THE DEPARTMENT OF STATE
BULLETIN

Volume LXXV • No. 1956 • December 20, 1976

THE OFFICIAL WEEKLY RECORD OF UNITED STATES FOREIGN POLICY

For index see inside back cover

THE DEPARTMENT OF STATE BULLETIN

VOL. LXXV, No. 1956
December 20, 1976

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

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

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

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

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

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.

National Meeting on Science, Technology, and Development

Representatives of industry, universities, foundations, research institutes, private voluntary organizations, and labor unions attended a National Meeting on Science, Technology, and Development held by the Department on November 17. The meeting initiated a series of activities leading to a National Conference on Science, Technology, and Development in 1977. Results of that conference will further the development of U.S. policy in this area and support U.S. participation in the U.N. Conference on Science and Technology for Development scheduled for 1979.

Following are informal remarks made before the meeting by Secretary Kissinger, together with addresses by H. Guyford Stever, who is Director of the Office of Science and Technology Policy and Science and Technology Adviser to President Ford, and by Daniel Parker, Administrator, Agency for International Development (AID).

REMARKS BY SECRETARY KISSINGER

Press release 561 dated November 17

First of all, I would like to express my appreciation and that of my colleagues to all of you for coming here and giving us your time on a subject that has proved rather obdurate for us to deal with. Of course, when we called this conference we were expecting to do some more long-range planning [laughter] than now turns out to be the case.

The issue that we are here to consider is not one that is bounded by any Administration and deals with problems that will have to concern us for the indefinite future.

I thought I would make just a few informal remarks to put before you some of the thinking that led to this conference, some of the questions to which we would appreciate your answers or your views, and then to turn it over to the regular proceedings.

Any Administration, any President or Secretary of State, must have as one of his principal concerns the problem of international order. We are always overwhelmed on a day-to-day basis with the cables and problems that present themselves. And I have the impression sometimes that the qualities of our high officials—that our high officials need—are becoming more and more those of an athlete responding rapidly to stimuli with no opportunity to reflect about the long-term trends. The problems that present themselves, however, are not always the most significant. And in any event, they are those that are frequently the most unmanageable.

The fundamental problem is how to create an international system, or to participate in creating an international system, in which the principal participants have a sense of belonging. That doesn't mean that everybody has to be satisfied, but it does mean that everybody, or at least all those countries or groups that can upset it, feel either that their basic concerns have been met or that a mechanism exists by which their concerns can be met.

If this does not exist, then those who feel

themselves disadvantaged, unjustly treated, dispossessed, will band together, and they will join any other group that is willing to undermine the existing order. And then international problems will be settled by endless confrontations, by contests of strength; and we will be living in an environment of political, economic, and, occasionally, military conflict.

Now, the United States is the strongest nation in the world. The United States could survive better than most, in fact probably better than any other country, in such an environment. But it is an environment that would tax even our resources. It would be in the long term incompatible with the sort of economy with which we are familiar and under which we have flourished. And above all, it would be inconsistent with the fundamental American values.

We have to live in a world, not where everybody agrees with us, but where our values have some relevance. We do not wish to live in a siege mentality or in a world in which only might makes right. And therefore, while I know that many of you here are hardheaded businessmen, and while I have been told by all of my advisers never to stray from the emphasis on self-interest, I would like to point out that our self-interest is not incompatible with the world interest and that only to the extent that we can make our self-interest relevant to the world interest can we really prosper as a country and survive with our basic institutions intact.

This is the general problem, as I see it, of the relationship of the tasks that all Administrations since the war have faced in one way or another. It has become particularly acute in recent years because of the beginning cartelization of some of the world's economy; because of the organization of some of the developing countries into political units operating more and more as a bloc; because the United States, while still the most powerful country in the world, is no longer the predominant country it was in the fifties and early sixties—nor can it be.

Therefore our foreign policy problem has become, as it has been for most other nations throughout their history, how to contribute to a world that can be both secure and make progress, how to do this with resources that are finite in relation to all of the objectives we could be pursuing at any one time, and how to build a consensus of like-minded states.

Now, the trends that I have described have resulted in some tendencies which we find very unfortunate. Too many of the developing countries are following a radical rhetoric that is incompatible with their own progress and indeed with the achievement of the goals they profess. Too many of them seek to achieve by confrontation and extortion what can only result, and what can only be significant, through the voluntary cooperation of all nations.

While it is crucial for the United States to take an enlightened and farsighted view about the process of development, while it is foolish and shortsighted for us to be niggardly and petty in our approach, it is also true that what we offer cannot appear to be, and indeed cannot be, the result of conditions imposed on us by those who will be the primary beneficiaries of the process of development.

So, we have to steer a course in which we show that we are concerned about the problems of the greater part of humanity, but where we also have a right to ask of those countries that they remember that 90 percent of the transfer of all capital from private and public sources comes from the industrial democracies, that there are no realistic alternative sources, and that the process must be a reciprocal one.

The United States, in my view, has an obligation to respond to some of the fundamental concerns of our times. The developing countries must have an enhanced capability of access to worldwide capital markets, especially private capital markets. The markets for the primary commodities sold by developing countries should be stable and efficient. Special measures will be needed to help developing countries find new markets for the goods and services which they will be increasingly able to produce. And the international community should help the developing countries to develop, transfer, adapt, and

manage technology appropriate to their needs.

On the other hand, we have a right—indeed an obligation—that the process of development is not something that is handed by one group of nations to another group of nations. In all societies it was a process that extended over decades. And indeed in all other societies it was a process that extended over generations. It needs domestic disciplines. It requires a process of education. In many societies it requires an adaptation of our basic values. There is no substitute for hard effort by the developing countries in their own process of development, and no one should create the illusion that there can be.

Developing countries must find a way to encourage savings, reward initiatives and ability, spread education and training, and expand opportunities for all their people.

It is also clear that a constructive world order must have provisions in which foreign investors can operate in a stable and peaceful environment as long as they may give serious contributions to the social and economic progress of the host country. But they must be free of harassment and unreasonable restraints. And it is indeed one of the curious phenomena of this period that, for some reason, transfer of governmental capital is considered in many countries more acceptable than private capital, even though the capacity of governments to attach restrictive conditions is infinitely greater than the capacity of private capital to attach restrictive conditions.

So, in the process of development we need a sense of obligation on the part of the developed countries and a sense of participation and reciprocity on the part of the developing countries.

Now, let me turn to the subject matter of this conference. When you see me shuffle papers here, I have been deluged with words of warning, advice, and some formulations that extend over many pages of dependent clauses. [Laughter.] As far as I can see, every bureau in this building has been given a chance, not just to add its views, but to make an input to each sentence. [Laughter.] I just want you to know that—let it never be said that we have not institutionalized foreign policy.

Let me turn to the issues of this conference. However we view the process of development, in one way or another it must involve a transfer of technology. Whether we do it directly as an act of policy, or whether we do it indirectly by raising the general level of economic activity of the developing countries, progress in development depends on whether the developing countries learn to harness technology to the purposes of their societies.

Now, among the many warnings I have received is that there is a group—I can't see them with these lights—but I am told there is a group of cold-eyed managers sitting here that is determined not to be impressed by do-gooders who want to spread our technology around the world and to create new competitors. And I am told by my hardheaded business friend over here [Deputy Secretary of State Charles W. Robinson] that I have got to explain to them that they will make more money by spreading technology [laughter]—by spreading technology than by holding onto it. But if you are hardheaded businessmen and if you believe a Harvard professor who tells you how to make money [laughter], then you are in worse shape than I think you are [laughter].

So my friend Chuck Robinson, who specializes in building ports in landlocked countries [laughter], no doubt by telling them that it is highly profitable [laughter], will be able to explain to his colleagues from the business community exactly how this works.

I will talk about the subject that I know something about, which is that if we are going to have an international environment in which our economy can prosper at all—not any one business, but our economy in its present form—then we must be dealing with societies that consider us relevant to their concerns. We cannot abolish the concern for development, nor do we want to abolish it. It is an expression of our entire history. For the United States not to take a leading role in this would be to abdicate from one of the principal currents of our time. It would be to make us irrelevant to the concerns of the

major part of humanity. I know that it would undermine the effective conduct of our foreign policy. I must believe that over a period of time it would undermine the effective operation of our economic institutions around the world.

So, in the broad self-interest of the United States, which in this sense is identical with the world interest, development must be one of the increasing concerns of our country.

Now, I have believed for a considerable time that this country, representing the most advanced technology in the world, must be able to make a contribution to what is, after all, the principal way in which development will take place; namely, the development of technology around the world.

We have found ourselves restricted by traditional concepts in which the government would focus primarily on certain types of exchange programs and in which private industry was supposed to do its thing entirely on commercial considerations. And we have lacked a coherent strategy by which the benefits of technology that we possess can be made available in a disciplined and farsighted and cooperative manner.

During the last year we have made a number of proposals in international forums. Our initiatives have generally fallen into two categories.

One, national. We have proposed national and international institutes and programs to provide information, research, and training assistance to developing countries in science and technology.

And secondly, we have attempted to take steps to create an international environment in which the private sector, which is the repository of most of our technology, can make its maximum contribution.

The first category includes information supporting the creation of an international center for the exchange of technological information; proposing the establishment of a technology exchange service for Latin America; proposing an inventory of U.S. national information sources and improved access to U.S. facilities; supporting the concept of regional advisory services under UNCTAD [U.N. Conference on Trade and Development] auspices; and supporting an offer to host the U.N. Conference on Science and Technology for Development in 1979.

The second category is in the area of research and training. We have increased our support for international agricultural research centers; proposed the establishment of an International Energy Institute; urged the establishment of an International Industrialization Institute; supported the creation of an inter-American technology center; and extended existing support for applied research in nutrition, health, and education.

We have encouraged training by the encouragement of formation of a technology corps and by proposing incentives and measures to curb emigration of highly trained manpower from developing countries.

With respect to encouraging the private sector, we have supported a voluntary code of conduct for the transfer of technology in UNCTAD.

We have supported a voluntary code of conduct for transnational enterprises in the United Nations.

We have proposed the establishment of an International Resources Bank. And if I had not mentioned this I would have been shot in the back by the Deputy Secretary. [Laughter.]

We have supported the examination of restrictive business practices and recommended that other OECD [Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development] nations urgently study the possibility of the greater contribution of all industrial nations to the problems of technology transfer.

Now, all of these were useful steps, extorted from a recalcitrant bureaucracy with great pain. [Laughter.]

What we need, however, at this moment, is some integrated concept—something in which all sectors of American life address such questions as:

What technology is it in our interest and in the global interest to transfer?

How is that transfer accomplished in a way that the developing countries can benefit from it and the world economy as a whole advance?

What should be the relationship between our educational institutions, our industrial enterprises, and the host countries so that they can build the most creative partnership, not simply in relationship to any one firm but in relationship to the total environment?

Is the establishment, for example, of regional research centers in developing countries, which has led to major breakthroughs in agricultural research, a useful tool in such fields as industrial technology?

How can multinational corporations relate themselves to universities and the host countries in a deliberate strategy which improves the environment in which they operate and at the same time is of benefit to the host countries?

These and many other questions are the purposes behind our calling this conference. Indeed, we have, as you know, distributed a whole list of questions to this group. You should not feel confined by those questions. You should feel free to tell us that some of these questions are nonsense. My colleagues are experts at being lacerated and ignoring in a graceful way whatever they do not really agree with. [Laughter.]

But we genuinely would like to know what this distinguished group thinks about the problem I have put before you. Have we defined the problem correctly? What approach should be taken? Obviously, we cannot have a strategy emerge out of one conference, but I hope that a work program can emerge out of this conference that can be carried forward in the years ahead.

I do note, to return to my starting point, that the problem of world order is the dominant problem of our time. We have talked a great deal about its military component, and we have an understanding of its political component. But in the decades ahead it is very probable that the social and economic aspects of international order will dominate our concerns, and our ability to solve it will determine whether we live in a world that has a consciousness of cooperation and of progress or in a world of constant strife.

I have no doubt what the U.S. commitment must be. And I can think of no area in which our host of private institutions, private enterprises, and private initiatives can make a greater contribution to the freedom, prosperity, and peace of man than in the subject matter of this conference.

ADDRESS BY DR. STEVER

Last May in Nairobi, Secretary Kissinger announced that the United States would convene a national conference "to bring together our best talent from universities, foundations, and private enterprise . . . . to consider the broad range of technological issues of concern to the developing world." [1] I am pleased that so many of you are here today to help us prepare for that conference. What we accomplish here in preparation for our national conference will ultimately have a significant impact on our U.S. contribution to the 1979 U.N. Conference on Science and Technology for Development.

Nothing that has happened since last May has in any way reduced the need for and importance of the 1979 U.N. conference. If anything, the pressures are greater than ever. And they are pressures that may ultimately have greater influence on world order than the relations—including military—of the industrialized nations.

Those pressures, due to population growth, the need for more food and better nutrition, increased energy costs, resource demand, and social and political expectations, will not slacken. They involve the needs, hopes, and dreams of a major part of humanity—and, we must remember, a part of humanity that will grow vastly in proportion to the rest of us who are more fortunate. This growth will take place over the next few decades regardless of a decline in the birth rates in those poorer areas of the world.

Though pressures grow and the clamor for development assistance grows with them—often reaching a strong and strident pitch—there are some signs that a new and healthier climate is emerging in which to pursue industrial-Third World relations:

---

[1] For an address by Secretary Kissinger made before the fourth ministerial meeting of UNCTAD at Nairobi on May 6, see BULLETIN of May 31, 1976, p. 657.

—It is one in which more people are recognizing that what is needed is less threats and recriminations and more understanding of the mutuality of benefits to be gained by successful development.

—It is one in which the advanced countries are taking a fresh look at the possibilities of new markets and sources of commodities and labor and looking beyond that to the long-term benefits of a peaceful, stable world community.

—It is one in which there is also a growing recognition that development is a continuous and dynamic matter.

—It is one recognizing that in relation to development, science and technology are not forms of magic, but costly resources difficult to acquire and apply wisely.

New Ways of Thinking About Development

This new realism includes the recognition that while technology is at the heart of the development process, a new and more mature attitude toward the application of technology has emerged. This attitude emphasizes that the application of a technology should be more broadly considered in terms of the long-term environmental and social impact as well as its more immediate economic results.

The fact that we are thinking in terms of development as an ongoing process and not the reaching of a specific goal at a specific time is also an important sign of maturity. As we move into the years ahead, the very nature and aims of development may change. So we must remain flexible and creative (and perhaps humble) in our thinking about it.

To me all these are encouraging signs that we may finally be getting on the right track, or at least realizing what the right track is. They are even more encouraging if one compares today's thinking on development with that of the past. We are not dealing with a new subject here. The relations of science and technology to development have been noted and used for decades, perhaps centuries, with both notable successes and failures. There have been programs and projects that were bilateral, multilateral, international, regional, privately supported, government-supported, and university-to-university programs, sister lab arrangements, and so forth—all with varying results. Hundreds of such arrangements still exist, and a good number of them are highly productive.

On an international organization scale, we seem to be the least successful. Plans for a U.N. Conference on Science and Technology for Development have been germinating since 1963 when the United Nations held a Conference on the Application of Science and Technology for the Benefit of the Less Developed Areas. Most who were associated with that conference recall that it failed to live up to expectations. There has been much discussion since concerning that failure. That discussion has led to the decision to hold the 1979 conference for which we are preparing now.

This preparatory meeting and the U.S. national conference in 1977 will be very important. They will help to formulate our contribution to the U.N. conference in 1979. And while we should think of that meeting not as any final activity but just the beginning of a major effort that will take place for decades, time and conditions demand that we do some constructive thinking and planning during the next few years.

There are a number of lines along which we must think, plan, and act to achieve success in using science and technology for development. And it is on some of these that I want to focus for the balance of my remarks.

First we must realize that a unified, interdisciplinary outlook is now essential to development thinking. Past U.N. conferences have emphasized to some extent our singular approaches. Such conferences have focused individually on population, food, energy, environment, habitation, economics, and so forth. One cannot be faulted for wanting to concentrate on these topics, as individually they represent enormous challenges. However, development is a matter that relates to all of them and must consider all these areas in a rather integrated approach.

We must recognize also that development is a process, one which must be pursued in an

orderly way and rest on a firm foundation. The process involves, first, assurance of subsistence: sufficient food to avoid hunger and malnutrition; shelter and clothing; protection from disease and natural disaster. Outside aid can initially provide some of this, but a people's future must depend on a fundamental ability to provide these necessities for themselves lest it collapse like a house of cards when that outside support is withdrawn.

With subsistence achieved, the next step is capitalization. When resources—materials, energy, and skills—beyond those necessary to achieve subsistence can be saved, they become capital, which in turn can be applied to increase production and productivity. At this point, the development process really begins. Science in the form of useful knowledge, and technology in the form of tools, machinery, processes, and systems, are essential to such development. We have seen this throughout history. It is the story of the industrialized world—which is really a misleading term because it is also the "agriculturalized" world, the "energized" world, and the "knowledgeized" world. Food, fuel, and information are among its major underpinnings; and we must never forget this.

When we apply this thinking to the needs of the less developed countries (LDC's), we come up against a fundamental argument where our ideas have been changing. The prevailing belief (or hope) for many years was that development, such as that achieved by the industrialized nations, could be transplanted to LDC's. We realize now that such a direct transplantation is usually rejected, much as a biological host rejects a transplant from a foreign body or organism. Most societies are complex structures. Their environment, institutions, economy, and culture cannot in most cases accept the radical change that takes place when development is imposed on a region and a people in such total fashion.

So the thought that one could force-feed development, could start the process simply by bringing in all the tools, techniques, and funds that made development go in other areas, is no longer looked on favorably.

Production of Necessities of Life

What are some of the current ideas as to possible alternative approaches? Let me touch on several.

As mentioned before, a foremost aim of development today appears to be that of providing a means for a subsistence base. This emphasizes the need for LDC's to work toward greater agricultural self-sufficiency. A strong underlying motivation for this, both on the part of the developed and the developing nations, is the realization that the agriculturally well-endowed countries, principally the United States, Canada, and Australia, cannot remain indefinitely the world's food hedge through their sources of surplus grain. All countries, no matter where they are located and whatever their previous agriculture and food history, must seek every means to maximize their indigenous food production.

This and the importance of other subsistence items emphasize the need for a strong effort to increase research and provide the appropriate technology transfer in agriculture plus other means to stimulate the production of the necessities of life in the LDC's. Development cannot take place in a condition of abject poverty and hunger. And direct aid for preventing this condition is limited and will become relatively more so in the light of future population pressures.

In spite of the economic advantages to us in selling agricultural surplus (and most of it does not go to the LDC's), the United States recognizes the future limitations of food sales and aid and the need for foreign agricultural development; hence the recent passage of title XII of the Foreign Assistance Act and the beginning of its implementation through AID with the help of a new Board for International Food and Agricultural Development. Title XII authorizes land-grant colleges and universities to pursue research applicable to foreign agriculture and food needs. It encourages and gives some increased mechanisms for support to areas of research which heretofore have been secondary in U.S. agricultural research, which have not had the prestige and attention needed to at-

tract and hold sufficient research talent. It is important to note that the title XII Board includes in addition to its university members others associated with the agriculture and food industries. U.S. industry's long interest and involvement in overseas agricultural production and distribution have been recognized, and its future role is being emphasized.

Adapting Technologies to Specific Needs

In speaking out strongly about a subsistence base for the LDC's and taking this first-things-first-for-survival approach, we are not denying the next steps in development. This has been a point of some misunderstanding and may continue to be, as some of the LDC's hold to the belief that the advanced countries want all of them to remain primarily rural, agricultural societies.

While it might be best for many LDC's to become successful in their countrysides and prevent an influx of unemployed and unemployable people to their cities, no one pattern of agriculture-industry development is suggested for all LDC's. Each represents a different set of conditions with different resources and different potentials.

This, I believe, is an important point and one of which we should take special note in these sessions and in the conferences ahead. We tend to lump all LDC's together under a single classification—and they do have some common problems. But these countries cannot and should not be so easily categorized. Not only does their per capita income vary greatly, but there is a wide range of differences in all the things that matter in development. Their land, water, and weather; their natural resources; their educational conditions; their demographic distribution; their social and political stability; their culture and institutions—all these and more make an enormous difference in how they can and should develop. There can be no single plan or path for these diverse countries, even though many share some common conditions and problems.

It is important that all this is being recognized today. As a result, we realize that the LDC's represent a great range of technology-transfer interests and needs, many of which have to be carefully tailored to their special situations. The preliminary planning for the 1979 U.N. conference will consider this to some extent in their regional meetings. It should be a frame of reference for the work in our thinking and planning for the U.S. conference next year and for 1979.

We must consider the large range of technologies available and how they can be adapted to specific needs. Those technologies run the gamut from improved simple farm tools, to small-scale advanced technologies such as a solar-electric pump for a tube well, to the high technologies of Landsat applications for agriculture and geology and nuclear power for electricity.

Our future success, and that of the LDC's, may hinge on studying specific conditions and tailoring technologies and systems very closely to what research reveals is most applicable in each step of development. Working toward, and failing to meet, unrealistic expectations can be disastrous. Each successful step builds not only a firm technical step for the next but an entire environment of success that includes self-esteem, pride of accomplishment, and economic reward that are essential to the process. Too often in the past "grand schemes" have been brought in, have failed, and have left a devastated morale that discourages future attempts for progress. This has also alienated the people of the area from those who tried to help them.

Along these lines of working by building on specific, successful steps, I am reminded of the words of William Blake:

> He who would do good to another must do it in minute particulars:
> General good is the plea of the scoundrel, hypocrite and flatterer,
> For art and science cannot exist but in minutely organized particulars.

The particulars of development are many and varied.

Those of you here who have had experience in technology transfer abroad know that it involves far more than making the hardware available. It calls for the availability of trained personnel and managers, a suitable

social as well as physical environment, and a population willing and able to accept the technology and be trained to use it and maintain it. In addition, no transplanted technology of any size or consequence, no matter how carefully introduced, can endure without the necessary infrastructure of education, transportation, communication, health services, and so forth to back it up.

In considering these and other broad aspects of development, the United States must enter the 1979 U.N. conference with some firm policy outlook. We must decide what it is we want to accomplish and what we want to avoid. We must be cautious about promising what we cannot deliver. We should seek means to work as directly as possible with those countries and regions that need and request our assistance and offer cooperation. In the past, direct approaches such as bilateral arrangements and industrial agreements have worked well, and these probably represent our best tactic for the future. Many agreements are in effect today and could be expanded. We are not starting from a zero base.

Importance of Basic Research

A most important point that should be stated and restated for our own benefit as well as for the ultimate success of what the U.N. conference hopes to accomplish is: To help others we must be strong ourselves. The United States must maintain its leadership in science and technology through a reinvigorated program of domestic R. & D. [research and development].

Basic research is of particular importance. A deep reservoir of basic knowledge is essential to generate effective technology transfer. A major virtue of such knowledge is that it provides for a flexibility in understanding and adapting to new environments, for innovating, and for meeting new contingencies. In addition, the domestic economic health achieved through R. & D. places us in a better position to aid others and to act as markets for them.

I think it is an encouraging sign that Federal support for R. & D. is once again rising and particularly that there has been a substantial increase in the support allocated to basic research in this year's Federal budget. This has come about through a recognition that the advancement of such research is essential to the nation's future strength and well-being.

Role of Industry and Universities

I turn now to your role in all this—and I view it as most important. Among our greatest assets to generate the technology and means of technology transfer that are essential to development are our universities and industries. In this country, it is well known that our land-grant colleges and state universities played a major role in our own development. Currently many of them and our other universities are conducting outstanding work with foreign countries in agriculture, engineering, and biomedical programs. These may be expanded through title XII, which I mentioned before, and perhaps through similar arrangements in other fields. We have a Peace Corps, to which the universities contribute a flow of talent; and Secretary Kissinger at Nairobi proposed formation of a technology corps, "a private, nonprofit organization to which corporations and universities will contribute highly skilled personnel experienced in the management of scientific and technical operations."

U.S. industry, of course, has been instrumental in technology transfer on a global scale. This has been primarily in the more advanced countries but has also had an impact on some LDC's. We know that a few of these countries have achieved remarkable economic progress through industrial technology transfer. There is going to be a growing market for such transfer in the future.

A great difficulty ahead may be in exercising restraint in transferring technologies that may be desired by but harmful to LDC's or detrimental on a regional or international scale. There will be pressures from the standpoint of short-term gains, prestige, political and military strength, and a variety of other reasons that will be difficult to deal

with. The issue of paternalism will be raised. From our standpoint, short-term profits will be a temptation in transferring technologies that might have a detrimental long-term effect on the LDC or its neighbors. There is a whole ecology of technology transfer that must be considered in such a matter. One does not simply transfer a technology but with it a host of potential natural, social, economic, and political changes.

This last point is one that emphasizes the need to bring our universities, industry, and government together in this effort to advance the LDC's through science and technology. Some of the complexities of development and development assistance that I have brought out, and many I have not mentioned, indicate how important it is that the process be studied and pursued from a number of viewpoints. These should not be considered in isolation but by bringing together people from the various segments of our society to discuss them and exchange views. These interactions will provide important new insights and approaches that may save many costly mistakes.

In discussing development realistically, we must emphasize the importance of incentives for the assisting nations. Too much talk about development is cast purely in moral and idealistic terms. We should not expect idealism alone to be a driving force for development abroad when we know that the profit motive is essential to economic growth.

To bring about new technologies and innovation for development and to see that they are applied properly, incentives for industry have to be provided. Therefore we need to take a good look at such things as our system of patent protection, taxes, and industry regulations to see what steps relating to these can be taken to encourage innovation and the best technology transfer.

Of course there are the broader incentives of establishing a peaceful and stable world community in which growing economies can flourish and thus provide new business opportunities. But this condition can best be brought about by the motivation of a great many private forces. Therefore I believe that in the future we are going to see, both on the part of the advanced nations and the LDC's, a more favorable attitude toward industry participation in development. It is part of the new realism that must take hold if substantial progress is to be made in improving conditions in the Third World.

Differing Views on Technology Transfer

One of the most difficult issues we may face in considering development will center on not the question of should there be development in an area, but the nature of that development and who should determine it. This issue comes up particularly when the case is made for introducing what has come to be known as intermediate technology or appropriate technology. Advocates of these technologies argue that it would be best if LDC's could first develop a strong rural-agricultural base to employ a large part of their population, rather than encourage a rapid influx of undereducated, untrained people into the cities. They believe that industry in these countries should be smaller scaled, less capital intensive, and more labor intensive than in the West.

Among the most prominent groups to promote such ideas has been the Intermediate Technology Development Group in the United Kingdom. Similar organizations, interested in small-scale development and helping to provide assistance along these lines, have been formed in other countries, including the United States.

However, as humanitarian and environmentally sound as the intermediate-technology approach might seem, there are those who take issue with it—and partially on ethical grounds. Their argument is that by fostering small-scale, rural-based, labor-intensive development in the Third World the advocates of such ideas are seeking to maintain the economic status quo, preventing the developing nations from reaching living standards comparable with the advanced nations. Is this not a new form of paternalism? they ask. By what right do people in the advanced nations, with their energy- and capital-intensive industries, enjoying high

standards of living—and much of it based on cheap commodities from the LDC's—suggest that the Third World remain rural and labor intensive?

These are among the many questions involving ethical as well as economic and environmental considerations that must be faced and resolved by the entire community of nations if we are going to have peace and a more equitable world in the coming century. They will be issues that will surface in some form or other in the 1979 conference and in general in the years ahead.

I have covered a great deal of ground concerning the challenges of development as we will face them in the difficult role of contributors, innovators, and mentors for development but also as members of a world community who in our own lifetime and through our children will have to live with the consequences of what we do. It is time for us to exercise the courage, the foresight, the compassion, and the united will to marshal our array of intellectual resources to meet these challenges. It is time for a rethinking of the relationship of science and technology with the global society they have created. Nothing less than human survival may be at stake in the challenges set forth by this relationship.

We are calling on all of you to devote yourselves to the problems that will be raised at this conference and carried into future deliberations on development. We know that you will make valuable contributions, and we look forward to applying those contributions toward the building of a better world.

ADDRESS BY AID ADMINISTRATOR PARKER

There has been a remarkable and tangible change in the public perception of our foreign assistance program during the last few years. Humanitarian concerns which earlier appeared altruistic are now seen as enlightened self-interest. Burgeoning population growth is not only a cause of hopeless poverty and destitution abroad; it threatens our own vital interests and well-being in many ways, tangible and intangible.

This new reality that we perceive as Americans, the philosophical foundation of our foreign aid program, is interdependence. In the search for a new international economic order, we must take into full account the developing countries, whose needs have increased dramatically. The underlying need in the Third World and the basic objective of our development program is to concentrate on increasing productivity by a large and growing poor majority of the population. But having said this, dimension of scale is lost, since it is a stark fact of reality that one-third to two-thirds of the world's people—that part of the population on which we in AID concentrate—are essentially a nonentity in economic terms. Thus, they cannot consume. Our task is to bring them to a point where they are producing more than they need for basic survival and thus become active participants in the market system.

If countries can create conditions which both stimulate and permit individuals to increase their productivity, the end result will be a collective rise in international productivity. Poor countries must do much for themselves, but until their productivity can become self-regenerating they will need massive technical and managerial resources from the industrial world. Foreign assistance must be oriented to increase the productivity of the key sectors: rural development, agriculture, and national market systems that make it possible for all people to have enough to eat.

As our assistance has shifted to these "new directions" that shape our foreign policy with the developing world, we have sought increasingly to enlist the resources, initiative, and technology of the private sector in these efforts. We have been invited to gather today to consider what you in the private sector and we in government should do in active partnership to make the vast technological resources of the United States available to the poor countries so as to enhance the achievement of their development goals.

These nations are the source of scarce raw materials and can be an expanding market for our products, provided that the purchasing power of the people is increased

through efforts that bring them remunerative returns. And it follows that as countries direct their attention toward constructive efforts and develop positive linkages to one another through commerce and investment, they will be less likely to concentrate their energies and resources on destructive confrontational activities. Thus we serve the moral purpose of building world order and justice when we help countries establish the conditions which allow all people to satisfy their basic needs by working within economic systems that provide rewarding opportunities for individual initiative.

The Secretary of State has announced that the U.S. national conference next year will deal with a number of issues related to technology and the Third World. I need not tell most of you that the U.S. foreign assistance program has for many years supported less developed nations in building the infrastructure essential to the generation or adaptation of technologies critical to economic growth. I would like to share with you some of our recent experience in this regard, cite lessons we have learned in the process, and mention some ideas to improve what we are doing now or are capable of doing in the future.

Sharing Advanced Technologies

Immediately following World War II, when foreign aid was directed to the rehabilitation of Europe, the overwhelming need was for capital. Today Third World countries likewise require capital, but there is the clear perception that the capital-intensive technology which powered the economic growth of the West and the recovery of Europe will not necessarily be the source for generating the wealth which the less developed nations now require. And it is important to emphasize that the developing nations of the world are indeed abundantly endowed with the most critical of basic development assets: humankind, with the innate desire to be productive.

The fact that the requirements of Third World nations are different from our own need not preclude them from taking advantage of some of our technologies. Through the diligent and imaginative application of existing advanced technology and management practices which were not necessarily created for developing-country needs, poor countries can make quantum jumps to leapfrog the conventional evolutionary steps that the industrialized countries made in their own development. A vast amount of the off-the-shelf technology is now available to developing nations. There is evidence that just as the rate of scientific discovery has greatly accelerated, so has our capability to share these advances with the Third World grown rapidly.

Advanced technologies offer a wider choice of approaches to development. They promise major advances in crucial fields such as energy, food production, health, and fertility control. In general, there is a vast unrealized potential of advanced technologies to improve the material well-being of the world's poor.

One can cite dramatic examples of these new "state-of-the-art" or "cutting-edge" technologies. Many are already in use by AID. Female sterilization has been simplified through an innovative technique called manilaparotomy, performed on an outpatient basis. We are discovering fast-growing trees to ease the shortage of firewood and for the rehabilitation of land in the developing world. Nitrogen-fixing legumes have been found which significantly reduce fertilizer demand. A recently introduced technique called thematic mapping has greatly enlarged the information available from satellite remote sensing. Systems analysis speeds effective decisionmaking by LDC planners, and computer-enhanced modeling enriches the economic and social benefits of agricultural programs and transportation systems.

A most compelling illustration of how space-age technology can be applied in developing countries in the battle against poverty, disease, and disaster lies in the cluster of technologies associated with earth satellites. One of the most perplexing problems facing decisionmakers in developing countries is how to make a scientifically accurate national assessment of the natural resource

base available for development in meeting the basic needs of their populations. Our Agency has just completed an unprecedented worldwide demonstration in 27 of the world's poorer and more remote countries of the virtually untapped potential of satellite remote sensing and communications technologies to directly improve the well-being of their people.

Nowhere was the potential of this advanced technology described more eloquently than by Prime Minister Zulfikar Ali Bhutto of Pakistan, who said:

> This vivid demonstration of the relevance of space technology to our most critical and compelling problems is an occasion to reflect on the great deprivation of the Third World—its lack of technology. We cannot precisely map our water resources, observe the depth and extent of snow coverage, survey our crops and soil, detect the conditions of cultivated lands, locate the incidence of pest attacks without earth resources satellites. . . . Let the hope be reciprocal that the satellite program heralds an age in which disparities will be narrowed and justice insured in sharing the fruit of man's scientific enterprise.

As we shared information from our earliest earth resources satellites, so are we prepared now to offer this technology through more comprehensive follow-on programs. Regional training and utilization centers for satellite application will be set up in Africa, Asia, and Latin America. We are now encouraging and acting upon requests from LDC's for assistance in exploiting this sophisticated technology.

Assimilation of Technology

In the transfer of technology, simply making products and processes known or available is not enough. Our experience indicates that a country's growth depends on the degree to which local industry can assimilate and commercialize technology. We need to know how technology can more effectively be integrated with capital and management to accelerate the process of industrialization in developing countries.

It is precisely with this objective in mind that AID has assumed leadership in establishing an International Industrialization Institute following a proposal made by the Secretary of State at the U.N. General Assembly seventh special session and UNCTAD IV meetings.

In the West, the process of industrialization has been evolutionary, has been founded on private enterprise, has grown from small to large, and has been guided by criteria not relevant to the needs of and environment in the developing world. These process phenomena were not studied *a priori* but, rather, researched *ex post facto*. Thus, there is neither lore nor research into Western industrialization which would reveal the processes by which it evolved, and if such research did exist, it would not suggest a process most appropriate to the environment in the developing world. What we need to discover through the International Industrialization Institute is how to assist countries whose environments are not naturally attractive to the processes by which we achieved industrialization.

Technological assistance, which has become an appreciably larger component of our bilateral aid, can function as a power lever on a country's industrialization, and this may be a much more effective way than transfer of capital to generate foreign exchange for development purposes. In developing countries overall, three-quarters of all foreign exchange is derived from trade, 13 percent from donor aid, and 12 percent from private investment.

Through our technical assistance, projects are conceived and implemented not only with greater cost-effectiveness, but they result in production having enhanced marketability even to the extent of achieving export potential. Thus, technical assistance can lead to a profound increase in the rate of capital flows to an economy. It can also improve managerial skills and technical competence and develop the necessary institutional capacity to process more effectively capital transfer and private investment. In fact, it is fair to say that each of our projects has a technical component, an inherently innovative and learning component for both the United States and the developing country.

Making the most appropriate technologies available to developing countries through our

technical assistance program is not a new activity for AID. The Agency has a diversified portfolio of current projects directed toward the use of low-cost labor-intensive technology. However, this year Congress has provided new impetus for this activity. It instructed AID to set aside $20 million to underwrite an expanded and coordinated private effort, an appropriate-technology fund, to develop and disseminate technologies appropriate for developing countries. This new private nonprofit organization, which is to be in operation early next year, will give priority focus to technologies suited to small market towns, rural areas, and villages in the developing world. Among other activities, it will concentrate on helping small businesses in LDC's and finding ways to involve U.S. business in appropriate-technology programs for these countries.

Considering technology and development from a broader perspective, one can compare the development process in a country to a ship convoy in wartime. The convoy moves only as fast as its slowest vessel; an observer at a distance is unable to discern which ship is the laggard. When the development process is slow or inefficient, and fails to meet the aspirations of a people, it is not easy to pinpoint the weak component or faulty linkage. To identify the systemic deficiency requires close and comprehensive *systematic* assessment. Take the multinational Volta River development project and the mainstream dams projected for the Senegal and Niger Rivers. The vast potential offered by these dams for irrigation, flood control, and power generation will be nullified in terms of human benefit if we cannot generate and infuse the technology to control or eradicate the dread tropical scourges of schistosomiasis, river blindness, and malaria.

Industry-Government Dialogue

The Secretary of State has suggested that the most effective way to mobilize these technological resources for international development is through a new partnership between our private and public sectors. Therefore let me describe briefly some of the programs AID is supporting not only to facilitate access to our technological resources but to assist the private sector to respond more positively to developing-country needs.

With our support, the National Technical Information Service of the Department of Commerce has made agreements with technical centers in at least 15 developing countries which improve access to government-owned or public research and development. Links between U.S. industrial research institutes and local industries and research institutes in 25 developing countries have been established by the Denver Research Institute. The National Bureau of Standards is upgrading standards with counterpart laboratories in LDC's to simplify the transfer of technology.

I am personally convinced that the potential role of the private sector—whether U.S., developing country, or transnational—has only barely been scratched. Many colleagues in business share this view, as do many leading officials of developing countries. Why, then, has foreign and domestic private sector involvement in the developing countries generally not been more significant?

Many reasons are given, but simplistically they boil down to lack of incentive on the part of the private sector on the one hand and the distrust and unfamiliarity with modern business practices on the part of many developing countries on the other. And as I mentioned earlier, the basic cause of these failures stems from attempting to introduce industrialization into what is essentially an unnatural environment for its prosperity and growth. To overcome these problems, both government and private industry will have to increase their knowledge of the complementary and yet unique roles of the public and private sectors and conscientiously identify opportunities for productive undertakings by both with genuine results for the consumer and the producer. This understanding cannot materialize without an effective dialogue involving the governments and the private sector of developing countries on the one hand and U.S. and other foreign companies on the other. Governments can and should establish the incentives and climate for meaningful involvement of private enter-

prise and can reorient policies and programs, particularly from the standpoint of political and economic considerations, to overcome constraints to individual and private initiative. The private sector can consult and advise in the process.

In such a dialogue between industry and government, many questions should be addressed, such as:

What basic goods and services does the society want produced and distributed to the people at large?

Which should be supplied by the public and private sectors, and which by some combination of the two?

At what point should industry advise governments on policies and plans?

What are the bottlenecks to effective private enterprise involvement, domestic and foreign, and how can they be overcome?

What specific policy and procedural changes are needed?

Developing countries and development agencies such as AID need private sector guidance on these questions. For our part, we are prepared to react with candor as to what we can or cannot do—and why. Government may not be able to respond favorably to all recommendations from industry; but unless we try, we cannot move forward.

In summary, the challenge before us is to:

—Bring about genuine rather than contrived productivity in the developing world, in major proportions and in very genuine economic terms;

—Take advantage of, and preserve, the symbiotic relationships between public and private sector technology, with the public sector technology being addressed in good part toward enabling developing-country people to have basic opportunities to become productive and the private sector being able to function in a naturally compatible environment where there is both the incentive and the capacity to utilize technology which may have to be adapted to needs; and

—Provide the necessary dimension to permit the developing countries to expand their own national economic level, by insuring that what is produced is greater than, and different from, that which they need for their own survival.

Official development assistance alone is not a sufficient condition for achieving these goals. But, by acting in concert, the public and private sectors can bring about far more resounding results than will reliance primarily on the public sector alone. It is in this endeavor for mankind that we in the foreign assistance program earnestly seek your cooperation.

Letters of Credence

Burundi

The newly appointed Ambassador of the Republic of Burundi, Laurent Nzeyimana, presented his credentials to President Ford on November 24.[1]

Cameroon

The newly appointed Ambassador of the United Republic of Cameroon, Benoit Bindzi, presented his credentials to President Ford on November 24.[1]

Gabon

The newly appointed Ambassador of the Gabonese Republic, Rene Kombila, presented his credentials to President Ford on November 24.[1]

Lesotho

The newly appointed Ambassador of the Kingdom of Lesotho, Thabo R. Makeka, presented his credentials to President Ford on November 24.[1]

Mali

The newly appointed Ambassador of the Republic of Mali, Ibrahima Sima, presented his credentials to President Ford on November 24.[1]

---

[1] For texts of the Ambassador's remarks and the President's reply, see Department of State press release dated November 24.

U.S. Vetoes Application of Vietnam for U.N. Membership

Following is a statement made in the U.N. Security Council by U.S. Representative William W. Scranton on November 15, together with his statement in the U.N. General Assembly on November 26.

STATEMENT BY AMBASSADOR SCRANTON, SECURITY COUNCIL, NOVEMBER 15

USUN press release 151 dated November 15

The United States voted against the application for membership in the United Nations by the Socialist Republic of Vietnam, not because we doubt that the Socialist Republic of Vietnam is able to carry out the obligations of the U.N. Charter; rather, the United States has serious doubts about the willingness of Vietnam to do so. It is this lack of demonstrated will which leads the United States to conclude that the Socialist Republic of Vietnam does not meet the standards established by article 4 of the U.N. Charter.[1]

Let me be specific. The Socialist Republic of Vietnam has failed so far to manifest satisfactory humanitarian or practical concern regarding American servicemen missing in action (MIA's). It has failed, despite the information available to it, to account satisfactorily for Americans missing in action and to return the remains of those killed in the recent conflict in Indochina, despite repeated efforts by the United States to persuade them to do so. We cannot help but conclude from the Vietnamese refusal to provide a fuller accounting that the Socialist Republic of Vietnam persists in its attempt to play upon the deep anguish and the uncertainty of the families of these men in order to obtain economic and political advantage.

Through its record and policies, the Socialist Republic of Vietnam has convinced my government that it is not willing to carry out obligations of the charter. As we all know, these obligations embrace not only the maintenance of international peace and security but observance of human rights.

Should the Socialist Republic of Vietnam, by its actions, demonstrate its willingness to carry out fully the charter's obligations, the United States, for its part, would reconsider its position in regard to a renewed application for entry into the United Nations.

Now I would like to take the opportunity of just a moment more to comment on some of the views that have been expressed by a number of representatives during the course of this debate. Some have spoken with great seriousness and evident preoccupation. Some have reacted angrily. And still others have exuded virtuous indignation in very strong terms.

My delegation acknowledges the genuine concern of some among us over the very present situation. What we cannot accept is the cynical posturing represented in many of the statements we have heard in this Council's debate on the issue.

For instance, it comes with singular ill grace for that power which has cast 110 vetoes in this Council to lecture us on proper behavior in self-righteous tones. Fifty-one of these 110 vetoes—51 of them—were applied to membership applications.

As I look around the table, I see among the present membership of the Council one whose application was vetoed six times before that country was finally accepted. Another now at this table suffered four such vetoes.

An Asian permanent member did not hesitate not so long ago to veto the application of an emerging Asian state because it did not like the way it had come to independence. Later it relented and allowed the application to be accepted.

Numerous members of the nonaligned on the Council and among the general membership of our organization have spoken with fervor on the rights of the current applicant. However, as recently as a year ago the mem-

[1] The Council on Nov. 15 voted on the draft resolution (S/12226) to recommend the admission of the Socialist Republic of Vietnam to the United Nations; the vote was 14 in favor and 1 (U.S.) against.

bers of the nonaligned group on the Council could not bring themselves even to consider the application of a well-qualified Asian state—a state whose population is greater than that of 124 members of the United Nations and whose gross national product exceeds that of 107 of the current membership. And yet the nonaligned talked of an unfailing commitment to the principle of universality.

Mr. President, I do not seek here to be contentious. I merely wish to recall some facts in this Council's record. Those who make accusations, whether pious or ill tempered, might well be advised to examine the reflecting mirror for examples of their actions in times past and recent.

I speak directly to the point. I appeal to the current applicant to give attention to the human rights provisions of the charter, to abandon trading on the sorrow of families to attain its ends. Normalization of relations could then flow swiftly.

STATEMENT BY AMBASSADOR SCRANTON, GENERAL ASSEMBLY, NOVEMBER 26

USUN press release 165 dated November 26

Today as we discuss again the question of the Socialist Republic of Vietnam's application for membership in the United Nations, it is timely to restate our position and what we mean by an accounting of the MIA's.

The United States believes that Vietnam, by its refusal to account for our men missing in action during the recent conflict in Southeast Asia, has shown itself unwilling to fulfill basic humanitarian obligations consistent with U.N. membership. Vietnam apparently persists in its efforts to play upon the anguish of the families of these men for political and economic advantage. Let me remind this body that in 1974 the General Assembly itself recognized the importance of providing information on the missing and returning the remains of the dead when it passed by an overwhelming majority a resolution calling upon all parties to armed conflicts to do so after hostilities had ceased.[2]

What we mean by an accounting has sometimes been of concern to others. The allegation has been repeated often in harsh terms that we are asking for the impossible. This is not so. Clearly, we want to know what has happened to all of our men. But we understand that many were lost in circumstances which make it unlikely that any direct information about them will be discovered. But what we do expect from the authorities in Hanoi is that they will provide all the information in their possession on our MIA's, that they will return to us all recoverable remains of our dead, in accordance with that resolution I just cited, and that they will carry out serious search efforts to ascertain the fate of others.

Mr. President, I can add that on October 2 Secretary of State Kissinger expressed the following views during a panel discussion at the National Conference of Editorial Writers.

Secretary Kissinger said that basically we have no conflict with Vietnam now. After our experience in Vietnam we are the one great power that can be guaranteed not to have any national objectives there. So, the Secretary continued, the normalization of relations between the United States and Vietnam eventually will come.

On the other hand, the Secretary said we believe that the behavior of the Vietnamese in not turning over to us lists which we are confident they must have is a cruel and heartless act and one for which we are not prepared to pay any price.

The Secretary concluded that if this were accomplished there would be no significant obstacles to normalization.

Mr. President, these remarks should make clear that the United States is not asking the impossible but, rather, a reasonable manifestation of willingness to meet a most fundamental humanitarian obligation, as indicated in the resolution I cited.

The United States will vote against the resolution contained in document A/31/L.21, not because we object in any way in principle

---

[2] For text of A/RES/3220 (XXIX), see BULLETIN of Dec. 2, 1974, p. 774.

to the issue of Vietnam's membership being discussed in the General Assembly.[3] We do object, however, to the resolution's directly citing for criticism the vote by the United States in the Security Council in opposition to Vietnam's membership. The Security Council has recently considered Vietnam's membership application. The reasons my government opposed that application are a matter of record and are very clear.

I might add that the United States still has no information that would lead us to change our view that Vietnam is unwilling to meet the humanitarian obligations of the United Nations Charter that would qualify it for membership. While we have no objection to the Security Council's meeting again on Vietnam's membership application, should the members of the Security Council wish to have such a meeting, it is important for all to appreciate the standards against which my government will continue to assess any membership application by Vietnam.

U.S. Abstains on Application of Angola for U.N. Membership

Following is a statement made in the U.N. Security Council by U.S. Representative William W. Scranton on November 22.

USUN press release 157 (corr. 2) dated November 22

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

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

It is clear that the Cuban Army, a foreign, non-African force, is waging a bloody and difficult guerrilla war in three separate areas of Angola. We have heard disturbing reports that these Cuban occupation forces have been carrying out military assaults upon undefended villages and towns in Angola. These reported attacks include the killing of refugees, the burning of villages, and the slaughter of the people's main source of food and livelihood, their cattle. Reportedly several thousand Angolans have fled from this recent onslaught across the border into Namibia.

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

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

Nevertheless, the United States has followed a consistent policy of support for African solutions to African problems and respect for the role of the Organization of African Unity. The Organization of African Unity has formally recommended U.N. membership for Angola, and OAU members have asked us to facilitate Angola's entry. For the reasons I have enumerated earlier we cannot, in good conscience, vote in favor of the Angolan application for membership in this organization. In this case, out of deference to African views, we will not oppose the application.[1]

---

[3] The Assembly on Nov. 26 adopted by a rollcall vote of 124 to 1 (U.S.), with 3 abstentions, a resolution (A/RES/31/21) recommending that the Security Council reconsider Vietnam's application for membership.

[1] The Council on Nov. 22 adopted by a vote of 13 to 0, with 1 abstention (U.S.), a resolution (S/RES/397 (1976)) recommending to the General Assembly "that the People's Republic of Angola be admitted to membership in the United Nations"; the People's Republic of China did not participate in the vote. The Assembly on Dec. 1 adopted by a recorded vote of 116 to 0, with 1 abstention (U.S.), a resolution (A/RES/31/44) admitting Angola to membership.

United States and U.S.S.R. Sign New Fisheries Agreement

Joint Statement

Press release 572 dated November 26

Representatives of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics and the United States of America on November 26, 1976, signed [at Washington] a new agreement relating to fishing activities of the Soviet Union off the coasts of the United States. The agreement sets out the arrangements between the countries which will govern fishing by the Soviet Union within the fishery conservation zone of the United States beginning March 1, 1977. The agreement will come into force after the completion of internal procedures by both governments.

Vladimir M. Kamentsev, First Deputy Minister of Fisheries, U.S.S.R., signed for the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics. Ambassador Thomas A. Clingan, Jr., Chairman of the U.S. Delegation, signed for the United States.

Both delegations expressed their satisfaction with the new accord and the hope that it will contribute to mutual understanding and cooperation between the two governments.

Current Treaty Actions

MULTILATERAL

Coffee

International coffee agreement 1976, with annexes. Done at London December 3, 1975. Entered into force provisionally October 1, 1976.
Ratification deposited: Rwanda, November 23, 1976.

Conservation

Agreement on the conservation of polar bears. Done at Oslo November 15, 1973. Entered into force May 26, 1976; for the United States November 1, 1976.
Proclaimed by the President: November 26, 1976.

Cultural Relations

Constitution of the United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization. Done at London November 16, 1945. Entered into force November 4, 1946. TIAS 1580.
Signatures: Surinam, July 16, 1976; Papua New Guinea, September 21, 1976; Mozambique, October 11, 1976; Seychelles, October 18, 1976.
Acceptances deposited: Surinam, April 8, 1976; Papua New Guinea, October 4, 1976; Mozambique, August 16, 1976; Seychelles, October 18, 1976.

Diplomatic Relations

Vienna convention on diplomatic relations. Done at Vienna April 18, 1961. Entered into force April 24, 1964; for the United States December 13, 1972. TIAS 7502.
Accession deposited: Yemen, November 24, 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: Republic of Korea, November 16, 1976; Rwanda, November 19, 1976.

Maritime Matters

Amendment of article VII of the convention on facilitation of international maritime traffic, 1965 (TIAS 6251). Adopted at London November 19, 1973.[1]
Acceptance deposited: Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, October 22, 1976.

Amendments to the convention of March 6, 1948, as amended, on the Intergovernmental Maritime Consultative Organization (TIAS 4044, 6285, 6490). Adopted at London October 17, 1974.[1]
Acceptances deposited: Czechoslovakia, Indonesia, November 23, 1976; Egypt, November 16, 1976; Oman, Peru, November 18, 1976.

Meteorology

Convention of the World Meteorological Organization. Done at Washington October 11, 1947. Entered into force March 23, 1950. TIAS 2052.
Accession deposited: Sao Tome and Principe, November 23, 1976.

Oil Pollution

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 12, 1971.[1]
Acceptance deposited: Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, October 22, 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: Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, October 22, 1976.

Phonograms

Convention for the protection of producers of phonograms against unauthorized duplication of their phonograms. Done at Geneva October 29, 1971. Entered into force April 18, 1973; for the United States March 10, 1974. TIAS 7808.
Notification from World Intellectual Property Organization that accession deposited: Guatemala, November 1, 1976.

---

[1] Not in force.

Postal

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: Algeria, July 29, 1976; Hungary, September 17, 1976; Israel, November 8, 1976; Lesotho, September 1, 1976; Niger, September 1, 1976.

Money orders and postal travellers' checks agreement, with detailed regulations. Done at Lausanne July 5, 1974. Entered into force January 1, 1976. TIAS 8232.

Ratifications deposited: Algeria, July 29, 1976; Hungary, September 17, 1976; Niger, July 19, 1976.

Space—Liability

Convention on international liability for damage caused by space objects. Done at Washington, London, and Moscow March 29, 1972. Entered into force September 1, 1972; for the United States October 9, 1973. TIAS 7762.

Accession deposited: Chile, December 1, 1976.

Trade

Protocol of terms of accession of Japan to the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade, with annexes. Done at Geneva June 7, 1955. Entered into force September 10, 1955. TIAS 3438.

Acceptance deposited: Austria, October 27, 1976.

War

Geneva convention for amelioration of condition of wounded and sick in armed forces in the field;

Geneva convention for amelioration of the condition of wounded, sick and shipwrecked members of armed forces at sea;

Geneva convention relative to the treatment of prisoners of war;

Geneva convention relative to protection of civilian persons in time of war.

Done at Geneva August 12, 1949. Entered into force October 21, 1950; for the United States February 2, 1956. TIAS 3362, 3363, 3364, and 3365, respectively.

Notification of succession: Surinam, October 13, 1976.

Wheat

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

Ratifications deposited: Brazil, November 26, 1976; El Salvador, November 30, 1976.

Women—Political Rights

Convention on the political rights of women. Done at New York March 31, 1953. Entered into force July 7, 1954; for the United States July 7, 1976. TIAS 8289.

Accession deposited: Morocco, November 22, 1976.

BILATERAL

Egypt

Loan agreement to increase Egypt's industrial and agricultural production. Signed at Cairo September 30, 1976. Entered into force September 30, 1976.

Loan agreement for construction of a National Energy Control Center in Egypt, with annex. Signed at Cairo September 30, 1976. Entered into force September 30, 1976.

Ghana

Project agreement relating to small farmer development, with annexes. Signed at Accra September 29, 1976. Entered into force September 29, 1976.

International Telecommunications Satellite Organization

Headquarters agreement. Signed at Washington November 22 and 24, 1976. Enters into force upon exchange of notes by the two parties.

Japan

Agreement amending the agreement of June 11, 1976, as amended, relating to the limitations of imports of specialty steel from Japan, with attachments. Effected by exchange of letters at Washington October 29, 1976. Entered into force October 29, 1976; effective November 21, 1976.

Korea

Agreement relating to scientific and technical cooperation. Signed at Seoul November 22, 1976. Entered into force November 22, 1976.

Romania

Long-term agreement on economic, industrial, and technical cooperation, with annexes. Signed at Bucharest November 21, 1976. Enters into force on the date on which both parties have received written notice of its approval by the other party.

Union of Soviet Socialist Republics

Agreement concerning fisheries off the coasts of the United States, with agreed minutes, and related letter. Signed at Washington November 26, 1976. Enters into force on a date to be mutually agreed by exchange of notes.

Name Index

Checklist of Department of State Press Releases: Nov. 29–Dec. 5

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

No.	Date	Subject
*574	11/29	Kissinger: arrival, Mexico City.
*575	12/1	U.N. Environment Program meeting on stratospheric ozone layer, Washington, Mar. 1–9, 1977.
†576	12/1	Kissinger: remarks to U.S. delegation to inauguration of Mexican President, Nov. 30.
*577	12/2	Kissinger: remarks to the press, Mexico City, Nov. 30.
*578	12/3	Program for official visit of Italian Prime Minister Giulio Andreotti, Dec. 5–8.
*579	12/3	Kissinger, Rosalynn Carter, Jack Ford: departure, Mexico City, Dec. 2.
*580	12/3	U.S. and Canada consult on St. Lawrence Seaway, Dec. 2.
†581	12/3	U.S. and Romania sign fisheries agreement.
*582	12/3	Meat import negotiations, Dec. 6.
†583	12/3	Kissinger: statement on announcement of Cyrus Vance to be the next Secretary of State.

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