



THE DEPARTMENT OF STATE BULLETIN

Volume LXXV • No. 1941 • September 6, 1976

SECRETARY KISSINGER'S AUGUST 4-11 TRIP
TO IRAN, AFGHANISTAN, PAKISTAN, AND THE NETHERLANDS

*Toasts and News Conferences,
U.S.-Iran Joint Commission Communique,
U.S.-Afghanistan Joint Statement*

THE OFFICIAL WEEKLY RECORD OF UNITED STATES FOREIGN POLICY

For index see inside back cover

THE DEPARTMENT OF STATE BULLETIN

VOL. LXXV, No. 1941

September 6, 1976

The Department of State BULLETIN is a weekly publication issued by the Office of Media Services, Bureau of Public Affairs, provides the public 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 select 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 included concerning treaties and international agreements to which the United States is or may become 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

The Secretary of State has determined that the publication of this periodical is necessary in the transaction of the public business required by law of this Department. Use of funds for printing this periodical has been approved by the Director of the Office of Management and Budget through January 31, 1981.

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.

Secretary Kissinger Attends Session of U.S.-Iran Joint Commission; Visits Afghanistan, Pakistan, and the Netherlands

Secretary Kissinger visited the United Kingdom, Iran, Afghanistan, Pakistan, France, and the Netherlands August 4-11. Following are toasts by Secretary Kissinger and news conferences, together with the texts of the communique of the U.S.-Iran Joint Commission and a U.S.-Afghanistan joint statement.¹

TOAST BY SECRETARY KISSINGER, TEHRAN, IRAN, AUGUST 6²

Mr. Minister, Mrs. Ansary, distinguished guests: Let me first of all, on behalf of all of my colleagues, express my gratitude for the marvelous reception that we have received here. We realize that the point Hushang made so subtly, about the relative lengths of our histories, reflects itself in our relative hospitalities. And we know that we in the United States are, as far as hospitality is concerned, an underdeveloped country. So we appreciate it. But first of all we appreciate the kind words, totally undeserved, that you said about us. But we feel, as always, very happy here. Hushang said to me that he was giving a little dinner party tonight in a place that was not quite as elegant as the State Department, proving that he is a great diplomat or that he is talking about a State Department that I don't know.

¹ Other press releases relating to the Secretary's Aug. 4-11 trip are Nos. 368 of Aug. 7, 369 of Aug. 8, 373 of Aug. 10, and 374 of Aug. 11.

² Given at a dinner hosted by Minister of Economic Affairs and Finance Hushang Ansary (text from press release 366, which includes Minister Ansary's toast).

We are beginning our Joint Commission meetings tomorrow, which is one reason why I still have my coat and shirt, because usually after a day's negotiations with Ansary I have lost almost everything that I possess, and I just want to tell this to our Iranian friends here—that the real negotiation hasn't started yet and so I'm still reasonably intact.

The Joint Commission, however, expresses the close identity of interest between the United States and Iran; and it attempts to express and it has successfully expressed, across a wide variety of common efforts, the close connection that has grown up between our two societies. Hushang said that he was somewhat pained that some Americans do not appreciate the nature of this relationship. I would like to say to him that the President and the Secretary of State and the Government of the United States do appreciate the nature of this relationship.

There has been a great deal of literature during the past week about the number of Americans that find themselves in Iran, and I think it might be useful to reflect about this.

There are about 24,000 Americans in Iran. Of those, about 1,000 are military personnel; 2,000 are engaged in training activities that will end when the training is completed; another thousand are engaged in combined training and maintenance activities, which will also end when the capabilities are developed. Five thousand are here in the oil business, and 2,000 are here in other businesses. And the rest are dependents.

So it is true there are 24,000 Americans

here. There are 11,000 who are working here, 7,000 in civilian pursuits, and their families. So when people talk lightly about "hostages," the hostages are created by the nature of the connection of our societies and not by any particular decision having to do with military affairs alone or even primarily.

Iran is the country where in 1946 President Truman considered it important to the interest of the United States to confront the Soviet Union over Azerbaijan, when there were only a few hundred Americans in this country, because we thought then that the territorial integrity of Iran was important for the United States.

Iran is the country about which in 1949, again, President Truman developed point 4, to express the close connection we felt not only with the territorial integrity but with the development of Iran.

Iran is the country with which President Eisenhower in 1959 made an executive agreement in which he pledged that the United States would come again to the assistance of Iran against Communist attack or Communist-inspired attack, according to our constitutional processes. And while one can debate today, in the sophisticated period in which we have the great fortune of living, what the legal significance of an executive agreement was, there can be no question that it reflected the conviction of an American President that the security of Iran was an important interest of the United States.

And now, in 1976, when the efforts of 1946 and the efforts of 1949 have led to the result that Iran's security is no longer as precarious as it was right after the war and Iran's progress economically has reached a point where it is part of the plan of Iran that within 10 years this country will have the economic level of activity of Western Europe today—under those conditions it goes without saying that Iran has not become less important to the United States.

At the time when Iran and the United

States first encountered each other in the postwar period, we were predominant in the world; and we, in our innocence of international affairs, assumed all the burdens for defense and for economic advance. And it was indeed necessary that we do so, because there was no one else to man the ramparts.

Now, in 1976, the world has become much more complicated. Other centers of power have developed. The threats have become more complex. The United States cannot assume all the responsibilities. Under those conditions we especially value those friends who are prepared to make their own efforts for their economic advance and who are prepared to make a significant contribution to their own defense.

As the recent period has made amply clear, the Middle East, always a pivot of world affairs, has become one of the potentially most tense areas of the globe. In the circumstances, the stability of Iran, the commitment of Iran to its security, is a major factor for global peace and a major factor in the stability of the Middle East.

There are at least some Americans who do not take it for granted, because they remember that even in Iran things were not always that way and that they do not always have to be that way and that we owe something to the farsighted leadership of His Imperial Majesty, which has brought matters to this point.

It is true that Iran has made great economic progress. It is also true that Iran has made strenuous efforts in its own defense. And finally, it is true that it has been the policy of the United States to support both of these efforts.

The first, the economic effort, no longer requires American support. In fact, it may be a little bit the reverse, if Hushang keeps raising the oil prices.

But in assessing the relationship between the two countries, we note a number of factors. First, on all major international issues, the policies of the United States and the policies of Iran have been parallel and

therefore mutually reinforcing. Those countries which have represented the greatest threat to the security of Iran are also those countries whose domination of Iran would have a profound effect on the global balance of power or on the regional balance of power and would therefore have profound consequences for the United States.

In all the years of our cooperation, Iran has never gone to war, or threatened to go to war, for any purpose which would not have been parallel to our own.

And this cooperation has been all the more significant because it grew out of a leadership that is clearly independent, that pursues its conception of its own national interest based on a history of 2,500 years of Iranian policy; and this is what has made the cooperation all the more effective.

I do not want to paint too idyllic a picture. There have been conferences where we have not seen eye to eye—not involving questions of peace and war. Unfortunately, the technical competence of your personnel is such that when we do not agree you can make life extremely unpleasant for us. But those occasions have been rare; and they have not gone to the central issues of global stability and global peace, not to the strategy toward the Middle East nor to the strategy toward the Soviet Union, both key elements in the global balance.

I have taken the liberty of speaking in this manner because I wanted our Iranian friends to understand that, not out of sentimentality, though we are always happy here, but out of a calculation of our own national and global interests—just as Iranian policy is based on its calculation of its national interests—there has developed a parallelism of views on many key problems that has made our cooperation a matter that is in the profound national interest of both countries. This is the conviction of our Administration. It is this conviction that has brought me here, and it will be pursued in the period ahead.

So it is in this spirit that I would like to

propose a toast to your great leader His Imperial Majesty the Shahanshah and to the permanent friendship between the peoples of the United States and the great people of Iran. And if I may, I also propose a toast to my good friend the Minister of Finance and Mrs. Ansary.

NEWS CONFERENCE BY SECRETARY KISSINGER AND MINISTER ANSARY³

Minister Ansary: Ladies and gentlemen, we just concluded the deliberations of our third session of the Joint Iran-U.S. Commission on Economic Cooperation; and together with the Secretary of State and the members of the American delegation, I'm glad to say that we have reached some very important decisions. This session has started, as you know, with meetings of experts at committee levels, and the Secretary's visit started with an audience yesterday with His Imperial Majesty the Shahanshah, following which the work of the Commission began this morning.

The Commission, as you know, was set up to concretize decisions and policy matters and provide directions for the development of trade and economic cooperation between Iran and the United States; and in that context I am very pleased to say that this session—this particular session—has been highly successful. The highlights of these agreements which you have just signed with the Secretary of State are as follows.

In the field of trade you may recall that at the last session of the Commission in Washington last year, an estimate was provided for an amount of trade between the two countries in the order of about 15 billion U.S. dollars. At this particular session we reached an agreement for the figure of trade to be more comprehensive and to present a very clear picture of what we envisage would lie ahead in the ex-

³ Held at Tehran on Aug. 7 at the conclusion of the third session of the U.S.-Iran Joint Commission (text from press release 367).

change of goods and services between the two countries.

We must revise our previous estimate to include the additional potentials that we feel lie ahead in the course of the next few years until 1980. We have therefore revised the figure upward, in the order of about \$40 billion, to include exports of oil from Iran to the United States, exports of industrial and traditional goods from Iran to the United States, and the import of goods and services from the United States, but not inclusive of military input.

I would like to say here and now that we are appreciative of the readiness that has been expressed on the part of the U.S. Government to facilitate and cooperate with us for the expansion of Iranian exports to the United States so that we will over the years attain a reasonable proportion in the amount of exports and imports between the two countries.

In the field of energy I would like to say that as far as nuclear energy is concerned, we are pleased that we have made very good progress forward in our discussions for cooperation in this field between the two countries. Iran, as you know, is a signatory to the Nonproliferation Treaty, and we very strongly believe in the measures that are needed to assure safeguards in this particular area. We are ready to support measures on an international level aimed at preventing proliferation in the world at large. We therefore quite naturally indicated our readiness to agree to safeguards that are necessary, as long as we are assured of the supply of enriched uranium—not plutonium—needed for our fast-breeder. We are hoping that in the light of this progress and our talk with the Secretary of State and the American delegation, we will, hopefully, reach the final phase of our agreement in the near future.

We also reached an agreement to cooperate between the two countries in the field of solar energy and in other fields of energy, including gas, in connection with which we have two important multibillion-dollar agreements now under considera-

tion. Because of this we have created a new Research and Development Committee in this field so that the experts and the officials of the two sides may continue their active cooperation because primarily—not only for the concern of the two sides that need to meet the energy requirements of the two countries but also of the requirements of the world at large in the next decade.

In the field of agriculture, we agreed to some important decisions in pinpointing the areas of cooperation including the possibilities of cooperation between the two countries for the purpose of manufacturing agricultural machinery and implements as well as insecticides and petrochemicals and chemicals for use not only in Iran but also for meeting the needs of the general region as a whole.

Because of our mutual concern for active steps that are necessary for the purpose of meeting food requirements of the world at large and this general region as a whole, we feel therefore that the discussions that were held in the past two days for the purpose of selecting a special region in Iran for development with U.S. cooperation in the field of agriculture are also important in this particular field.

In the field of housing we have reached agreement to encourage the private sector on both sides as well as the public sector in Iran to engage in ventures that would be aimed at manufacturing and producing construction material and housing components and participating in the development of construction technology for mass production of housing in Iran. This, of course would also include participation, on the part of Iran and on the part of the United States, in commercial exhibitions in this particular field, as well as engagement in training programs.

In the field of science, technology, and education, the cooperation will continue in oceanography, fishery studies, geological and mineral surveys and environmental protection, health care education, and the like.

In the field of health we have reached an agreement in principle to cooperate for the purpose of establishing a Food and Drug Administration in Iran and the development of procedures for specific techniques in the laboratories for drug and food control. On the Iranian side, we attach a great deal of importance to this particular field of cooperation between our two countries.

In the field of industry, we have reached an agreement to encourage further activities on the part of the private sector on both sides to an active participation on the part of the Joint Business Council that was established as a result of the decisions of the Commission previously, and we feel that in various big industries it would result in agreement for joint ventures in promising areas to both countries, especially in the field of petrochemicals and mining as well as in other fields of interest.

As far as investment is concerned, we have expressed our readiness in principle on both sides to encourage movement in the private sector in accordance with the laws and regulations of the two countries, and we believe that the measures that will be introduced as a result of these decisions in principle will encourage movement in that direction.

I want to express my sincere appreciation to the Secretary of State for his invaluable contributions to the deliberations of the Commission and for the very friendly atmosphere in which the talks were conducted. I believe we have taken some very important steps forward, the results of which should be witnessed in the coming 12 months and in the years that we have ahead of us, as a result of which we are certain the friendship between our two peoples will advance and the trade and economic relations between the two countries will further consolidate our friendship.

I will now ask the Secretary of State to please address the group.

Secretary Kissinger: First of all, I would like to express on behalf of my colleagues my gratitude for the extraordinary hospitality we have received here and for the cordiality and spirit of cooperation in which the discussions were conducted.

My colleague and friend has outlined the major results of the work of the Commission. I would like to emphasize that they demonstrate the broad cooperation in civilian fields that is going on between Iran and the United States, reflecting the importance that both sides attach to the relationship and the importance also that the United States attaches to the position of Iran.

With respect to the trade figures that were given, we have decided to include the oil figures because it makes it a more meaningful presentation. If one takes the comparable figures from last year, we project an increase from \$15 billion in trade to \$26 billion in trade. That would be an increase of about 60 to 65 percent over the figures of last year, but we will from now on use the basis of the entire two-way trade between the two countries.

I would like to say a word about the problem of nuclear energy. We have had extraordinarily fruitful talks with respect to the relationship between nuclear energy, peaceful uses of nuclear energy, and the problem of nonproliferation, and we have explored a number of ways, which—if they are implemented as we intend to implement them—will turn this into a commercial issue; that is, who is to pay for the consequences of nonproliferation—of the commercial cost of nonproliferation. But if we proceed as we intend to proceed to a conclusion of these discussions, it can be a model not only for this particular set of relationships but for other relationships in the area of peaceful uses of nuclear technology.

I would like to express the appreciation of the American side for the constructive attitudes which our Iranian colleagues—led by His Imperial Majesty, who laid the basis for it yesterday—followed on today, and our discussion approached this topic

which is of such great importance for the future of mankind.

I think with this we can perhaps answer questions.

Q. Mr. Secretary, thank you for explaining the difference in the comparison of the figures over a five-year period, but it seems to me that last year it did not include military figures and this time it does include military figures.

Secretary Kissinger: It does not include military figures. The military estimates would add between \$2 and \$3 billion a year over that five-year period. If you add the military you have to add the total figure, which would be about \$50 to \$55 billion.

Q. Let me see, \$50 to \$55 billion over the five-year period? Spread out over the five years?

Secretary Kissinger: Of which roughly \$10 billion would be military; roughly \$24 billion would be American exports to Iran; roughly \$14 billion would be Iranian oil exports to the United States; roughly \$2 billion would be civilian exports. Is that approximately correct?

Minister Ansary: Yes, sir, that is correct.

Q. Is it not possible, Mr. Secretary, to break this down to an annual figure then? Do all of these figures cover a four-year, five-year period?

Secretary Kissinger: They cover a five-year period, but you can divide it by five and you would be roughly correct.

Q. So the \$15 billion that was talked about last year was based also on a five- or six-year projection?

Secretary Kissinger: Five-year projection.

Q. The military aspect of this trade is not included in this document which you just signed? That is a projection which would be negotiated under a different rubric?

Secretary Kissinger: That is correct. This Commission deals only with the civilian re-

lationship between Iran and the United States.

Q. Mr. Secretary, does it mean that oil in some way has come into a more formal context here by including it in this new arrangement?

Secretary Kissinger: What it means quite frankly, if my friend will permit me, because last year we got into a horrible mess explaining these figures because if you exclude the oil exports there is a considerable imbalance in these trade figures. You cannot give a fair estimate of the economic interrelationship between Iran and the United States unless you include the oil figures. So this is an attempt on our part to give as accurate a description of the total interplay of economic relationships, excluding the military one, that exists between Iran and the United States. Is that correct?

Minister Ansary: That is correct. It would just complete the picture of trade.

Q. Have you in any way discussed oil quotas or anything like that?

Secretary Kissinger: Oil what?

Q. Oil quotas?

Secretary Kissinger: No.

Q. Mr. Secretary, regarding the nuclear cooperation between Iran and America, how many reactors are actually involved, and are there going to be any programs for training the personnel required to run these reactors.

Secretary Kissinger: We have been talking about six to eight reactors, and there will be programs for training the personnel. What has concerned the United States is that the beginning of these programs—we have no concern about the reactors as such—what we have been concerned about is the problem of reprocessing and the possible diversion of materials into weapon usage. We have had very satisfactory talk on this issue both with His Imperial Majesty and with the responsible ministers. And we believe that we are on the way to a solution that meets both the Iranian con-

cerns for nuclear power and our concerns about nuclear proliferation.

Q. Mr. Secretary or Mr. Minister, either one, does this balance or imbalance now represent the reasonable level that you want to reach on the trade? Is it going to be a more evening process in the next five years?

Secretary Kissinger: Well, we have indicated that we will encourage Iranian exports in the industrial and traditional commodities to the United States. As you can see, there is still a gap, even with the oil exports, and we will encourage this.

Minister Ansary: May I add to that? An ideal situation, of course, is a balance of trade, but at the moment—with Iran developing very fast, needing capital goods, machinery, and other equipment for its development programs—we envision that a reasonable ratio between the imports and exports of the two countries would be an acceptable situation until such time as we are capable of producing more for export to the United States and other nations.

Q. Do these figures represent a commitment or a projection?

Secretary Kissinger: They represent a projection, but it is based also on a foreseeable commitment. We believe that we have made a statistical study of this with great care, and this represents what we in fact think is the minimum that is likely.

Q. Sir, does it include the projected value of any barter arrangements?

Secretary Kissinger: No. It doesn't include any of the barter arrangements.

Minister Ansary: It does not take into account any future developments unforeseen in the trade. Obviously we have negotiations for imports, exports, and so on, so that when the Commission meets, of course, in the future, taking into account other developments, the figures can, of course, be revised.

Secretary Kissinger: As I understand it, if some of these barter arrangements go through, it would not increase the number

of arms, the level of the arms projection; it would increase the export of Iranian oil.

Q. Now, Mr. Secretary, yesterday His Majesty spoke of needing possibly as much as three times the arms imports that are coming in. These projections that you presented to us today contain a steady figure of \$2 to \$3 billion a year for weapons.

Secretary Kissinger: As I understood His Majesty yesterday, he was responding to a lot of insistent oratory that was put to him, and he was saying that if Iran were arming itself in the same proportion per capita as some of its neighbors, it would require three times the armament that it now has. In none of our discussions had he ever proposed a level of armaments that is measured per capita in the same relation as his neighbors, and this was a point to illustrate that. In his judgment Iranian requests had not been excessive. It was not a projection of what he has in fact discussed with us.

Q. Unless I'm totally mistaken, even though the figure first presented by His Majesty was a vague one, he did indicate that Iran wanted more weapons in the future and not a steady supply.

Secretary Kissinger: Well, it depends what you mean by "more." As we understand the request that Iran has made of us, it is for a replacement of some of the existing weapons with modern generations of weapons that will involve, due to inflation and greater technological complexity, undoubtedly an increase in expenditure, but no substantial increase at the total force levels, as I understand it.

Q. The projected trade that is talked about at this meeting, where would that leave the United States relative to Iran's other trading partners?

Secretary Kissinger: I think about 18 percent, isn't it, Hushang?

Minister Ansary: Do you mean in terms—

Q. Would the United States be your biggest trading partner and if so by how much?

Minister Ansary: I would envisage that if this trend continues the United States would most probably occupy the first position among Iran's trading partners. There is West Germany ranking first at this time.

Q. Mr. Secretary, did your talks in Tehran go beyond bilateral limits when you talked about international affairs with the Finance Minister?

Secretary Kissinger: Whenever I have the privilege of meeting His Majesty, we have a detailed review of the international situation. This, of course, puts particular emphasis on those areas that are of profound concern to Iran; that is to say, the Middle East, South Asia, the Indian Ocean. But a central review of the world situation, and we discussed this in considerable detail, as I said yesterday, we have found the policies in Iran in these respects, and ours, to be parallel and mutually supportive.

Q. Mr. Secretary, could you kindly tell me what percentage of the projects which were agreed upon two years ago when Mr. Kissinger visited Tehran have been implemented? What progress we have had over the past two years?

Minister Ansary: I can tell you that we have had considerable progress in implementing the decisions that were made in the past sessions of the Commission. But I can't give you off the top of my head a percentage. I think it can be provided.

Q. Mr. Secretary, if we can go back for a moment to the arms question, a two-part question: I wonder if you would comment briefly on what sort of role discussion about the Senate report⁴ had in your talks with His Majesty? And secondly, are both sides concerned about the management of these arms transfers and their control, and are they taking any steps to shore up any inadequacies that might exist?

⁴ U.S. Military Sales to Iran. A staff report to the Subcommittee on Foreign Assistance of the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations. July 1976. 59 pp.

Secretary Kissinger: First of all, I think the report itself was far less sensational than some of the conclusions that were drawn from it in various media. The report as such was discussed only briefly. The implications of our relationship were obviously discussed at greater length.

It is in the interest of both Iran and the United States to make certain that the arms that are supplied to Iran are handled in an effective manner, that the management of these programs be efficient and suitable to the common purposes that we have.

We believe that on the American side the reorganization that was conducted about 18 months ago has proved to be effective, and most of the criticisms referred to the period before the reorganization of our Military Advisory Group and that part of the Embassy that dealt with this program. Since most of the criticism concerned the American side, I don't want to comment on the Iranian handling of it, but I had the firm impression from His Majesty that he is firmly determined on his side to make certain that there is an efficient cooperation and an efficient utilization of these weapons.

Q. Mr. Secretary, when you said that arms over a five-year period would only come out to about \$10 billion, was that something that was agreed upon and projected during this visit?

Secretary Kissinger: That is not agreed upon, that is a projection. On this visit there was no agreement made on any particular weapon system, on any particular supply. We were talking about the projection of needs, and indeed, this figure I'm giving you was not discussed between His Majesty and myself. It is a figure that we projected on the basis of foreseeable Iranian requests in the replacement field as we were putting together the figures for this meeting. It is not an agreed figure between the two countries, but a reasonable projection.

Q. Mr. Secretary, to prevent a repetition

of last year's press conference, where there was a great misunderstanding, I gather, as to statistics, my memory is that last year the arms sales were included in the discussion at the press conference as within the \$15 billion projection of sales.

Secretary Kissinger: This is a confusion that we have never really fully cleared up. I can assure you that the \$26 billion-a-year figure and the \$40 billion-a-year figure clearly exclude the arms figure and that the arms sales beyond this are not part of an agreement by the Commission but are a projection that the experts made on the basis of recent trends of what was probable over a five-year period, but not something that was discussed in any detail and which was subjected to any scrutiny. It was simply to enable us to answer your questions. The \$40 billion figure was examined in great detail and represents the best judgment of all the experts, and it explicitly excludes the military precisely to avoid the trouble of last year.

Q. My second question is on the oil export figure. What has been the oil export figure from Iran to the United States, say for the last two years, in dollars?

Secretary Kissinger: Please, you would know that better.

Minister Ansary: If you want the exact figures, I have them here: 1975, 9.8 million tons, through the consortium; 6.8 million tons direct exports by NIOC [National Iranian Oil Co.]. In 1976, we expect it to reach a total of 20 or 21 million tons and for 1977 we have approximately 24 million tons.

Q. Do you have a dollar figure by any chance?

Minister Ansary: Trade for 1975 is approximately, excluding oil, \$2.5 billion.

Q. Excluding oil and military?

Minister Ansary: [Inaudible.]

Q. Are there any especially set up measures, or have you discussed any measures

with the Secretary on exports of uranium to the United States?

Secretary Kissinger: One of the measures that is mentioned in the communique is the conviction of the executive branch that a distinction ought to be made in our legislation between those OPEC nations that joined the oil embargo and those OPEC nations that not only did not join the last embargo but have explicitly stated that they would not join any new embargo. This would remove a number of discriminatory features vis-a-vis Iranian exports that our current legislation imposes on them.

We would also be prepared to assist the Iranian trade promotion effort and to consult with Iran on other measures to close the gap that the figures that we have given here indicate.

Q. Mr. Minister, at your news conference in Washington a year ago you talked about plans to create here in Iran a major financial center, which you said would be the only one between Zurich and Singapore. Is that plan still alive?

Minister Ansary: Yes. As you know we had a financial conference with the active participation of the members of the Joint Iran-U.S. Business Council at which certain decisions were made, which are being followed up.

Q. Do you have any firm date? I'm sorry.

Minister Ansary: In the meantime, measures are being taken to facilitate the flow of capital in and out of Iran. As you know, we have no restrictions on the outflow of capital from Iran and other measures are being studied on the part of the government and the central bank, which are all being aimed in that direction.

Q. Mr. Secretary, why has Iran needed \$2.5 billion worth of arms a year for the last four years and projected for the next five years, and why is it U.S. policy to sell Iran that many arms?

Secretary Kissinger: Iran has borders with Iraq, the Soviet Union, Afghanistan, and

Pakistan. Iran has committed itself to make the maximum effort in its own defense, which is consistent with our own objectives that countries in whose security we do have an interest should make a major effort in their own defense.

I think if one looks at the threats, the potential threats, that Iran faces, the armaments of its neighbors, and the role that Iran has played in international affairs, it's evident that its self-defense is strongly in the American interest. This is not a favor that we do to Iran.

If you add to it that Iran is paying cash for its armament, that it has at no time threatened to use its armament for purposes of which the United States has disapproved . . . if you look at the stabilizing role that Iran has played in both Middle East and South Asia policy, we have found it to be in the national interest of the United States and the interest of regional stability to cooperate with Iran in its progress.

Minister Ansary: Last question, please.

Q. Mr. Secretary, putting Iran-American relations aside for a while, I would like to hear your comments on the latest developments in the Middle East and in particular the Lebanese situation. With reference to the cooperation between the U.S. Embassy and the Palestinians, would this have any implication on forward developments in that region?

Secretary Kissinger: The contact between the United States Embassy and the Palestinians in Beirut resulted from the de facto control of west Beirut by the Palestinians. It was confined to the security of American personnel in Beirut and the evacuation of Americans from Lebanon. It had no other significance. And it had no implication for the evolution of the Middle East negotiations.

The situation in Lebanon is a tragedy for the people of Lebanon. The United States is deeply interested in the territorial integrity and sovereignty of Lebanon and hopes that the parties concerned can negotiate a

solution that will rapidly restore these conditions.

With respect to peace in the Middle East, the United States has repeatedly said that we do not believe that a long period of stagnation is in the interest of anybody. The United States will support efforts to begin a negotiating process again as soon as the parties concerned are ready to do so and the [inaudible] of their efforts which Lebanon represents is at an end. But we believe that a lasting and just peace in the Middle East must be high on the agenda of all people who are concerned with peace in the world.

Minister Ansary: Thank you, ladies and gentlemen.

COMMUNIQUE OF U.S.-IRAN JOINT COMMISSION ISSUED AT TEHRAN AUGUST 7

Press release 368A dated August 9

The Iran-U.S. Joint Commission met in Tehran for its third session August 6 and 7, 1976. His Excellency Hushang Ansary, Minister of Economic Affairs and Finance, and the Secretary of State, the Honorable Henry A. Kissinger, Co-Chairmen of the Commission, headed the Iranian and the U.S. delegations.

During his visit to Iran, the Secretary of State was received in audience by His Imperial Majesty, the Shahanshah, at Nowshahr and conveyed to him the personal greetings of President Ford. In their talks, His Imperial Majesty and Secretary Kissinger discussed the current world situation and reviewed bilateral matters in the spirit of mutual respect and understanding characteristic of relations between Iran and the United States.

Trade and Investment

The Commission noted with satisfaction that the trade between the two countries had expanded well beyond earlier expectations. In March 1975 a target of \$15 billion in trade (exclusive of oil and military items) over the following five years was established. The Commission agreed that a target of \$26 billion for the period 1975-80 is now attainable, and agreed that the two governments would cooperate to reach that goal. If Iran's oil exports to the United States are taken into account, total non-military trade is expected to exceed \$40 billion over the period 1975-80.

In their desire to achieve continued expansion of trade and economic cooperation between the two countries, the two parties recognized the need for considerable expansion of Iranian industrial exports

to the United States. In this connection the U.S. delegation expressed its readiness to cooperate in the Iranian efforts to increase such exports. The Iranian side emphasized that exclusion of Iranian exports from the U.S. generalized system of preferences (GSP) runs counter to the aim and determination of the two sides in facilitation and expanding trade between the two countries. The U.S. side stated that while any change in GSP eligibility would require an act of Congress, the U.S. Executive Branch supports legislation recently introduced to provide GSP benefits covering Iran and will continue to use its best efforts to achieve passage in the current session of Congress.

The Commission expressed its satisfaction at the cooperative spirit which characterized the March 1976 Inaugural Meeting of the Iran-U.S. Business Council, followed by the Iran-U.S. Financial Conference. The Commission welcomed the decisions of these bodies to create a joint study group on financial matters and joint task forces on investment and trade. The two sides believe that further contacts between the U.S. and Iranian financial and commercial communities would be useful and urged the Iran-U.S. Business Council to facilitate action programs in these fields.

The two sides expressed satisfaction over the developments in the two countries in the field of investment, and welcomed increased flows of capital on both sides.

Energy

Both delegations agreed that one of the major problems facing mankind in the decades ahead will be the availability of adequate energy to meet the demands of growing populations and industrial expansion throughout the world. Iran, as a major supplier of petroleum with vast natural gas reserves, and the United States as a center of advanced technology, have the shared responsibility to work together to contribute to solutions of this problem. In order to facilitate broad cooperation throughout the spectrum of energy research and development, the Commission established an Energy Research and Development Committee and instructed it to initiate rapidly an innovative and practical program.

The Commission noted that substantial progress has been made in defining the principles of a new cooperative agreement in nuclear power, which takes into account Iran's interest in developing the peaceful uses of nuclear energy and the concern of both countries to prevent the proliferation of nuclear weapons. Good progress has been made in reconciling these two objectives and as a result of this discussion, a realistic basis for proceeding with final negotiations now exists. The Commission agreed that these negotiations should be pursued promptly in order to reach an early agreement.

The Commission particularly noted cooperation between the two countries in the evaluation of sites for

the establishment of nuclear power plants in Iran, exploration in Iran for uranium resources, training of Iranian engineers and scientists, and fabrication of slightly enriched fuel uranium for nuclear power reactors.

The Commission noted that solar energy must have an increasingly prominent role in meeting man's energy needs, and agreed to develop a program of cooperation in this field. As the first step, a team of experts from Iran will visit the United States in the near future to consult with officials of the Energy Research and Development Administration. It is anticipated that the cooperative research program will be coordinated with multilateral arrangements in this field.

Further discussions will be held looking to collaboration in research and development in alternative energy fields.

The Iranian party reviewed recent natural gas developments in Iran, noting that proven reserves may now exceed those of any other country and that the Imperial Government of Iran has well-advanced plans for the utilization of these resources. Two multibillion-dollar joint ventures involving the National Iranian Gas Company and U.S. private companies are under consideration. The American delegation reported President Ford's recent decisions establishing the United States policies on natural gas imports. These policies enable the U.S. Executive Branch to encourage and support projects for the production and delivery of natural gas to the United States on economically attractive terms.

Technical Cooperation

The two delegations reviewed existing and planned programs of technical cooperation. In particular, the Commission noted the following activities:

—The agreement between the U.S. Department of Transportation's Federal Highway Administration and the Iranian Ministry of Roads and Transport.

—The initiation of a new program by the Manpower and Technical Cooperation Committee, concerning the measurement and improvement of Iranian labor productivity.

—The continuation of vocational training program development and employment service units. In this connection, the Commission noted Iran plans to acquire 40 more mobile training and employment service units for use in non-urban areas. These units and the 23 centers which have been already obtained and will start operation during the current year will increase the annual capacity of training skilled workers by 1,700, and will facilitate the mobility of the workers according to the requirements of the country.

—The Commission agreed to expand cooperation in the field of agriculture with an emphasis on encouraging the respective sectors of the two countries to

form joint ventures for intensive production, and distribution of agricultural products as well as machinery, pesticides, fertilizers, etc.

—Tentative plans have been developed for cooperation between the two countries in animal health, plant pest control, forest and range management, agricultural extension and education.

—A team of American experts will visit Iran in October 1976 in order to cooperate with the Iranian party in preparing a program for the establishment of an integrated agricultural region.

Housing

The Commission observed that considerable exchange of information has taken place in the field of large-scale housing, with the U.S. private sector gaining a better understanding of Iranian housing and building plans and regulations and Iranian officials gaining greater knowledge of U.S. housing methods and technology. The Commission approved plans to broaden the scope of cooperation in the coming year. These will include the encouragement of private sector joint ventures and provision of know-how and services related to the manufacture of housing and housing components. It also includes the transfer of technology in housing and urban management, housing finance, and technical information. Participation in commercial exhibits and training activities also will be expanded.

Science and Technology

The Commission noted the expansion of scientific and technological cooperation, particularly with regard to programs underway or planned in the field of oceanography, seismic studies and geological and minerals surveys. Both delegations agreed that environmental protection, health care education, biomedical sciences and arid land sciences were promising areas for cooperation.

The United States noted with appreciation the generosity of Her Imperial Majesty's Committee for the American Bicentennial, in establishing an American Studies endowment fund, capitalized at \$1 million to support American studies programs in Iran. The U.S. delegation also expressed appreciation for the Imperial Government of Iran's creation of a \$100,000 Bicentennial scholarship fund to assist American students to study in Iran.

The Commission expressed satisfaction at the completion of the study, undertaken by the U.S. Government in accordance with a decision of the last meeting of the Commission, of ways to facilitate and expedite education linkages between U.S. and Iranian institutions of higher learning.

The Commission agreed that the two countries will cooperate in food and drug administration, and, in particular, development of specific techniques in laboratory procedures for drug and food control and exchange of know-how and experts. Cooperation in

the field of health will also cover control of drug addiction and rehabilitation of addicts.

It was agreed to hold the next meeting in Washington at a mutually convenient time, in 1977.

U.S.-AFGHANISTAN JOINT STATEMENT ISSUED AT KABUL AUGUST 8

Press release 371 dated August 8

At the invitation of the Government of Afghanistan, Dr. Henry Kissinger, Secretary of State of the United States of America, paid an official visit to Afghanistan on August 8, 1976. Head of State and Prime Minister Mohammad Daoud received Dr. Kissinger and had talks with him.

During these talks, which were held in the warm and friendly atmosphere characterizing Afghan-American relations, the two sides held a friendly and fruitful exchange of views on major international questions of mutual interest, especially the development of the situation in South Asia and the Middle East, as well as on Afghan-American bilateral relations and cooperation in different fields.

The two sides reaffirmed the importance of the strengthening and expansion of friendship and cooperation between states for preserving and consolidating regional and world peace. The sides expressed the view that differences between states should be settled by peaceful means and through comprehensive and realistic discussions.

The Secretary of State expressed the United States' strong support for the recent initiatives which have improved relations among the states of the region.

The two sides noted the similarity of the views and purposes of Afghan and American leaders and peoples regarding national independence and integrity.

The Government of Afghanistan pointed out that its traditional policy—based on positive neutrality, non-alignment and friendship and cooperation with all peace-loving countries—safeguards its national independence. The United States expressed understanding of Afghanistan's position.

On the afternoon of August 8, 1976, the American Secretary of State paid a courtesy call on Mr. Mohammad Naim [Chief Foreign Policy Adviser to Head of State Daoud].

Later in the afternoon, Secretary of State Kissinger held talks with an Afghan delegation on bilateral Afghan-American relations and cooperation. These talks were attended from the Afghan side by Minister of Planning Ali Ahmad Khurram, Minister of Education Professor Abdul Kayum, Minister of Mines and Industries Abdul Tawab Asefi, Minister of Public Health Dr. Abdullah Omar, Deputy Foreign Minister Waheed Abdullah, and Director General for Political Affairs, Ministry of Foreign Affairs, Abdul

Samad Ghaus; and from the American side, in addition to Dr. Kissinger, by Ambassador Theodore L. Eliot, Jr., Assistant Secretary of State for the Near East and South Asia Alfred L. Atherton, Jr., AID Director for Afghanistan Vincent W. Brown, and Mr. Peter Rodman of the National Security Council Staff.

In these discussions, Secretary Kissinger reaffirmed United States interest in participating closely in Afghanistan's economic and social development and noted on-going programs in the Helmand Valley, rural works, education and rural health. The Afghan side expressed its pleasure at American contributions which have been and are being made through bilateral economic, technical, and educational cooperation. Both sides expressed their desire to expand further existing cooperation, particularly in the technical and economic fields.

Dr. Kissinger attended the signing ceremony of an agreement between the United States and Afghanistan for the sale of edible oil to Afghanistan under concessional terms. The agreement was signed for the Afghan side by Minister of Planning Khurram and for the American side by Ambassador Eliot.

TOAST BY SECRETARY KISSINGER, LAHORE, PAKISTAN, AUGUST 8⁵

Mr. Prime Minister, Mrs. Bhutto, distinguished guests: It is always a joy for me to visit Pakistan, but there always occurs a moment of terror, when I have to follow one of the great orators of our period, who not only speaks more eloquently than I do but with a better English than I possess.

I think all of the distinguished guests here have understood some of the subtle points that the Prime Minister made. It is clear that I have never tamed rivers and therefore our match tomorrow will be inherently unequal. But if by any chance I should on this or that point rise to the occasion, it is also clear to me what is waiting for me underneath. So as far as I can see, the negotiations tomorrow will concern primarily the rate at which I acquiesce to the proposals of the distinguished Prime Minister of Pakistan.

When I was a professor, many learned articles were written about whether or not individuals made a difference in history or

whether history resulted from objective factors that would take the same course no matter who led his country. I believe that all of us who have had the privilege of knowing and working with the Prime Minister understand that individuals do make a difference. We know how he took over this country in a tragic and desperate period and how he has returned it to international respect, to self-confidence, and to a more important role than it has ever played before. In fact, the Prime Minister has succeeded so well in this task that he now finds that he has time available not only to reform his own country but occasionally to lecture some other friendly countries. And those of us who have been exposed to this advice suffer from the fact that he almost invariably turns out to be right.

This relationship that exists between our two countries and between the leaders of our two countries is of great significance because both of our countries have gone through not an identical experience but a somewhat parallel experience. The United States, too, has gone through a rather difficult and occasionally tragic period. We, too, have had to ask ourselves what our fundamental values were and where our basic interests lay. We, too, have had to fight a war whose outcome did not meet with our expectations. And we, too, are going through a process of redefining an international position. I believe that this process, when it is concluded, as I believe it will be after our election, will see America emerge stronger and more understanding of the requirements of peace and of progress in the world.

Through these years of difficulty that our two countries have had—for different reasons but with some of the same characteristics—your Prime Minister has never failed to stress that the security of the world depended importantly on America's understanding and that the progress of peoples depended crucially on America's commitment. And if he has sometimes scolded us, it has always been from the

⁵ Given at a dinner hosted by Prime Minister Zulfikar Ali Bhutto (text from press release 370, which includes Prime Minister Bhutto's toast).

conviction that the future of hundreds of millions around the world depended on American understanding and on the American dedication. And this is why our talks have been so important to us and so fruitful.

Tomorrow I will enter, with some trepidation, this conference room that the Prime Minister has so threateningly described, and we will talk again about the problems that concern us all. What is the nature of security? And what is the meaning of progress?

Nations that feel secure only if they reduce everyone to impotence become of concern for all surrounding countries and eventually for the security of all of mankind. And equally, we understand that it may be possible to have local security and yet, within a region, there may be elements of insecurity. So what we have to find is an approach to the problem of security which preserves both the general peace and the regional peace, which banishes not only the fear of general war but which also gives a sense of security to all the individual nations whose fate may not by itself affect the general peace but the example of whose destruction or the impairment of whose security would have a profound effect on the general attitude of all the peoples of the world.

We live in a world of fearsome weapons in which one must balance security against universal cataclysm. And these are the issues which we will discuss—in the context, however, of what we have repeatedly stated: that the sovereign territorial integrity and independence of Pakistan are a matter of great concern to the United States; that we will be talking about methods of security and not the principles. And of course one also has to realize that a world cannot rest on security alone but it must have a vision of a positive future in which men can improve their status and realize their potentiality. And in these areas, too, we are prepared to work with our old friends in Pakistan.

Mr. Prime Minister, distinguished guests,

Pakistan is the country which made it possible for us to launch our initiative toward China, an initiative which we believe is important to the peace of the world and for which [applause] we will never forget the role that Pakistan has played in this effort.

In the lives of all nations, there is a process of constant renewal, and nations have periodically to reprocess themselves. And they have to decide what it is that is worth reprocessing and what it is that is better left alone. This is the nature of history, and no doubt when we have our philosophical discussions, we will reflect about that problem as well. But for now, Mr. Prime Minister, let me say on behalf of all of my colleagues, we feel that we are here among friends and that you can also count on our friendship. We shall continue to cooperate in the years ahead as we have in the past. We attach importance to your leadership, and I am grateful to have had this occasion to visit this beautiful city and look forward to our talks tomorrow.

Let me propose a toast to the Prime Minister and Begum Bhutto and to the lasting friendship between the Pakistani and the American people.

NEWS CONFERENCE BY SECRETARY KISSINGER, LAHORE, AUGUST 9

Press release 372 dated August 9

Secretary Kissinger: I would like, before I take your questions, to make two points.

First, on behalf of my colleagues and my family and myself, I would once again want to express our appreciation to the Government of Pakistan, Prime Minister and Mrs. Bhutto for the extraordinarily warm reception that we have had here. Our talks have been conducted with a cordiality that has marked our relationship, and I consider them both wide-ranging and very constructive.

Secondly, on behalf of the President, I want to express the sympathy of the American people for the disaster that has be-

fallen Pakistan in the flood, and we are making available 200,000 tons of wheat under Public Law 480 to assist in the recovery.

Those are the two things that I wanted to say, and now I will be glad to take your questions. Perhaps we can start with questions from Pakistani journalists before order breaks down when American journalists are asking questions.

Q. Mr. Secretary, has your visit in any way changed Pakistan's attitude toward the reprocessing plant?

Secretary Kissinger: Are you Pakistani?

Q. Pakistani based.

Secretary Kissinger: Well, the issue of reprocessing, as you know, is an extremely complicated issue. Pakistan has been negotiating with France on a reprocessing plant for many years and has concluded an agreement with respect to it. That agreement has all the international safeguards that were considered appropriate at the time that those negotiations started. As far as the United States is concerned, we have, as we have studied the problem, developed increasing concern about the spread of reprocessing plants, even with the safeguards that were considered appropriate several years ago. Our concern is not directed toward the intentions of Pakistan, but toward the general problem of the proliferation of nuclear weapons which can have, in our view, disastrous consequences for the future of mankind. The Prime Minister and I have had extensive talks about the problems that are produced by these two attitudes. We have agreed to continue these discussions in the weeks and months ahead, but we are going to conduct these discussions with the determination on both sides that there will be no confrontation on that issue.

Q. Sir, there appears to be a dichotomy in the American approach to the nuclear efforts in Pakistan and India. How do you resolve that?

Secretary Kissinger: No, there is no dichotomy in the approach toward India and Pakistan. We have deplored, we have greatly deplored, the Indian effort in setting off a nuclear explosive device, and we believe that what India has done is very inimicable to the process of proliferation and therefore to the problems of world peace.

We nevertheless—and we also can understand the concerns of Pakistan with respect to that—nevertheless, we believe that the spread of nuclear weapons and nuclear explosive technology is of such long-range danger to the survival of mankind that at some point the line must be drawn, and the problem we now face in the discussions that we started this morning is how to reconcile the particular concerns of one country with the general concerns. And while I do not say we have reached a conclusion—in fact we have not reached a conclusion—we will, as I said, conduct these discussions with the attitude that we will avoid a confrontation.

Q. Sir, do you generally believe that despite the lifting of the embargo, the rate of supply of arms to Pakistan is rather slow?

Secretary Kissinger: Well, the American bureaucracy is becoming increasingly complicated as its numbers multiply. And even the Secretary of State has trouble getting answers to his questions from the bureaucracy, unrelated to Pakistan. I believe that the requests that have been before us have been—are now all either answered or in the process of being answered, except for one item. And I believe that we are making progress in this field now.

Q. Sir, did you discuss the proposed recommendations in the subcontinent and the proposal mooted by the Shahanshah of Iran about the "common market" comprising Pakistan, India, and Bangladesh and other countries of this region? Did you discuss that?

Secretary Kissinger: Well, the United States strongly supports the efforts at normalization in this area. And we have paid

tribute to the farsighted efforts that have been made by all of the parties, but we would like to pay particular tribute to the Prime Minister for his efforts in this direction.

As for any particular scheme, such as the common market, of these countries, the United States does not oppose it, and if it commends itself to the parties concerned, the United States would have no objection. But it seems to me to be a matter that the parties involved have to decide in negotiations among each other, and it is not one that should appear as an American scheme.

Q. Sir, you have identified what other disputes between the two countries which have been settled. Only one remains. As one of the parties who supported the resolution in the United Nations, will America be playing a helpful role in the solution of the Kashmir?

Secretary Kissinger: Well, as I have understood the position of the Prime Minister and of the Government of Pakistan, this is an issue that will be discussed between the two governments in a principled but patient manner and that the Government of Pakistan has not asked any outside country to inject itself in these negotiations. We welcome any efforts at a peaceful resolution, and we also commend the basic attitude of negotiating this issue with patience and on the basis of principle.

Q. Mr. Secretary, what connection, if any, is there between the purchase of a reprocessing plant and the sale of American weapons to Pakistan?

Secretary Kissinger: I do not want to say more about the problem of reprocessing than what I have already stated. These are complicated negotiations among friends, and they will be discussed on their merits without blackmail or pressure by either side. We have to reconcile these two principles that I have enunciated at the beginning: the concern of Pakistan with agreements it has made in good faith on the basis of the knowledge it had at the time

of making them, and the concern of the United States with the principle of non-proliferation. And these discussions will continue.

Q. Mr. Secretary, will the United States now sell aircraft to Pakistan?

Secretary Kissinger: I don't want to get into any particular supply relationship. We will look at Pakistan's requests with a basic attitude of interest in the territorial integrity of Pakistan, and we will discuss them as they come and on their merits.

Q. Sir, do you require some further safeguards on this reprocessing plant? Or is it your position that Pakistan should not have it at all under any circumstances?

Secretary Kissinger: The problem of reprocessing is not one that is directed against any one country. We have, for example, worked out some arrangements on reprocessing with Iran that may or may not commend themselves to other nations as they study the problem over a period of time. We believe that what we should look for—I am speaking now for the United States, not for Pakistan—the United States will try to elaborate general principles with respect to reprocessing that would apply equally to all countries and that do not involve discrimination against any one particular country. And it's with this attitude that we conduct our conversations also with our friends here.

Q. [Inaudible.]

Secretary Kissinger: I have not said that any conclusions have been reached. And I am sure that the Pakistani press knows the Prime Minister is a man of principle and of spirit. All I described was the issue as we defined it and the attitude with which we will seek to solve it. And we have solved other problems between us. In fact, we have always solved problems between us, and we will approach it in this spirit.

Q. Mr. Secretary, you said that there will

be no confrontation, but the U.S. Congress appears to be bent on confrontation over this issue. On the basis of your conversations here, are you confident that you can handle the congressional attitude?

Secretary Kissinger: As I pointed out, we will have future discussions over the weeks and months ahead, and we are very hopeful to avoid confrontation from any source.

Q. Sir, if Pakistan goes ahead with the reprocessing plant, will this mean a cut in American economic and military aid?

Secretary Kissinger: I think that it's totally inappropriate for me to speculate now about events that may happen in the future. I have come here as a friend, and we are discussing these issues as friends, so there is no point in speculating about how provisions in our law will apply to circumstances that at this moment do not exist.

Q. Sir, is there any possibility that French reprocessing plants will be used as sort of a regional center such as you were discussing with Iran?

Secretary Kissinger: I just don't want to go into the various possibilities that may emerge from discussions. I have explained the spirit with which these negotiations will be conducted and the attitudes that both sides have, and from that it should be apparent that we will look for constructive solutions.

Q. Sir, is it true that your attitude, the U.S. attitude, about the reprocessing plant remains the same that it was before your arrival in Lahore?

Secretary Kissinger: The basic U.S. attitude toward the problem of reprocessing and its impact on nonproliferation is as I have stated at the beginning. It is substantially unchanged. But this is a basic attitude; it is not to be applied to concrete circumstances. And that is what we will try to discuss in the weeks and months ahead.

Q. Sir, the Indian atomic energy chief has said that within five years India will be self-sufficient in nuclear materials. Meanwhile, the Americans are providing India with nuclear fuels [inaudible].

Secretary Kissinger: No, the American supply to India refers to one particular contract that was made many years ago. Certainly with respect to any new contracts the United States would take into account the impact of Indian attitudes on the problem of nonproliferation and would insist on safeguards that would give us assurance with respect to this.

The only immediate issue is whether a contract that was made many years ago should be fulfilled with respect to one particular reactor, and that raises questions with respect to the general reliability of American contracts once they are made. This is the issue that arises. But in any new contract that India would attempt to make with us, the basic principle I have stated with nonproliferation would be stringently applied.

Q. Sir, talking about contracts, is it possible that Pakistan can now back out of the French deal in view of the fact that it has already signed a contract?

Secretary Kissinger: I simply do not think that it is appropriate for me to go into all the complexities. This is one of the aspects of the Pakistan problem that exists and, of course, as the Prime Minister said yesterday, Pakistan conducts a principled policy. We have to look at all of these aspects in our discussions. And I will not now prejudge what the possible outcome could be, what solutions could be found, if any solutions can be found. But the spirit in which we have always conducted our discussions and the attitude which we have decided to adopt at least make me believe that we will give it a very good try.

I think I had better get my plane.

Thank you.

Minister of Foreign Affairs Max van der Stoel: Ladies and gentlemen, I will perhaps first of all mention the way the visit of Secretary of State Kissinger to the Netherlands came about. As you know, the Netherlands has at the moment the Presidency of the European Community, and we do feel especially the need to keep in close contact on the number of current international problems with the United States. I therefore, at the end of July, invited the Secretary for a visit to The Hague, and I am very pleased that he found his way on his return from Asia to pay a visit to the Netherlands to discuss a number of current problems early in the Presidency of the Netherlands of the European Community.

We have spent time together, in my view, in a very fruitful way, and we have discussed a wide range of issues. We have discussed the problem of southern Africa; we have discussed the developments in the Middle East; we have discussed the forthcoming General Assembly of the United Nations; and we have discussed the problems which have arisen between Greece and Turkey, a subject on which I have informed the Secretary also of my impressions during my visit the last few days.

In essence, we discussed over luncheon, in the presence of the Minister of Development and Cooperation [Jan P. Pronk], the North-South dialogue in Paris and the ways of securing its success. On the subjects which came up, I am not aware of any specific bilateral questions we discussed, because the state of our bilateral relations is a happy one, so I think we spent very useful hours together in a very frank exchange of views.

May I now call on you, Mr. Secretary.

Secretary Kissinger: Before we take questions, I would simply like to thank the

Foreign Minister for the friendly reception we have had here and the very fruitful talks we have conducted. He has enumerated the subjects, and the discussion was conducted in the atmosphere of friends that have similar values and whose disagreements concern how to reach agreed objectives. I consider the talks very fruitful.

We will cooperate closely with the Netherlands in its Presidency of the European Community. We will stay in close touch with each other, and the Foreign Minister has kindly agreed to visit Washington when he is in the United States during the meeting of the General Assembly, and we will continue our dialogue then.

Now I'll be glad to answer questions.

Q. Mr. Secretary, what is the U.S. position now on the sale of the French nuclear weapons to Pakistan since Prime Minister [inaudible]—

Secretary Kissinger: There is no question of selling French nuclear weapons to Pakistan. There is the concern with nonproliferation. [Sentence partially inaudible] the sale of the reprocessing plant. I believe that too much has been said all around on this subject. There are two separate issues involved: one is the contract between Pakistan and France, which is a matter between Pakistan and France; the second is the question of general nonproliferation in which all nations have an interest. It is of no benefit to any one nation to prevent the spread of nuclear weapons, and we believe still that these two problems—the problem of any particular contract and the problem of the debate of the issue of nonproliferation—can be discussed. We are trying to create a calm atmosphere for it and we will say no more about the subject until everybody has cooled off a little bit and then return to the basic issues.

Q. Mr. Secretary, there is the impression that you had proposed a tripartite conference

Secretary Kissinger: I think there is a

⁶ Held at The Hague on Aug. 11 (text from press release 375).

misunderstanding. I have never proposed a tripartite conference between France, Pakistan, and the United States. I believe that the issues should be discussed among various parties, but I've never proposed a tripartite conference.

Q. We can say there are three fields of possible détente—the political, the military, and the humanitarian one. The humanitarian one is probably point 7 and “basket” 3 of the Final Act of Helsinki.⁷ There is some fear, especially among Soviet dissidents, that the United States may give less priority to point 7 and basket 3 in order to obtain more success in the other fields. Is this fear justified, and how much weight do you attach to point 7 and basket 3?

Secretary Kissinger: The United States will not trade concessions in the humanitarian field for benefits in the economic or military field, so that is absolutely out of the question. We attach considerable importance to basket 3 of the Final Act of Helsinki, and it was one of the principal incentives we had for signing the Final Act. Therefore we will give considerable attention to it, and we expect to work together with our allies in Western Europe on preparing for the Belgrade Conference next summer, where we will stress this point very much.

Q. This includes point 7, of course?

Secretary Kissinger: Yes, this includes—frankly, I don't know the individual points, so I don't want to say yes; what is 7?

Q. It involves the free press inside the countries.

Secretary Kissinger: Yes, the entire basket 3.

Q. Would you please give us your opinion on how you see the respective roles of Europe

and the United States in a potential settlement of the Greek-Turkish problem?

Secretary Kissinger: Well, the Greek-Turkish problem, of course, has many aspects. There is the problem of Cyprus, the problem of the Aegean. The United States feels very strongly that both of these problems should be settled by negotiations. We have stated repeatedly with respect to Cyprus that we do not believe that the status quo on Cyprus is an acceptable basis for a settlement and that therefore a solution has to be found that takes into account the self-respect and dignity of all of the communities.

As it happened, I had an extensive talk with Mr. van der Stoep on this subject, and I would not wish to say who has a greater role to play here—the United States or the European Community. I believe we both have an obligation to do our utmost to see to it, first of all, that there are no additional military clashes, because this would be a catastrophe for the two countries as well as a misfortune for NATO; secondly, to move the two countries toward equitable solutions on both of these issues. I had the impression that we agreed on these objectives, and we will pursue parallel policies in which each of us in our own way will urge restraint on both sides and will give whatever support we can to peaceful solutions. Is that a fair statement?

Minister van der Stoep: I think so, yes. Let me add that the countries of the European Community have been in touch both with Ankara and Athens in order to convey their views; that is, the Nine have agreed on a specific line calling for moderation and restraint. It has been made clear and explained in both capitals—Ankara and Athens.

Secretary Kissinger: And so has the United States, but separately and not with notes that were coordinated. It turned out we had very parallel views on the subject.

Q. What about the case being taken to the International Court at The Hague which was

⁷For text of the Final Act of the Conference on Security and Cooperation in Europe, see BULLETIN of Sept. 1, 1975, p. 323; for “basket” 3, Co-operation in Humanitarian and Other Fields, see p. 339.

confirmed last night by the registrar of the Court? Would you regard this as a help or as a hindrance to your present policy?

Secretary Kissinger: We are basically supporting a peaceful solution. Referring it to the International Court is one of those which we certainly would not exclude and would not consider a hindrance, but it of course has to be accepted by both parties.

Q. Mr. Secretary, is there a reasonable chance that a SALT Two agreement will be signed before the Presidential election?

Secretary Kissinger: It depends whom you talk to in the United States. Now, I would not want to predict when a SALT Two agreement will be signed. The issues that remain to be solved are clearly defined, and they deal substantially with the relationship of cruise missiles to Backfire bombers. There are discussions within our government of various approaches to this problem. Most press accounts of these approaches are incorrect; but nevertheless, there are various approaches to it, and when we have formulated our position and submitted it to the Soviet Union, then it is hard to predict how long it will take to negotiate it.

Q. Have you formulated that position now, already?

Secretary Kissinger: No, it is still before the National Security Council.

Q. Mr. Secretary, there is a report from Johannesburg saying that there has been a breakthrough on the negotiations on Namibia. One, are you aware of such a breakthrough? Two, does that mean avoiding confrontation at the United Nations? And three, do you foresee a smooth transition to black majority rule in Namibia?

Secretary Kissinger: We have been talking to South Africa about the problem of Namibia, and we have been urging a solution that moves in the direction of self-determination for Namibia, and we have publicly supported self-determination for

Namibia and a date for independence. I think it is premature to say that there has been a breakthrough. We have had useful talks with the Prime Minister of South Africa, but I would think it is premature to speak of a breakthrough.

Q. Would you consider another term in your present job if whoever was elected President asks you to remain?

Secretary Kissinger: If I as much as suggested that a Democratic President might ask me, there would be 20 candidates for my position on the Democratic side who would be in a state of extreme agitation. I have stated my view on the subject repeatedly, and I think the time to consider this is after President Ford is reelected, and I have stated my preferences on that subject.

Q. I would like to know if you also discussed with Mr. van der Stoep the type of Puerto Rican meetings you are having from time to time, where you exclude the smaller countries of the Common Market by their [inaudible]? Now the last one concerned Italy and aid to Italy, and I understand that Dutch Socialist Prime Minister den Uyl has other views on that than cutting off aid that would be [inaudible] Communists in the government. Could you say more on that? What is your next plan for meeting and will you then invite the other countries as well?

Secretary Kissinger: Well, first of all, I haven't had the privilege of meeting your Prime Minister. I will do that after the press conference, but it would not be the first time in history that his views did not exactly coincide with ours without in any way indicating any lack of friendship on either side.

Now, on the Puerto Rico meeting, there is no Puerto Rico meeting foreseeable during the Presidency of the Netherlands and so this issue did not come up. Also, it is incorrect to describe the Puerto Rico meeting as concerning Italy. It was inevitable that, as various leaders met, various ideas

were exchanged on the subject. But that was not the purpose of the meeting, and there have been some exaggerated accounts of what it was that was in fact discussed. At any rate, there will be no meeting of the Puerto Rican type during the Presidency of the Netherlands that I can foresee and thereafter; I also don't foresee one, but thereafter I can't preclude it for all eternity, particularly if one of the 20 people that we talked about—

Q. And did you think the statement by Chancellor [of the Federal Republic of Germany Helmut] Schmidt exaggerated?

Secretary Kissinger: As I understand it, Chancellor Schmidt didn't even make a formal statement. These were accounts of things that he was—I think they gave it—it gave an impression of formality to general discussions. That was perhaps exaggerated, yes.

Q. Is the United States still of the opinion that aid should be cut off from Italy if there would be Communists in the government?

Secretary Kissinger: I have stated the U.S. view about Communist participation in Italy on repeated occasions, always under extreme provocation. And I have now decided that I will no longer be provoked, so you will have to read my previous statements.

Q. A week ago you spoke about negotiations in southern Africa being in a formative state. That means to say that you will not be expected to give any details. Can you give us a general idea as to what U.S. diplomacy is up to and what role, if any, the European Community will play?

Secretary Kissinger: We are obviously trying to find a basis by which progress can be made toward self-determination in southern Africa, with particular emphasis in this phase on Rhodesia and Namibia.

We are in the closest touch with Great Britain on the Rhodesian question because of its historical and legal responsibilities. We also exchanged views on this matter

with the Dutch Foreign Minister. We believe that the problems of Africa are not American problems, but first of all African problems. But if any other outside countries take an interest in it, I think Europe, because of its historical relationship to it, has a major responsibility as well. So, our basic concern is to defuse the situation that may be drifting toward radical and violent solutions with great rapidity and to find an outcome that respects the dignity of all of the communities involved there and which is achieved by negotiation. But time is clearly running out, and this gives a certain urgency to our efforts.

Q. About southern Africa, you spoke about Rhodesia and Namibia. First question: Is the question of self-determination also critical to South Africa? Second question: about the Middle East, you mentioned in the past the responsible role of Syria in Lebanon. Do you think at this moment that Syria is still filling a responsible role in Lebanon or not?

Secretary Kissinger: The United States has expressed its opposition to the policy of apartheid, and it has repeatedly called attention to the need to heed the warnings of [inaudible] are reflected in such issues and such tragedies as the riots that have recently occurred in South Africa. At the same time, we believe that the problem of South Africa has a different dimension from the problem of Rhodesia and Namibia in the sense that the latter can be called, can be generally put under the category of the vestiges of a colonial period, while South Africa, whatever one thinks of the moral quality of apartheid, is not a colonial problem but an African problem, and therefore it requires a different mode of solution and a different approach. But we are, in principle, opposed to the policy of apartheid and have stated so repeatedly.

With respect to Lebanon, our view is that the Damascus formula of earlier this year is the best solution to the problem of Lebanon; that is to say, a certain reapportionment of power as between the Christian and the Moslem communities but neverthe-

less an essential balance in their political influence. This is what we have considered a responsible solution. As for the individual moves that are being carried out, we are not in favor of interference of any outside country, and our present conviction is that there should be a roundtable conference as rapidly as possible among all of the parties to bring about a solution.

Q. [Inaudible] and do you expect in this regard something from the meeting of the nonaligned countries and the Group of 77?

Secretary Kissinger: As a general proposition I cannot accept the argument that whenever there is a deadlock in the North-South dialogue it is up to the United States to break it. Nor can I accept as a general proposition the argument that we must always talk on an agenda which is proposed by the Group of 77. On the other hand, I believe we had very good talks here with the Foreign Minister and Minister Pronk about the general direction this dialogue might take. I expect to meet with Canadian Foreign Minister MacEachen, who is the chairman of the conference—cochairman of the conference—next week. I will also invite Minister Perez Guerrero [Manuel Perez-Guerrero, Venezuelan Minister for International Economic Affairs, cochairman of the Conference on International Economic Cooperation] to meet with me, and I think that after I've had those two meetings it will be clearer about what progress can be made.

Q. Mr. Secretary, what do you think about the recent events at the frontier between the German Democratic Republic and [inaudible] and Mr. Kreisky [Chancellor of Austria] said events like these must be discussed at the conference in Belgrade?

Secretary Kissinger: At the risk of creating another uproar with another friendly government, I have to tell you I have not studied all the details of what happened during my trip. Of course, we believe that the dividing line and the manner in which it is enforced is itself contrary to the aspirations of the German people and we deplore

this enforced separation of the peoples of the two Germanys. I would believe that it might well be discussed in Belgrade, but I had reserved to study all the incidents when I returned, since I have been traveling for nearly 10 days.

Q. Mr. Secretary and Mr. Foreign Minister, did the Lockheed affair come up in your discussions today?

Secretary Kissinger: We have taken the position from the beginning that the Lockheed affair is a legal problem and not a foreign policy problem between the United States and any other country. And in pursuit of this we have deliberately not informed ourselves of any of the documents that are involved and have insisted that they be handled strictly between the legal authorities of the United States and the countries concerned. This being our position, we have no basis for any discussions on the foreign minister level. The issue was not raised or discussed.

Minister van der Stoep: I can only confirm what the Secretary has just said.

Q. You have several times in the past few weeks spoken of a need or a preference for a roundtable conference on the Lebanese situation. First of all, have you ever had any favorable response from any of the parties, and secondly, would you consider it advisable for the United States to participate in such a conference?

Secretary Kissinger: There have been at various times indications from various parties that they might be willing to do it, but it has never been possible to bring them to the point of fruition. I do not believe that the United States should invite itself to such a conference. If all the parties were to agree to invite us, we would have to look at it, but I consider that an unlikely prospect.

Q. Mr. Secretary, you said in the beginning that the United States will not sacrifice humanitarian issues for economic or military factors. Is it a general principle of your government, or is the principle applicable only to the East bloc?

Secretary Kissinger: In the sense of engaging in a negotiation in which we would sacrifice a humanitarian principle for some other benefit, I would say it is a general proposition. If you apply it in a more abstract way, it is clear we also have to weigh security and economic factors together with humanitarian factors in relation to many issues in the world and that creates the dilemmas of policymaking.

Q. In your assessment, does there now exist a real danger of armed conflict between Greece and Turkey?

Secretary Kissinger: I cannot believe that those two countries which have already suffered so much from their conflict would resort to armed means to settle an issue which, serious as it is, has far from exhausted all the peaceful means. Greece has taken the case to the Security Council, and I would believe this offers one way in which the discussion of the issue can occur. So I do not believe that an armed conflict should occur, and the United States will use all its influence with both parties to urge them to explore the many means of peaceful resolution that are still available. And I believe that the European Community has a similar attitude.

Q. You said that the time was running out in Namibia and Rhodesia. You said you are in close touch with Britain as far as policy is concerned. Would you say time has come now for Britain for a major initiative?

Secretary Kissinger: As I pointed out, we are in the closest touch with Great Britain. I believe that our policies are essentially in harmony on this matter. We are not ahead of Great Britain in the policy we are pursuing. We are not urging it to go any faster. I think matters are proceeding at the pace we consider appropriate, and we and Britain have essentially agreed that is the most effective way to proceed. So we have no private, and even less public, advice to extend to Great Britain at this moment. We have to keep one country on this continent, in Europe, on friendly terms.

Q. The Europeans are most concerned about changes of American policy with a change in government. Can you say anything concerning that?

Secretary Kissinger: Of course, I don't anticipate a change in government, but in the unlikely event that this were to happen, the American foreign policy is determined by the permanent interests and values of the United States. I believe that any responsible leader will interpret those in an analogous way, and while there are undoubtedly differences in emphasis, I would think the main lines of American foreign policy are determined by our interests and not by our parties.

Secretary Reaffirms U.S. Commitment to Law of the Sea Negotiations

Following is the text of a letter dated August 3 from Secretary Kissinger to Hamilton Shirley Amerisinghe, President of the Third U.N. Conference on the Law of the Sea, which was delivered on August 4 by Ambassador T. Vincent Learson, Special Representative of the President for the Law of the Sea Conference.

Press release 364 dated August 4

AUGUST 3, 1976.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: As the Law of the Sea Conference resumes in New York this week, I want to offer you the views of my Government on the importance of cooperative progress to resolve the major outstanding issues remaining before us.

As you know, it is the belief of the United States that this Conference has been engaged in one of the most important diplomatic negotiations in history. No current matter on the international agenda is more vital for the long-term stability and prosperity of our planet. Unless the competitive practices and claims of nations can be harmonized, the world could well face the prospect of mounting contention, or even conflict.

Congressional Documents Relating to Foreign Policy

94th Congress, 2d Session

- Humanitarian Problems in Lebanon. Hearing before the Subcommittee To Investigate Problems Connected With Refugees and Escapees of the Senate Committee on the Judiciary. April 5, 1976. 88 pp.
- Adjustment Assistance for the U.S. Stainless Steel Table Flatware Industry. Message from the President of the United States transmitting a report on his decision to provide adjustment assistance to the U.S. stainless steel flatware industry in lieu of the import relief recommended in the March 1, 1976, finding of the International Trade Commission under section 201(d)(1) of the Trade Act of 1974, pursuant to section 203(b)(2) of the act. H. Doc. 94-483. April 30, 1976. 1 pp.
- The Shifting Pattern of Narcotics Trafficking: Latin America. Report submitted to the House Committee on International Relations by a special study mission, conducted by Representatives Lester L. Wolff and Benjamin A. Gilman January 6-18, 1976, to Mexico, Costa Rica, Panama, and Colombia. May 1976. 76 pp.
- Cessation of Loans for Palm Oil Production. Report of the Senate Committee on Agriculture and Forestry to accompany S. Res. 444. S. Rept. 94-804. May 6, 1976. 3 pp.
- Training of Foreign Nationals at the Coast Guard Academy. Report of the House Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries to accompany H.R. 11407. H. Rept. 94-1110. May 10, 1976. 8 pp.
- U.S. Information Agency Authorization Act, Fiscal Year 1977. Report of the House Committee on International Relations to accompany H.R. 13589. H. Rept. 94-1116. May 11, 1976. 7 pp.
- Inter-American Development Bank. Report of the committee of conference to accompany H.R. 9721. H. Rept. 94-1121. May 11, 1976. 4 pp.
- Foreign Investment Survey Act of 1976. Report of the Senate Committee on Commerce to accompany S. 2839. S. Rept. 94-834. May 13, 1976. 14 pp.
- Export Reorganization Act of 1976. Report of the Senate Committee on Government Operations to accompany S. 1439. S. Rept. 94-875. May 13, 1976. 38 pp.
- Aftermath of War: Humanitarian Problems of Southeast Asia. A staff report prepared for the use of the Subcommittee To Investigate Problems Connected With Refugees and Escapees of the Senate Committee on the Judiciary. May 17, 1976. 589 pp.
- Humanitarian Assistance to Earthquake Victims in Italy. Hearing before the Subcommittee To Investigate Problems Connected With Refugees and Escapees of the Senate Committee on the Judiciary. May 19, 1976. 33 pp.

The achievements of the Conference thus far give us hope that a successful conclusion is possible—one which all nations and groups of nations should find satisfactory. But we have now come to a point where rapid, responsible and cooperative progress is indispensable. The world community now faces the possibility that domestic pressures of many nations may set in motion unilateral national moves which could gravely impair the chances of achieving a treaty in the near future, if at all. Thus it is vital that this current session of the Conference be successful.

The United States attaches the utmost importance to this objective. I will attend the Conference during the week of August 9, and at other times throughout the session will give the work of the Conference my personal attention. The leaders of all delegations and their governments share a heavy responsibility to work conscientiously and with perseverance. If we do so, I am convinced that it will be possible for us to resolve the major remaining issues during this session.

As always, Mr. President, your leadership will be of great importance. I want to convey to you my own appreciation, and that of the Government of the United States, for the work you have done.

I regret that I will not have the opportunity to meet with you before your departure for the meeting of the non-aligned nations in Colombo. But I want to assure you now that you may count on the continuing commitment of the United States Delegation to work with you and with all others at this session in a spirit of mutual cooperation. We have, Mr. President, an opportunity and a duty to make this Conference a cornerstone of a new era in international affairs which brings peace, prosperity and justice to all peoples.

With my best wishes,

Sincerely,

HENRY A. KISSINGER.

U.S. Policy With Respect to Lebanon. Report of the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations to accompany S. Res. 448. S. Rept. 94-908. May 20, 1976. 3 pp.

S. 1439: Export Reorganization Act of 1976. Hearing before the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy. June 22, 1976. 468 pp.

TREATY INFORMATION

Current Actions

MULTILATERAL

Astronauts

Agreement on the rescue of astronauts, the return of astronauts, and the return of objects launched into outer space. Opened for signature at Washington, London, and Moscow April 22, 1968. Entered into force December 3, 1968. TIAS 6599.

Notification of succession: Bahamas, August 13, 1976.

Aviation

Convention for the suppression of unlawful seizure of aircraft. Done at The Hague December 16, 1970. Entered into force October 14, 1971. TIAS 7192.

Notification of succession: Bahamas, August 13, 1976.

Containers

International convention for safe containers, with annexes. Done at Geneva December 2, 1972.¹

Ratification deposited: Federal Republic of Germany, July 27, 1976.²

Copyright

Universal copyright convention, as revised. Done at Paris July 24, 1971. Entered into force July 10, 1974. TIAS 7868.

Accession deposited: Colombia, March 18, 1976.

Energy

Agreement on an international energy program. Done at Paris November 18, 1974. Entered into force January 19, 1976. TIAS 8278.

Notification of consent to be bound deposited: Austria, June 30, 1976.

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

Acceptances deposited: Grenada, July 16, 1976; Zaire, July 15, 1976.

Load Lines

International convention on load lines, 1966. Done at London April 5, 1966. Entered into force July 21, 1968. TIAS 6331, 6629, 6720.

Accession deposited: Bahamas, July 22, 1976.

Maritime Matters

Convention on facilitation of international maritime traffic, with annex. Done at London April 9, 1965. Entered into force March 5, 1967; for the United States May 16, 1967. TIAS 6251.

Accession deposited: Bahamas, July 22, 1976.

Convention on the Intergovernmental Maritime Consultative Organization. Done at Geneva March 6, 1948. Entered into force March 17, 1958. TIAS 4044.

Acceptance deposited: Bahamas, July 22, 1976.

Narcotic Drugs

Protocol amending the single convention on narcotic drugs, 1961. Done at Geneva March 25, 1972. Entered into force August 8, 1975.

Accession deposited: Canada, August 5, 1976.

Nuclear Test Ban

Treaty banning nuclear weapon tests in the atmosphere, in outer space and under water. Done at Moscow August 5, 1963. Entered into force October 10, 1963. TIAS 5422.

Notification of succession: Bahamas, August 13, 1976.

Nuclear Weapons—Nonproliferation

Treaty on the nonproliferation of nuclear weapons. Done at Washington, London, and Moscow July 1, 1968. Entered into force March 5, 1970. TIAS 6839.

Notification of succession: Bahamas, August 13, 1976.

Ocean Dumping

Convention on the prevention of maritime pollution by dumping of wastes and other matter, with annexes. Done at London, Mexico City, Moscow, and Washington December 29, 1972. Entered into force August 30, 1975. TIAS 8165.

Accession deposited: German Democratic Republic, August 20, 1976.

Oil Pollution

International convention for the prevention of pollution of the sea by oil, as amended. Done at London May 12, 1954. Entered into force July 26, 1958;

¹ Not in force.

² Applicable to Berlin (West).

for the United States December 8, 1961. TIAS 4900, 6109.

Acceptance deposited: Bahamas, July 22, 1976.³

Amendments to the international convention for the prevention of pollution of the sea by oil, 1954, as amended (TIAS 4900, 6109). Adopted at London October 21, 1969.¹

Acceptances deposited: Bahamas, July 22, 1976; Ghana, July 2, 1976; Greece, August 3, 1976; Libya, July 19, 1976; Yugoslavia, June 25, 1976.

Amendments to the international convention for the prevention of pollution of the sea by oil, 1954, as amended (TIAS 4900, 6109). Adopted at London October 15, 1971.¹

Acceptance deposited: Yugoslavia, June 25, 1976.

International convention relating to intervention on the high seas in cases of oil pollution casualties, with annex. Done at Brussels November 29, 1969. Entered into force May 6, 1975. TIAS 8068.

Accession deposited: Bahamas, July 22, 1976.

International convention on civil liability for oil pollution damage. Done at Brussels November 29, 1969. Entered into force June 19, 1975.⁴

Accessions deposited: Bahamas, July 22, 1976; Greece, June 29, 1976.

International convention on the establishment of an international fund for compensation for oil pollution damage. Done at Brussels December 18, 1971.¹

Accession deposited: Bahamas, July 22, 1976.

Ratification deposited: Japan, July 7, 1976.

Patents

Patent cooperation treaty, with regulations. Done at Washington June 19, 1970.¹

Ratification deposited: Federal Republic of Germany, July 19, 1976.²

Postal

Constitution of the Universal Postal Union with final protocol signed at Vienna July 10, 1964 (TIAS 5881), as amended by additional protocol, general regulations with final protocol and annex, and the universal postal convention with final protocol and detailed regulations. Signed at Tokyo November 14, 1969. Entered into force July 1, 1971, except for article V of the additional protocol, which entered into force January 1, 1971. TIAS 7150.

Accession deposited: Comoros, May 10, 1976.

Second additional protocol to the constitution of the Universal Postal Union of July 10, 1964 (TIAS 5881, 7150), general regulations with final protocol and annex, and the universal postal convention with final protocol and detailed regulations. Done at Lausanne July 5, 1974. Entered into force January 1, 1976. TIAS 8231.

Ratifications deposited: India, July 6, 1976; Togo, June 30, 1976; Yugoslavia, July 2, 1976.

Accession deposited: Comoros, May 10, 1976.

Money orders and postal travellers' checks agreement, with detailed regulations. Done at Lausanne July 5, 1974. Entered into force January 1, 1976. TIAS 8282.

Ratifications deposited: Togo, June 30, 1976; Yugoslavia, July 2, 1976.

Accession deposited: Comoros, May 10, 1976.

Safety at Sea

International regulations for preventing collisions at sea. Approved by the International Conference on Safety of Life at Sea held at London from May 17 to June 17, 1960. Entered into force September 1, 1965. TIAS 5813.

Acceptance deposited: Bahamas, July 22, 1976.

International convention for the safety of life at sea, 1960. Done at London June 17, 1960. Entered into force May 26, 1965. TIAS 5780, 6284.

Acceptance deposited: Bahamas, July 22, 1976.³

Amendments to the international convention for the safety of life at sea, 1960 (TIAS 5780). Adopted at London November 30, 1966.¹

Acceptance deposited: Bahamas, July 22, 1976.

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

Acceptances deposited: Austria, July 27, 1976; Bahamas, July 22, 1976; Belgium (not including annex III), March 19, 1976; Nauru, November 25, 1975.

Amendments to the international convention for the safety of life at sea, 1960 (TIAS 5780). Adopted at London November 26, 1968.¹

Acceptances deposited: Austria, July 27, 1976; Bahamas, July 22, 1976.

Amendments to the international convention for the safety of life at sea, 1960 (TIAS 5780). Adopted at London October 21, 1969.¹

Acceptances deposited: Austria, July 27, 1976; Bahamas, July 22, 1976.

Amendments to the international convention for the safety of life at sea, 1960 (TIAS 5780). Adopted at London October 12, 1971.¹

Acceptance deposited: United Kingdom, July 19, 1976.

Amendment to chapter VI of the international convention for the safety of life at sea, 1960 (TIAS 5780). Adopted at London November 20, 1973.¹

Acceptance deposited: United Kingdom, July 19, 1976.

Amendments to chapters II, III, IV, and V of the international convention for the safety of life at sea, 1960 (TIAS 5780). Adopted at London November 20, 1973.¹

Acceptance deposited: United Kingdom, July 19, 1976.

Convention on the international regulations for preventing collisions at sea, 1972. Done at London October 20, 1972. Enters into force July 15, 1977.

Accession deposited: Bahamas, July 22, 1976.

¹ Not in force.

² Applicable to Berlin (West).

³ With declaration and reservations.

⁴ Not in force for the United States.

⁵ With a declaration.

Space

Treaty on principles governing the activities of states in the exploration and use of outer space, including the moon and other celestial bodies. Opened for signature at Washington, London, and Moscow January 27, 1967. Entered into force October 10, 1967. TIAS 6347.

Notification of succession: Bahamas, August 13, 1976.

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

Ratification deposited: Canada, August 4, 1976.

Signature: Niger, August 5, 1976.

Terrorism

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

Ratification deposited: Canada, August 4, 1976.

Tonnage Measurement

International convention on tonnage measurement of ships, 1969, with annexes. Done at London June 23, 1969.¹

Accession deposited: Bahamas, July 22, 1976.

Acceptance deposited: Poland, July 27, 1976.

United Nations

Amendment to article 109 of the Charter of the United Nations. Adopted by the General Assembly at United Nations Headquarters, New York, December 20, 1965. Entered into force June 12, 1968. TIAS 6529.

Ratification deposited: Cuba, May 17, 1976.

Amendment to article 61 of the United Nations Charter to enlarge the Economic and Social Council. Done at New York December 20, 1971. Entered into force September 24, 1973. TIAS 7739.

Ratification deposited: Cuba, May 17, 1976.

Wheat

Protocol modifying and further extending the wheat trade convention (part of the international wheat agreement) 1971 (TIAS 7144, 8227). Done at Washington March 17, 1976. Entered into force June 19, 1976, with respect to certain provisions, and July 1, 1976, with respect to other provisions.

Accession deposited: Panama, August 18, 1976.

BILATERAL

Honduras

Agreement relating to the limitation of meat imports from Honduras during calendar year 1976. Effected by exchange of notes at Tegucigalpa April 28 and June 10, 1976. Entered into force June 10, 1976.

¹ Not in force.

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 35¢ each.

Bahrain	Cat. No. S1.123:B14/2	
	Pub. 8013	4 pp.
Belize	Cat. No. S1.123:B44/2	
	Pub. 8332	4 pp.
Burma	Cat. No. S1.123:B92	
	Pub. 7931	8 pp.
China, Republic of	Cat. No. S1.123:C44/2	
	Pub. 7791	8 pp.
Mali	Cat. No. S1.123:M29/5	
	Pub. 8056	5 pp.
Somali Democratic Republic	Cat. No. S1.123:S05	
	Pub. 7881	6 pp.

Documents on Disarmament 1974. Basic documents on arms control and disarmament arranged in chronological order, preceded by a topical list of documents and lists of abbreviations and conferences and followed by a bibliography, a list of persons, and an index. ACDA Pub. 76. 918 pp. \$8.60. (Cat. No. S1.117/5:76). (Stock No. 002-000-00049-1).

Cultural Relations Programs of the U.S. Department of State, Historical Studies: Number 1, America's Cultural Experiment in China, by Wilma Fairbank. Monograph which recounts the history of the 1942-49 U.S. Government program "... aimed directly at offering assistance to the Chinese people in education, public health, sanitation, agriculture, engineering, and the like." Appendixes and index included. Pub. 8839. International Information and Cultural Series 108. 233 pp. \$5.10. (Cat. No. S1.67:8839.). (Stock No. 044-000-01597-8).

1975 Report of the Visa Office. Report of the Department of State's activities in carrying out its responsibilities under the Immigration and Nationality Act for FY 1975 including statistical tables with index. Pub. 8810. Department and Foreign Service Series 150. 84 pp. \$1.70. (Cat. No. S1.1./4:8810). (Stock No. 044-000-01612-5).

World Meteorological Organization. Amendments to the convention of October 11, 1947, as amended. TIAS 8175. 10 pp. 35¢. (Cat. No. S9.10:8175).

Trade in Cotton, Wool and Man-Made Fiber Textiles. Agreement with Japan modifying the arrangement of September 27, 1974. TIAS 8181. 21 pp. 35¢. (Cat. No. S9.10:8181).

Cooperation in Geothermal Energy Research and Development. Agreement with Italy. TIAS 8182. 12 pp. 35¢. (Cat. No. S9.10:8182).

Peace Corps. Agreement with Upper Volta. TIAS 8183. 11 pp. 35¢. (Cat. No. S9.10:8183).

Economic and Social Development—Sino-American Fund. Agreement with the Republic of China extending the agreement of April 9, 1965, as amended and extended. TIAS 8184. 8 pp. 35¢. (Cat. No. S9.10:8184).

Telecommunication—Assignment of Television Channels Along United States-Mexican Border. Agreement with Mexico amending the agreement of April 18, 1962. TIAS 8185. 7 pp. 35¢. (Cat. No. S9.10:8185).

Military Mission. Agreement with Iran amending and extending the agreement of November 27, 1943, as amended and extended. TIAS 8186. 6 pp. 35¢. (Cat. No. S9.10:8186).

Trade in Textiles—Consultations on Market Disruption. Agreement with Portugal. TIAS 8187. 5 pp. 35¢. (Cat. No. S9.10:8187).

Agricultural Commodities—Agreement with Chile. TIAS 8188. 7 pp. 35¢. (Cat. No. S9.10:8188).

Social Security. Agreement with Niger. TIAS 8194. 8 pp. 35¢. (Cat. No. S9.10:8194).

Education—Financing Educational Exchange Programs. Agreement with Finland amending the agreement of July 2, 1952, as amended. TIAS 8196. 7 pp. 35¢. (Cat. No. S9.10:8196).

Agricultural Commodities. Agreement with Jordan. TIAS 8197. 12 pp. 35¢. (Cat. No. S9.10:8197).

Mutual Defense Assistance—Cash Contribution by Japan. Arrangement with Japan relating to the agreement of March 8, 1954. TIAS 8198. 6 pp. 35¢. (Cat. No. S9.10:8198).

Agricultural Commodities. Agreement with Israel amending the agreement of December 16, 1974. TIAS 8200. 2 pp. 35¢. (Cat. No. S9.10:8200).

Agricultural Commodities. Agreement with Egypt. TIAS 8201. 4 pp. 35¢. (Cat. No. S9.10:8201).

Energy—Solar Heating and Cooling Systems in Buildings. Memorandum of Understanding with Other Governments. TIAS 8202. 4 pp. 35¢. (Cat. No. S9.10:8202).

Remote Sensing—Acquisition of Satellite Data. Memorandum of Understanding with Iran. TIAS 8203. 4 pp. 35¢. (Cat. No. S9.10:8203).

Continued Operation of Long Range Aid to Navigation (LORAN) Stations. Agreement with the Philippines. TIAS 8204. 3 pp. 35¢. (Cat. No. S9.10:8204).

Grains Agreement. Agreement with the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics. TIAS 8206. 8 pp. 35¢. (Cat. No. S9.10:8206).

Remote Sensing—Acquisition of Satellite Data. Memorandum of Understanding with Chile. TIAS 8211. 4 pp. 35¢. (Cat. No. S9.10:8211).

Finance—Damascus Water System. Agreement with Syria. TIAS 8212. 33 pp. 45¢. (Cat. No. S9.10:8212).

Remote Sensing—Acquisition of Satellite Data. Memorandum of Understanding with Italy. TIAS 8213. 4 pp. 35¢. (Cat. No. S9.10:8213).

Afghanistan. Secretary Kissinger Attends Session of U.S.-Iran Joint Commission; Visits Afghanistan, Pakistan, and the Netherlands (toasts, news conferences, Joint Commission communique, U.S.-Afghanistan joint statement)	305
Africa. Secretary Kissinger Attends Session of U.S.-Iran Joint Commission; Visits Afghanistan, Pakistan, and the Netherlands (toasts, news conferences, Joint Commission communique, U.S.-Afghanistan joint statement)	305
Arms Control and Disarmament. Secretary Kissinger Attends Session of U.S.-Iran Joint Commission; Visits Afghanistan, Pakistan, and the Netherlands (toasts, news conferences, Joint Commission communique, U.S.-Afghanistan joint statement)	305
Congress. Congressional Documents Relating to Foreign Policy	328
Economic Affairs. Secretary Kissinger Attends Session of U.S.-Iran Joint Commission; Visits Afghanistan, Pakistan, and the Netherlands (toasts, news conferences, Joint Commission communique, U.S.-Afghanistan joint statement)	305
Greece. Secretary Kissinger Attends Session of U.S.-Iran Joint Commission; Visits Afghanistan, Pakistan, and the Netherlands (toasts, news conferences, Joint Commission communique, U.S.-Afghanistan joint statement)	305
Iran. Secretary Kissinger Attends Session of U.S.-Iran Joint Commission; Visits Afghanistan, Pakistan, and the Netherlands (toasts, news conferences, Joint Commission communique, U.S.-Afghanistan joint statement)	305
Law of the Sea. Secretary Reaffirms U.S. Commitment to Law of the Sea Negotiations (letter to President of the Law of the Sea Conference)	327
Lebanon. Secretary Kissinger Attends Session of U.S.-Iran Joint Commission; Visits Afghanistan, Pakistan, and the Netherlands (toasts, news conferences, Joint Commission communique, U.S.-Afghanistan joint statement)	305
Netherlands. Secretary Kissinger Attends Session of U.S.-Iran Joint Commission; Visits Afghanistan, Pakistan, and the Netherlands (toasts, news conferences, Joint Commission communique, U.S.-Afghanistan joint statement)	305
Pakistan. Secretary Kissinger Attends Session of U.S.-Iran Joint Commission; Visits Afghanistan, Pakistan, and the Netherlands (toasts, news conferences, Joint Commission communique, U.S.-Afghanistan joint statement)	305
Publications. GPO Sales Publications	331
Treaty Information. Current Actions	329
Turkey. Secretary Kissinger Attends Session of U.S.-Iran Joint Commission; Visits Afghanistan, Pakistan, and the Netherlands (toasts, news conferences, Joint Commission communique, U.S.-Afghanistan joint statement)	305

stan, Pakistan, and the Netherlands (toasts, news conferences, Joint Commission communique, U.S.-Afghanistan joint statement)	305
United Nations. Secretary Reaffirms U.S. Commitment to Law of the Sea Negotiations (letter to President of the Law of the Sea Conference)	327

Name Index

Ansary, Hushang	307
Kissinger, Secretary	305, 327
van der Stoep, Max	322

**Checklist of Department of State
Press Releases: August 16-22**

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

No.	Date	Subject
*379	8/17	Shipping Coordinating Committee (SCC), Sept. 23.
*380	8/17	SCC, Sept. 24.
*381	8/17	SCC, Subcommittee on Safety of Life at Sea (SOLAS), working group on safety of fishing vessels, Sept. 21.
*382	8/17	U.S. National Committee for the International Telegraph and Telephone Consultative Committee, Sept. 15.
*383	8/17	SCC, SOLAS, working group on ship design and equipment, Sept. 14-16.
*384	8/17	SCC, SOLAS, working group on standards of training and watch-keeping, Sept. 14.
*385	8/16	U.S.-Canada joint press release on delay of the International Joint Commission report on the Garrison Diversion Unit.
*386	8/18	News specialists from nine countries participate in journalism project.
*387	8/18	SCC, SOLAS, working group on fire protection, Sept. 17.
*388	8/18	SCC, SOLAS, working group on life-saving appliances, Sept. 17.
*389	8/18	Advisory Committee to U.S. National Section of Inter-American Tropical Tuna Commission, La Jolla, Calif., Sept. 23-25.
*390	8/19	SCC, SOLAS, working group on radiocommunications, Sept. 16.
*391	8/20	Stephen Low sworn in as Ambassador to Zambia (biographic data).

* Not printed.