December 2, 1975.

Convention on psychotropic substances. Done at Vienna February 21, 1971.¹

Accession deposited: German Democratic Republic, December 2, 1975.

Program-Carrying Signals—Distribution by Satellite

Convention relating to the distribution of programme-carrying signals transmitted by satellite. Done at Brussels May 21, 1974.¹

Accession deposited: Nicaragua, December 1, 1975.

Safety at Sea

Amendments to the international convention for the safety of life at sea, 1960 (TIAS 5780). Adopted at London October 25, 1967.¹

Acceptance deposited: Oman, November 20, 1975.

Space

Convention on registration of objects launched into outer space. Opened for signature at New York January 14, 1975.¹

Signature: Pakistan, December 1, 1975.

Telecommunications

International telecommunication convention with annexes and protocols. Done at Malaga-Torremolinos October 25, 1973. Entered into force January 1, 1975.²

Accessions deposited: The Gambia, November 3, 1975; Papua New Guinea, October 31, 1975; Portugal, November 12, 1975.

Trade

Agreement on implementation of article VI of the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade. Done at Geneva June 30, 1967. Entered into force July 1, 1968. TIAS 6431.

Acceptance deposited: Australia, November 24, 1975.

¹ Not in force.

² Not in force for the United States.

BILATERAL

Canada

Agreement concerning the establishment and operation of a temporary space tracking facility in connection with Project Skylab, as amended and extended. (TIAS 7281, 7678). Effected by exchange of notes at Ottawa December 20, 1971, and February 23, 1972. Entered into force February 23, 1972. *Terminated*: November 17, 1975.

PUBLICATIONS

GPO Sales Publications

Publications may be ordered by catalog or stock number from the Superintendent of Documents, U.S. Government Printing Office, Washington, D.C. 20402. A 25-percent discount is made on orders for 100 or more copies of any one publication mailed to the same address. Remittances, payable to the Superintendent of Documents, must accompany orders. Prices shown below, which include domestic postage, are subject to change.

Background Notes: Short, factual summaries which describe the people, history, government, economy, and foreign relations of each country. Each contains a map, a list of principal government officials and U.S. diplomatic and consular officers, and a reading list. (A complete set of all Background Notes currently in stock—at least 140—\$21.80; 1-year subscription service for approximately 77 updated or new Notes—\$23.10; plastic binder—\$1.50.) Single copies of those listed below are available at 30¢ each.

France	Cat. No. S1.123:F49	
	Pub. 8209	7 pp.
Grenada	Cat. No. S1.123:G86	
	Pub. 8822	4 pp.
Rwanda	Cat. No. S1.123:R94	
	Pub. 7916	4 pp.
U.S.S.R.	Cat. No. S1.123:UN 33	
	Pub. 7842	13 pp.

U.S. Participation in the U.N. Report by the President to the Congress for the year 1974, including political and security affairs; economic, social, scientific, and human rights affairs; trusteeship and dependent areas; legal developments; and budget and administration. Pub. 8827. International Organization and Conference Series 121. 478 pp. \$4.20. (Cat. No. S1.70:8827).

Consular Relations. Convention, with agreed memorandum and exchange of letters, with the People's Republic of Bulgaria. TIAS 8067. 78 pp. 90¢. (Cat. No. S9.10:8067).

North American Air Defense Command. Agreement with Canada. TIAS 8085. 17 pp. 35¢. (Cat. No. S9.10:8085).

Constitution of the World Health Organization—Amendments to Articles 24 and 25. Adopted by the Twentieth World Health Assembly at Geneva May 23, 1967. TIAS 8086. 14 pp. 30¢. (Cat. No. S9.10:8086).

Trade in Wool and Man-Made Fiber Textile Products. Agreement with Malaysia amending and extending the agreement of September 8, 1970, as amended. TIAS 8093. 3 pp. 25¢. (Cat. No. S9.10:8093).

Agricultural Commodities. Agreement with Honduras amending the agreement of March 5, 1975. TIAS 8094. 4 pp. 25¢. (Cat. No. S9.10:8094).

Air Transport Services. Agreement with the Hungarian People's Republic amending the agreement of May 30, 1972. TIAS 8096. 5 pp. 25¢. (Cat. No. S9.10:8096).

Double Taxation—Taxes on Income. Agreement with Italy continuing application of the convention of March 30, 1955. TIAS 8097. 4 pp. 25¢. (Cat. No. S9.10:8097).

Customs Services. Agreement with the Federal Republic of Germany. TIAS 8098. 25 pp. 40¢. (Cat. No. S9.10:8098).

Fisheries—Northeastern Pacific Ocean off the United States Coast. Agreement with the Polish People's Republic. TIAS 8100. 31 pp. 45¢. (Cat. No. S9.10:8100).

Reimbursement of Income Taxes. Agreement with the International Labor Office. TIAS 8101. 3 pp. 25¢. (Cat. No. S9.10:8101).

Trade—Meat Imports. Agreement with Nicaragua. TIAS 8103. 7 pp. 30¢. (Cat. No. S9.10:8103).

Asia. A Pacific Doctrine of Peace With All and Hostility Toward None (Ford)	913
China	
Information on Americans Missing or Presumed Dead Given by P.R.C. (Department statement)	933
President Ford Visits the Pacific Basin (Ford, Marcos, Teng, texts of U.S.-Indonesia and U.S.-Philippines joint communiques)	916
Secretary Kissinger's News Conference at Peking December 4	926
Congress. Congressional Documents Relating to Foreign Policy	934
Indonesia. President Ford Visits the Pacific Basin (Ford, Marcos, Teng, texts of U.S.-Indonesia and U.S.-Philippines joint communiques)	916
Philippines. President Ford Visits the Pacific Basin (Ford, Marcos, Teng, texts of U.S.-Indonesia and U.S.-Philippines joint communiques)	916
Presidential Documents	
Bill of Rights Day, Human Rights Day and Week (proclamation)	933
A Pacific Doctrine of Peace With All and Hostility Toward None	913
President Ford Visits the Pacific Basin	916
Publications. GPO Sales Publications	948
Refugees. U.S. Commends UNHCR Efforts on Behalf of Refugees (Haugh)	944
South Africa. U.S. Discusses Human Rights in South Africa (Mitchell)	935
Treaty Information. Current Actions	947
United Nations	
U.S. Commends UNHCR Efforts on Behalf of Refugees (Haugh)	944
U.S. Discusses Human Rights in South Africa (Mitchell)	935
<i>Name Index</i>	
Ford, President	913, 916, 933
Haugh, John H	944
Kissinger, Secretary	926
Marcos, Ferdinand	922
Mitchell, Clarence M., Jr	935
Teng, Hsiao-p'ing	917, 920

Checklist of Department of State Press Releases: December 8-14

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

No.	Date	Subject
*594	12/9	Advisory Committee on Law of the Sea, Jan. 23-24.
*595	12/9	Shipping Coordinating Committee (SCC), Subcommittee on Safety of Life at Sea (SOLAS), working group on ship design and equipment, Jan. 5-6.
†596	12/9	Kissinger: news conference.
*597	12/10	Secretary of State's Advisory Committee on Private International Law, study group on hotelkeepers' liability, New York, Feb. 5.
*598	12/10	SCC, SOLAS, working group on fire protection, Jan. 8.
*599	12/10	SCC, U.S. National Committee for the Prevention of Marine Pollution, working group on segregated ballast in existing tankers, Jan. 7.
†600	12/10	Joint U.S.-Polish communique on Northeastern Pacific Ocean fisheries.
*601	12/11	Northwest Atlantic Fisheries Advisory Committee, Boston, Jan. 6.
*602	12/11	Kissinger: arrival, Brussels.
†603	12/11	Kissinger, Bitsios: remarks, Brussels.
†604	12/12	Kissinger, Caglayangil: remarks, Brussels.
†605	12/12	Kissinger: interview for German television, Brussels.
†606	12/12	Kissinger: news conference, Brussels.

* Not printed.

† Held for a later issue of the BULLETIN.