

3:

3/1889



THE DEPARTMENT OF STATE BULLETIN

Volume LXXIII • No. 1889 • September 8, 1975

INTERNATIONAL LAW, WORLD ORDER, AND HUMAN PROGRESS
Address by Secretary Kissinger 353

PRESIDENT FORD VISITS ROMANIA AND YUGOSLAVIA
FOLLOWING EUROPEAN SECURITY CONFERENCE 363

PRESIDENT FORD INTERVIEWED FOR PUBLIC TELEVISION
Excerpt From Transcript 377

THE OFFICIAL WEEKLY RECORD OF UNITED STATES FOREIGN POLICY

For index see inside back cover

SEP 23 1975
DEPT. OF STATE

THE DEPARTMENT OF STATE BULLETIN

VOL. LXXIII, No. 1889

September 8, 1975

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

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

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

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

PRICE:

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

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

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

International Law, World Order, and Human Progress

*Address by Secretary Kissinger*¹

President Fellers [James D. Fellers, President of the American Bar Association], President-elect [Lawrence E.] Walsh, ladies and gentlemen: I wonder if any of you have commented on the tableau we present today: an American Secretary of State addressing an assemblage of distinguished American attorneys on American attitudes toward international law in a foreign country. That this meeting should take place in Montreal with no hint of the inappropriate testifies to the understanding, mutual respect, and cooperation which surround the vast network of interconnections between the United States and Canada to an extent virtually without parallel among sovereign nations.

Our meeting here today is also witness to the openness of Canadian society and to its respect for open debate and honest differences. On several issues I will discuss today, Canadian and American positions are not identical; but the differences between us in the realm of international law and cooperation run only to details. The Canadian commitment to international cooperation in all areas and on a global scale is second to none. The United States shares this commitment and has welcomed the cooperation of Canada as we work toward common goals. I wish to acknowledge this kindred spirit as we benefit from Canadian hospitality today.

My friends in the legal profession like to remind me of a comment by a British judge

on the difference between lawyers and professors:

It's very simple (said Lord Denning). The function of lawyers is to find a solution to every difficulty presented to them; whereas the function of professors is to find a difficulty with every solution.

Today the number of difficulties seems to be outpacing the number of solutions—either because my lawyer friends are not working hard enough or because there are too many professors in government.

Law and lawyers have played a seminal role in American public life since the founding of the Republic. In this century lawyers have been consistently at the center of our diplomacy, providing many of our ablest Secretaries of State and diplomats and often decisively influencing American thinking about foreign policy.

This is no accident. The aspiration to harness the conflict of nations by standards of order and justice runs deep in the American tradition. In pioneering techniques of arbitration, conciliation, and adjudication, in developing international institutions and international economic practices, and in creating a body of scholarship sketching visions of world order, American legal thinking has reflected both American idealism and American pragmatic genius.

The problems of the contemporary world structure summon these skills and go beyond them. The rigid international structure of the cold war has disintegrated; we have entered an era of diffused economic power, proliferating nuclear weaponry, and multiple ideologies and centers of initiative. The challenge

¹ Made before the American Bar Association at Montreal, Quebec, Canada, on Aug. 11 (text of the two introductory paragraphs from press release 408A dated Aug. 12; balance of address from press release 408 dated Aug. 11).

of our predecessors was to fashion stability from chaos. The challenge of our generation is to go from the building of national and regional institutions and the management of crises to the building of a new international order which offers a hope of peace, progress, well-being, and justice for the generations to come.

Justice Holmes said of the common law that it "is not a brooding omnipresence in the sky but the articulate voice of some sovereign or quasi-sovereign that can be identified." But international politics recognizes no sovereign or even quasi-sovereign power beyond the nation-state.

Thus in international affairs the age-old struggle between order and anarchy has a political as well as a legal dimension. When competing national political aims are pressed to the point of unrestrained competition, the precepts of law prove fragile. The unrestrained quest for predominance brooks no legal restraints. In a democratic society law flourishes best amidst pluralistic institutions. Similarly in the international arena stability requires a certain equilibrium of power. Our basic foreign policy objective inevitably must be to shape a stable and cooperative global order out of diverse and contending interests.

But this is not enough. Preoccupation with interests and power is at best sterile and at worst an invitation to a constant test of strength. The true task of statesmanship is to draw from the balance of power a more positive capacity to better the human condition—to turn stability into creativity, to transform the relaxation of tensions into a strengthening of freedoms, to turn man's pre-occupations from self-defense to human progress.

An international order can be neither stable nor just without accepted norms of conduct. International law both provides a means and embodies our ends. It is a repository of our experience and our idealism—a body of principles drawn from the practice of states and an instrument for fashioning new patterns of relations between states. Law is an expression of our own culture and yet a symbol of universal goals. It is the heritage

of our past and a means of shaping our future.

The challenge of international order takes on unprecedented urgency in the contemporary world of interdependence. In an increasing number of areas of central political relevance, the legal process has become of major concern. Technology has driven us into vast new areas of human activity and opened up new prospects of either human progress or international contention. The use of the oceans and of outer space, the new excesses of hijacking, terrorism, and warfare, the expansion of multinational corporations, will surely become areas of growing dispute if they are not regulated by a legal order.

The United States will not seek to impose a parochial or self-serving view of the law on others. But neither will we carry the quest for accommodation to the point of prejudicing our own values and rights. The new corpus of the law of nations must benefit all peoples equally; it cannot be the preserve of any one nation or group of nations.

The United States is convinced in its own interest that the extension of legal order is a boon to humanity and a necessity. The traditional aspiration of Americans takes on a new relevance and urgency in contemporary conditions. On a planet marked by interdependence, unilateral action and unrestrained pursuit of the national advantage inevitably provoke counteraction and therefore spell futility and anarchy. In an age of awesome weapons of war, there must be accommodation or there will be disaster.

Therefore there must be an expansion of the legal consensus, in terms both of subject matter and participation. Many new and important areas of international activity, such as new departures in technology and communication, cry out for agreed international rules. In other areas, juridical concepts have advanced faster than the political will that is indispensable to assure their observance—such as the U.N. Charter provisions governing the use of force in international relations. The pace of legal evolution cannot be allowed to lag behind the headlong pace of change in the world at large. In a world of 150 na-

tions and competing ideologies, we cannot afford to wait upon the growth of customary international law. Nor can we be content with the snail's pace of treatymaking as we have known it in recent years in international forums.

We are at a pivotal moment in history. If the world is in flux, we have the capacity and hence the obligation to help shape it. If our goal is a new standard of international restraint and cooperation, then let us fashion the institutions and practices that will bring it about.

This morning I would like to set forth the American view on some of those issues of law and diplomacy whose solution can move us toward a more orderly and lawful world. These issues emphasize the contemporary international challenge—in the oceans, where traditional law has been made obsolete by modern technology; in outer space, where endeavors undreamed of a generation ago impinge upon traditional concerns for security and for sovereignty; in the laws of war, where new practices of barbarism challenge us to develop new social and international restraint; and in international economics, where transnational enterprises conduct their activities beyond the frontier of traditional political and legal regulation.

I shall deal in special detail with the law of the sea in an effort to promote significant and rapid progress in this vitally important negotiation.

The Law of the Sea

The United States is now engaged with some 140 nations in one of the most comprehensive and critical negotiations in history, an international effort to devise rules to govern the domain of the oceans. No current international negotiation is more vital for the long-term stability and prosperity of our globe.

One need not be a legal scholar to understand what is at stake. The oceans cover 70 percent of the earth's surface. They both unite and divide mankind. The importance of free navigation for the security of nations, including our country, is traditional; the eco-

nomic significance of ocean resources is becoming enormous.

From the 17th century until now, the law of the seas has been founded on a relatively simple precept: freedom of the seas, limited only by a narrow belt of territorial waters generally extending three miles offshore. Today the explosion of technology requires new and more sophisticated solutions.

—In a world desperate for new sources of energy and minerals, vast and largely untapped reserves exist in the oceans.

—In a world that faces widespread famine and malnutrition, fish have become an increasingly vital source of protein.

—In a world clouded by pollution, the environmental integrity of the oceans turns into a critical international problem.

—In a world where 95 percent of international trade is carried on the seas, freedom of navigation is essential.

Unless competitive practices and claims are soon harmonized, the world faces the prospect of mounting conflict. Shipping tonnage is expected to increase fourfold in the next 30 years. Large self-contained factory vessels already circle the globe and dominate fishing areas that were once the province of small coastal boats. The worldwide fish harvest is increasing dramatically, but without due regard to sound management or the legitimate concerns of coastal states. Shifting population patterns will soon place new strains on the ecology of the world's coastlines.

The current negotiation may thus be the world's last chance. Unilateral national claims to fishing zones and territorial seas extending from 50 to 200 miles have already resulted in seizures of fishing vessels and constant disputes over rights to ocean space. The breakdown of the current negotiation, a failure to reach a legal consensus, will lead to unrestrained military and commercial rivalry and mounting political turmoil.

The United States strongly believes that law must govern the oceans. In this spirit, we welcomed the U.N. mandate in 1970 for a multilateral conference to write a comprehensive treaty governing the use of the

oceans and their resources. We contributed substantially to the progress that was made at Caracas last summer and at Geneva this past spring, which produced a "single negotiating text" of a draft treaty. This will focus the work of the next session, scheduled for March 1976 in New York. The United States intends to intensify its efforts.

The issues in the law of the sea negotiation stretch from the shoreline to the farthest deep seabed. They include:

—The extent of the territorial sea and the related issues of guarantees of free transit through straits;

—The degree of control that a coastal state can exercise in an offshore economic zone beyond its territorial waters; and

—The international system for the exploitation of the resources of the deep seabeds.

If we move outward from the coastline, the first issue is the extent of the *territorial sea*, the belt of ocean over which the coastal state exercises sovereignty. Historically, it has been recognized as three miles; that has been the long-established U.S. position. Increasingly, other states have claimed 12 miles or even 200.

After years of dispute and contradictory international practice, the Law of the Sea Conference is approaching a consensus on a 12-mile territorial limit. We are prepared to accept this solution, provided that the unimpeded transit rights through and over straits used for international navigation are guaranteed. For without such guarantees, a 12-mile territorial sea would place over 100 straits—including the Straits of Gibraltar, Malacca, and Bab el Mandeb—now free for international sea and air travel under the jurisdictional control of coastal states. This the United States cannot accept. Freedom of international transit through these and other straits is for the benefit of all nations, for trade and for security. We will not join in an agreement which leaves any uncertainty about the right to use world communication routes without interference.

Within 200 miles of the shore are some of

the world's most important fishing grounds as well as substantial deposits of petroleum, natural gas, and minerals. This has led some coastal states to seek full sovereignty over this zone. These claims, too, are unacceptable to the United States. To accept them would bring 30 percent of the oceans under national territorial control—in the very areas through which most of the world's shipping travels.

The United States joins many other countries in urging international agreement on a 200-mile offshore *economic zone*. Under this proposal, coastal states would be permitted to control fisheries and mineral resources in the economic zone, but freedom of navigation and other rights of the international community would be preserved. Fishing within the zone would be managed by the coastal state, which would have an international duty to apply agreed standards of conservation. If the coastal state could not harvest all the allowed yearly fishing catch, other countries would be permitted to do so. Special arrangements for tuna and salmon, and other fish which migrate over large distances, would be required. We favor also provisions to protect the fishing interests of landlocked and other geographically disadvantaged countries.

In some areas the *continental margin* extends beyond 200 miles. To resolve disagreements over the use of this area, the United States proposes that the coastal states be given jurisdiction over continental margin resources beyond 200 miles, to a precisely defined limit, and that they share a percentage of financial benefit from mineral exploitation in that area with the international community.

Beyond the territorial sea, the offshore economic zone, and the continental margin lie the *deep seabeds*. They are our planet's last great unexplored frontier. For more than a century we have known that the deep seabeds hold vast deposits of manganese, nickel, cobalt, copper, and other minerals, but we did not know how to extract them. New modern technology is rapidly advancing the time when their exploration and commercial exploitation will become a reality.

The United Nations has declared the deep seabeds to be the "common heritage of mankind."² But this only states the problem. How will the world community manage the clash of national and regional interests or the inequality of technological capability? Will we reconcile unbridled competition with the imperative of political order?

The United States has nothing to fear from competition. Our technology is the most advanced, and our Navy is adequate to protect our interests. Ultimately, unless basic rules regulate exploitation, rivalry will lead to tests of power. A race to carve out exclusive domains of exploitation on the deep seabeds, even without claims of sovereignty, will menace freedom of navigation and invite a competition like that of the colonial powers in Africa and Asia in the last century.

This is not the kind of world we want to see. Law has an opportunity to civilize us in the early stages of a new competitive activity.

We believe that the Law of the Sea Treaty must preserve the right of access presently enjoyed by states and their citizens under international law. Restrictions on free access will retard the development of seabed resources. Nor is it feasible, as some developing countries have proposed, to reserve to a new international seabed organization the sole right to exploit the seabeds.

Nevertheless the United States believes strongly that law must regulate international activity in this area. The world community has a historic opportunity to manage this new wealth cooperatively and to dedicate resources from the exploitation of the deep seabeds to the development of the poorer countries. A cooperative and equitable solution can lead to new patterns of accommodation between the developing and industrial countries. It could give a fresh and concilia-

tory cast to the dialogue between the industrialized and so-called Third World. The legal regime we establish for the deep seabeds can be a milestone in the legal and political development of the world community.

The United States has devoted much thought and consideration to this issue. We offer the following proposals:

—An international organization should be created to set rules for deep seabed mining.

—This international organization must preserve the rights of all countries, and their citizens, directly to exploit deep seabed resources.

—It should also insure fair adjudication of conflicting interests and security of investment.

—Countries and their enterprises mining deep seabed resources should pay an agreed portion of their revenues to the international organization, to be used for the benefit of developing countries.

—The management of the organization and its voting procedures must reflect and balance the interests of the participating states. The organization should not have the power to control prices or production rates.

—If these essential U.S. interests are guaranteed, we can agree that this organization will also have the right to conduct mining operations on behalf of the international community primarily for the benefit of developing countries.

—The new organization should serve as a vehicle for cooperation between the technologically advanced and the developing countries. The United States is prepared to explore ways of sharing deep seabed technology with other nations.

—A balanced commission of consumers, seabed producers, and land-based producers could monitor the possible adverse effects of deep seabed mining on the economies of those developing countries which are substantially dependent on the export of minerals also produced from the deep seabeds.

The United States believes that the world community has before it an extraordinary

² For text of the Declaration of Principles Governing the Seabed and the Ocean Floor, and the Subsoil Thereof, Beyond the Limits of National Jurisdiction (A/RES/2749 (XXV), adopted on Dec. 17, 1970), see BULLETIN of Feb. 1, 1971, p. 155.

opportunity. The regime for the deep seabeds can turn interdependence from a slogan into reality. The sense of community which mankind has failed to achieve on land could be realized through a regime for the oceans.

The United States will continue to make determined efforts to bring about final progress when the Law of the Sea Conference reconvenes in New York next year. But we must be clear on one point: The United States cannot indefinitely sacrifice its own interest in developing an assured supply of critical resources to an indefinitely prolonged negotiation. We prefer a generally acceptable international agreement that provides a stable legal environment *before* deep seabed mining actually begins. The responsibility for achieving an agreement before actual exploitation begins is shared by all nations. We cannot defer our own deep seabed mining for too much longer. In this spirit, we and other potential seabed producers can consider appropriate steps to protect current investment and to insure that this investment is also protected in the treaty.

The conference is faced with other important issues:

—Ways must be found to encourage marine scientific research for the benefit of all mankind while safeguarding the legitimate interests of coastal states in their economic zones.

—Steps must be taken to protect the oceans from pollution. We must establish uniform international controls on pollution from ships and insist upon universal respect for environmental standards for continental shelf and deep seabed exploitation.

—Access to the sea for landlocked countries must be assured.

—There must be provisions for compulsory and impartial third-party settlement of disputes. The United States cannot accept unilateral interpretation of a treaty of such scope by individual states or by an international seabed organization.

The pace of technology, the extent of economic need, and the claims of ideology and national ambition threaten to submerge the

difficult process of negotiation. The United States therefore believes that a just and beneficial regime for the oceans is essential to world peace.

For the self-interest of every nation is heavily engaged. Failure would seriously impair confidence in global treaty-making and in the very process of multilateral accommodation. The conclusion of a comprehensive Law of the Sea Treaty on the other hand would mark a major step toward a new world community.

The urgency of the problem is illustrated by disturbing developments which continue to crowd upon us. Most prominent is the problem of fisheries.

The United States cannot indefinitely accept unregulated and indiscriminate foreign fishing off its coasts. Many fish stocks have been brought close to extinction by foreign overfishing. We have recently concluded agreements with the Soviet Union, Japan, and Poland which will limit their catch; and we have a long and successful history of conservation agreements with Canada. But much more needs to be done.

Many within Congress are urging us to solve this problem unilaterally. A bill to establish a 200-mile fishing zone passed the Senate last year; a new one is currently before the House.

The Administration shares the concern which has led to such proposals. But unilateral action is both extremely dangerous and incompatible with the thrust of the negotiations described here. The United States has consistently resisted the unilateral claims of other nations, and others will almost certainly resist ours. Unilateral legislation on our part would almost surely prompt others to assert extreme claims of their own. Our ability to negotiate an acceptable international consensus on the economic zone will be jeopardized. If every state proclaims its own rules of law and seeks to impose them on others, the very basis of international law will be shaken, ultimately to our own detriment.

We warmly welcome the recent statement by Prime Minister Trudeau reaffirming the need for a solution through the Law of the

Sea Conference rather than through unilateral action. He said:

Canadians at large should realize that we have very large stakes indeed in the Law of the Sea Conference and we would be fools to give up those stakes by an action that would be purely a temporary, paper success.

That attitude will guide our actions as well. To conserve the fish and protect our fishing industry while the treaty is being negotiated, the United States will negotiate interim arrangements with other nations to conserve the fish stocks, to insure effective enforcement, and to protect the livelihood of our coastal fishermen. These agreements will be a transition to the eventual 200-mile zone. We believe it is in the interests of states fishing off our coasts to cooperate with us in this effort. We will support the efforts of other states, including our neighbors, to deal with their problems by similar agreements. We will consult fully with Congress, our states, the public, and foreign governments on arrangements for implementing a 200-mile zone by virtue of agreement at the Law of the Sea Conference.

Unilateral legislation would be a last resort. The world simply cannot afford to let the vital questions before the Law of the Sea Conference be answered by default. We are at one of those rare moments when mankind has come together to devise means of preventing future conflict and shaping its destiny rather than to solve a crisis that has occurred or to deal with the aftermath of war. It is a test of vision and will and of statesmanship. It must succeed. The United States is resolved to help conclude the conference in 1976, before the pressure of events and contention places international consensus irretrievably beyond our grasp.

Outer Space and the Law of Nations

The oceans are not the only area in which technology drives man in directions he has not foreseen and toward solutions unprecedented in history. No dimension of our modern experience is more a source of wonder than the exploration of space. Here, too, the extension of man's reach has come up

against national sensitivities and concerns for sovereignty. Here, too, we confront the potential for conflict or the possibility for legal order. Here, too, we have an opportunity to substitute law for power in the formative stage of an international activity.

Space technologies are directly relevant to the well-being of all nations. Earth-sensing satellites, for example, can dramatically help nations to assess their resources and to develop their potential. In the Sahel region of Africa we have seen the tremendous potential of this technology in dealing with natural disasters. The United States has urged in the United Nations that the new knowledge be made freely and widely available.

The use of satellites for broadcasting has a great potential to spread educational opportunities and to foster the exchange of ideas.

In the nearly two decades since the first artificial satellite, remarkable progress has been made in extending the reach of law to outer space. The Outer Space Treaty of 1967 placed space beyond national sovereignty and banned weapons of mass destruction from earth orbit. The treaty also established the principle that the benefits of space exploration should be shared. Supplementary agreements have provided for the registry of objects placed in space, for liability for damage caused by their return to earth, and for international assistance to astronauts in emergencies. Efforts are underway to develop further international law governing man's activities on the moon and other celestial bodies.

Earth-sensing and broadcasting satellites, and conditions of their use, are a fresh challenge to international agreement. The United Nations Committee on the Peaceful Uses of Outer Space is seized with the issue, and the United States will cooperate actively with it. We are committed to the wider exchange of communication and ideas. But we recognize that there must be full consultation among the countries directly concerned. While we believe that knowledge of the earth and its environment gained from outer space should be broadly shared, we recog-

nize that this must be accompanied by efforts to insure that all countries will fully understand the significance of this new knowledge.

The United States stands ready to engage in a cooperative search for agreed international ground rules for these activities.

Hijacking, Terrorism, and War

The modern age has not only given us the benefits of technology; it has also spawned the plagues of aircraft hijacking, international terrorism, and new techniques of warfare. The international community cannot ignore these affronts to civilization; it must not allow them to spread their poison; it has a duty to act vigorously to combat them.

Nations already have the legal obligation, recognized by unanimous resolution of the U.N. General Assembly, "to refrain from organizing, instigating, assisting or participating (or) acquiescing in" terrorist acts.³ Treaties have been concluded to combat hijacking, sabotage of aircraft, and attacks on diplomats. The majority of states observe these rules; a minority do not. But events even in the last few weeks dramatize that present restraints are inadequate.

The United States is convinced that stronger international steps must be taken—and urgently—to deny skyjackers and terrorists a safehaven and to establish sanctions against states which aid them, harbor them, or fail to prosecute or extradite them.

The United States in 1972 proposed to the United Nations a new international Convention for the Prevention and Punishment of Certain Acts of International Terrorism, covering kidnaping, murder, and other brutal acts. This convention regrettably was not adopted, and innumerable innocent lives have been lost as a consequence. We urge the United Nations once again to take up

and adopt this convention or other similar proposals as a matter of the highest priority.

Terrorism, like piracy, must be seen as outside the law. It discredits any political objective that it purports to serve and any nations which encourage it. If all nations deny terrorists a safehaven, terrorist practices will be substantially reduced—just as the incidence of skyjacking has declined sharply as a result of multilateral and bilateral agreements. All governments have a duty to defend civilized life by supporting such measures.

The struggle to restrain violence by law meets one of its severest tests in the law of war. Historically nations have found it possible to observe certain rules in their conduct of war. This restraint has been extended and codified especially in the past century. In our time, new, ever more awesome tools of warfare, the bitterness of ideologies and civil warfare, and weakened bonds of social cohesion have brought an even more brutal dimension to human conflict.

At the same time our century has also witnessed a broad effort to ameliorate some of these evils by international agreements. The most recent and comprehensive are the four Geneva Conventions of 1949 on the protection of war victims.

But the law in action has been less impressive than the law on the books. Patent deficiencies in implementation and compliance can no longer be ignored. Two issues are of paramount concern: First, greater protection for civilians and those imprisoned, missing, and wounded in war; and second, the application of international standards of humane conduct in civil wars.

An international conference is now underway to supplement the 1949 Geneva Conventions on the laws of war. We will continue to press for rules which will prohibit nations from barring a neutral country, or an international organization such as the International Committee of the Red Cross, from inspecting its treatment of prisoners. We strongly support provisions requiring full accounting for the missing in action. We

³ For text of the Declaration on Principles of International Law Concerning Friendly Relations and Cooperation Among States in Accordance With the Charter of the United Nations (A/RES/2625 (XXV), adopted on Oct. 24, 1970), see BULLETIN of Nov. 16, 1970, p. 627.

will advocate immunity for aircraft evacuating the wounded. And we will seek agreement on a protocol which demands humane conduct during civil war, which bans torture, summary execution, and the other excesses which too often characterize civil strife.

The United States is committed to the principle that fundamental human rights require legal protection under all circumstances, that some kinds of individual suffering are intolerable no matter what threat nations may face. The American people and government deeply believe in fundamental standards of humane conduct; we are committed to uphold and promote them; we will fight to vindicate them in international forums.

Multinational Enterprises

The need for new international regulation touches areas as modern as new technology and as old as war. It also reaches our economic institutions, where human ingenuity has created new means for progress while bringing new problems of social and legal adjustment.

Multinational enterprises have contributed greatly to economic growth in both their industrialized home countries, where they are most active, and in developing countries where they conduct some of their operations. If these organizations are to continue to foster world economic growth, it is in the common interest that international law, not political contests, govern their future.

Some nations feel that multinational enterprises influence their economies in ways unresponsive to their national priorities. Others are concerned that these enterprises may evade national taxation and regulation through facilities abroad. And recent disclosures of improper financial relationships between these companies and government officials in several countries raise fresh concerns.

But it remains equally true that multinational enterprises can be powerful engines for good. They can marshal and organize the resources of capital, initiative, research, technology, and markets in ways which vast-

ly increase production and growth. If an international consensus on the proper role and responsibilities of these enterprises could be reached, their vital contribution to the world economy could be further expanded.

A multilateral treaty establishing binding rules for multinational enterprises does not seem possible in the near future. However, the United States believes an agreed statement of basic principles is achievable. We are prepared to make a major effort and invite the participation of all interested parties.

We are now actively discussing such guidelines and will support the relevant work of the U.N. Commission on Transnational Corporations. We believe that such guidelines must:

—Accord with existing principles of international law governing the treatment of foreigners and their property rights.

—Call upon multinational corporations to take account of national priorities, act in accordance with local law, and employ fair labor practices.

—Cover all multinationals, state owned as well as private.

—Not discriminate in favor of host-country enterprises except under specifically defined and limited circumstances.

—Set forth not only the obligations of the multinationals but also the host country's responsibilities to the foreign enterprises within their borders.

—Acknowledge the responsibility of governments to apply recognized conflict-of-laws principles in reconciling regulations applied by various host nations.

If multinational institutions become an object of economic warfare, it will be an ill omen for the global economic system. We believe that the continued operation of transnational companies, under accepted guidelines, can be reconciled with the claims of national sovereignty. The capacity of nations to deal with this issue constructively will be a test of whether the search for common solutions or the clash of ideologies will dominate our economic future.

Since the early days of the Republic, Americans have seen that their nation's self-interest could not be separated from a just and progressive international legal order. Our Founding Fathers were men of law, of wisdom, and of political sophistication. The heritage they left is an inspiration as we face an expanding array of problems that are at once central to our national well-being and soluble only on a global scale.

The challenge of the statesman is to recognize that a just international order cannot be built on power, but only on restraint of power. As Felix Frankfurter said:

Fragile as reason is and limited as law is as the expression of the institutionalized medium of reason, that's all we have standing between us and the tyranny of mere will and the cruelty of unbridled, unprincipled, undisciplined feeling.

If the politics of ideological confrontation and strident nationalism become pervasive, broad and humane international agreement will grow ever more elusive and unilateral actions will dominate. In an environment of widening chaos the stronger will survive and may even prosper temporarily. But the weaker will despair, and the human spirit will suffer.

The American people have always had a higher vision: a community of nations that has discovered the capacity to act according to man's more noble aspirations. The principles and procedures of the Anglo-American legal system have proven their moral and practical worth. They have promoted our national progress and brought benefits to more citizens more equitably than in any society in the history of man. They are a heritage and a trust which we all hold in common. And their greatest contribution to human progress may well lie ahead of us.

The philosopher Kant saw law and freedom, moral principle and practical necessity,

as parts of the same reality. He saw law as the inescapable guide to political action. He believed that sooner or later the realities of human interdependence would compel the fulfillment of the moral imperatives of human aspiration.

We have reached that moment in time where moral and practical imperatives, law, and pragmatism point toward the same goals.

The foreign policy of the United States must reflect the universal ideals of the American people. It is no accident that a dedication to international law has always been a central feature of our foreign policy. And so it is today—inescapably—as for the first time in history we have the opportunity and the duty to build a true world community.

Delegation to 7th Special Session and 30th U.N. General Assembly

The Senate on August 1 confirmed the nominations of the following to be Representatives and Alternate Representatives of the United States to the seventh special session and to the thirtieth session of the General Assembly of the United Nations:

Representatives

Daniel P. Moynihan
W. Tapley Bennett, Jr.
Donald M. Fraser, U.S. Representative from
the State of Minnesota
J. Herbert Burke, U.S. Representative from the
State of Florida
Clarence M. Mitchell, Jr.

Alternate Representatives

Albert W. Sherer, Jr.
Jacob M. Myerson
Barbara M. White
Carmen Maymi
John H. Haugh

President Ford Visits Romania and Yugoslavia Following European Security Conference

After attending the Conference on Security and Cooperation in Europe (CSCE) at Helsinki, President Ford visited Romania (August 2-3) and Yugoslavia (August 3-4). Following are remarks by President Ford and President Nicolae Ceausescu of the Socialist Republic of Romania, the text of a joint communique signed at Sinaia, Romania, on August 3, remarks by President Ford and President Josip Broz Tito of the Socialist Federal Republic of Yugoslavia, the text of a joint statement issued at Belgrade on August 4, and a statement by President Ford issued upon his return to Washington.¹

ARRIVAL, BUCHAREST, AUGUST 2

White House press release (Bucharest) dated August 2

President Ceausescu²

Dear Mr. President of the United States of America, dear Mrs. Ford, ladies and gentlemen, dear comrades and friends: It is with great joy that I and my wife, all of us, have you as our guests and address to you, Mr. President, and to Mrs. Elizabeth Ford, as well as to your associates, our warm greetings and to extend to you our traditional bidding of welcome on the soil of the Socialist Republic of Romania.

I wish to make a particular note with satisfaction of the outward force taken by

¹ President Ford's address before the conference and remarks and joint statements issued during his visit to the Federal Republic of Germany and Poland en route to Helsinki are printed in the BULLETIN of Sept. 1, 1975. Additional remarks are printed in the Aug. 4 and Aug. 11 issues of the Weekly Compilation of Presidential Documents.

² President Ceausescu spoke in Romanian on all three occasions.

the Romanian-American relations, of the fact that in the last few years the economic exchanges have gone up strongly, that technical-scientific cooperation has been intensified, as well as the cultural and other exchanges between our two countries.

The very fact of your visit to Romania is, in my opinion, an eloquent expression of these relations, of the desire evinced by the Romanian and the American peoples to work more and more closely together in the mutual interest, as well as in the interests of their force of understanding, cooperation, and peace among all nations.

You are coming to Romania just a day after the successful conclusion of the Conference on Security and Cooperation in Europe. Thus your visit is a wonderful part of the spirit which permeates the documents that we have signed together yesterday in Helsinki and whereby we have asserted our common will on behalf of our peoples to develop cooperation on the principles of fully equal rights, respect for the independence, sovereignty of each nation, noninterference in internal affairs, and the renunciation of force and threat with the use of force in the settlement of problems between states.

As we have mentioned in the statement in Helsinki, in order to convey into real fact whatever we have agreed in the signed documents, sustained efforts are required in order to insure our peoples and the peoples of the world at large a better world and a world with more justice, in order to proceed in such a way as to insure that our children and mankind in general will never know the disasters of war and would live in peace and friendship.

During your brief visit to this country,

you will have an opportunity, Mr. President, to get to know the present-day interests and some of the achievements of the Romanian people on the way of building a new life of well-being and habit. You will be able, sir, to understand better the desire of the people of Romania to cooperate with the American people and to work together with all the peoples of the world irrespective of their social systems.

I should like your visit to mark a new, significant moment in the course of friendship and cooperation between our two countries and peoples.

With these thoughts in mind, I wish you to feel at home among the Romanian people, who greet you with esteemed friendship and its traditional hospitality.

President Ford

Mr. President, Mrs. Ceausescu, ladies and gentlemen: Mrs. Ford, our son Jack, and I are highly honored and greatly pleased to visit Romania. We are especially pleased to be in this unique land so rich in history, with such a great natural beauty and such a proud and independent people.

As you may recall, Mr. President, I met with a splendid group of young Romanians in the White House several months ago. I found them to be excellent and outstanding ambassadors of friendship between our two countries.

Mr. President, let us assure coming generations a more normal, relaxed, and peaceful world. We must find ways to increase real and direct cooperation among all peoples.

Among the principles we both cherish is the right of every nation to independence and sovereignty. We believe that every nation has the right to its own peaceful existence without being threatened by force, and we believe that all states are equal under law regardless of size, system, or level of development.

Principles such as these are included in the document we signed in Helsinki. We have both worked hard, Mr. President, and we must continue to devote our efforts to making all of these principles a reality in interna-

tional life in this spirit. I look forward to our discussions on the international problems that concern us both.

Our bilateral relations are good, Mr. President. I am very pleased that our Congress has approved the U.S.-Romanian trade agreement. This creates new opportunities, particularly in the mutually beneficial commercial and economic field. I am confident that we can continue to improve our relations in many, many other areas as well.

Mr. President, I know that our discussions will be very productive during my stay in your country. As during your visit to Washington in June, our goal will be to seek closer cooperation between Romania and the United States. I look forward to our talks that we will have in the hours ahead.

On behalf of the American people I bring to you and your family and the Romanian people warm, warm greetings and the very best wishes for peace and prosperity.

TOASTS BY PRESIDENT FORD AND PRESIDENT CEAUSESCU, AUGUST 2³

President Ceausescu

Mr. President, Mrs. Elizabeth Ford, ladies and gentlemen, friends and comrades: I should like once again to express our joy, our joy which we share, all of us, for having the President of the United States with us, and Mrs. Ford, too, and his associates, as our guests in Romania and with the fact that this visit is part of the continuous development of the friendly relations and cooperation between our two people.

I think I shall not be mistaken if I say that in this very place, six years ago, day for day, we welcomed the first President of the United States ever to visit Romania. By sheer coincidence, because it was not programmed to be so, you are coming to Romania precisely six years after.

At that time, that visit was regarded as a somewhat exceptional thing by some people,

³ Given at a dinner hosted by President Ceausescu at Bucharest (text from White House press release (Bucharest)).

of course. Changes of particular importance have occurred in the world since.

But in the first place, I would like to mention with deep satisfaction the fact that relations between Romania and the United States have seen very strong progress—besides many agreements in these years, various years, among which the last agreement regards our trade relations which, I have to say, was today ratified unanimously by the Council of State while a few days ago it was adopted by the Senate and the House of Representatives of the United States.

I can say that once this agreement has come into force, an agreement whereby our two countries mutually grant each other the most-favored-nation treatment—although I will have to recognize that Romania stands to gain significantly as a result of this—larger, broader prospects are opening up for the development of economic relations between our two countries.

In order not to have people believe that Romania will have I don't know what kind of advantages as a result, I have to say that this simply means that Romanian products are going to enjoy the same status as the produce of other countries on the U.S. market. It now follows, of course, for our goods to prove competitive both in terms of price, quality, and technical.

In the last few years our trade exchanges have gone up almost four times over. I am convinced that after this trade agreement has come into force in the forthcoming years, we can achieve a substantial increase in our economic exchanges and cooperative adventures, although fulfilling the target of \$1 billion per annum in the next three to four years.

As you see, Mr. President, we are also practical people, and we talk primarily of material things, things of economic exchanges. I should not fail to mention the fact that during these years we also concluded agreements in technology, science, culture, and there has been an intensive exchange of people in various walks of life between our two countries.

Only in the last few years more than 5,000 American young people spent several weeks

in Romania, and starting last year groups of Romanian young people also visited the United States, within the program appropriately called Ambassadors For Friendship. Indeed they are goodwill ambassadors for peace and friendship.

We attach special attention to such activities, not only or necessarily in connection with humanitarian problems as described in the documents we signed together yesterday but mainly with the need we feel for the people of our two countries—for the young people all over the world—to meet together to strengthen their cooperation so that in the future they can be at peace and work together with each other with no threat of force of war.

Bearing all this in mind, I wish to express my hope—more, indeed my conviction—that your visit to Romania is going to mark a moment of particular and new importance for the further extension of many-sided cooperation in all fields between our two countries.

I think I am not going to disclose a special secret if I simply mention that during our talks tonight we agreed to work in this direction with a conviction that this responds fully to the interests of our two peoples, to the interests of a general policy of cooperation and peace in the world.

In the international sphere, change has been perhaps even more important. It is true that fundamental changes have occurred in the manner people judge events, but in particular in the ratio of forces in the international arena.

Nowadays I think that nobody—or at least very few people—would regard as something strange or interpret as a heresy a visit by the President of the United States to Romania.

On the contrary, I would rather think it is vain [sic] regarded as something that should be normal for relations between states. This is the most telling proof of the depth of change in international relations.

That is why I take the liberty to say that the first visit six years ago by the President of the United States, to Romania, had a particular significance, not only for the rela-

tions between our two countries but also for the overall course for détente and cooperation in international terms.

The fact that two countries with different social systems and different insights—to say nothing about the difference between their heritage—were able to make a contribution, each one related to what it stands for, for the general course of peace, illustrates that today cooperation among states and among peoples, regardless of size, big and small, irrespective of their social system, becomes a factor of particular importance for the general force of events for insuring new policy based on people's rights and mutual respect among all the nations of the world.

This time is the first visit of a President of the United States to another country after the successful conclusion of the European Security Conference. I should like to interpret this as an expression of a beginning of the application of the points we have underscored by our signature yesterday together with the executives of the other participating states.

Of course, it just happened that this first visit was in Romania, but maybe now acquires a special significance. Maybe that significance is that two states with different social systems and different insights are firmly determined to take action in order to carry into effect things for which they had signed a day before.

No doubt there are still many problems in the world that await a solution. You mentioned them in your speech yesterday. So did I. Distinct efforts will still be required by all states in order to see to it that new relations are built among states and that the right of each nation is respected for a free development without fear of aggression and to insure the rights of each people to choose its own social system according to its own will.

There are problems in Europe. There are problems in Cyprus, in the Middle East, Africa, Latin America, and Asia. But all of them could be solved starting from this new precedent of ruling out force, threat of the use of force. They could be solved by peaceful means so as to give a happier future to

the people, and in particular we should think of the future of our children, of our young people, and of the total mankind.

We can hardly overlook the fact that the problems of disarmament are a matter of concern for all people these days, but there are economic problems of most serious degree, the solution of which requires close cooperation in order to solve them in a way opening the road toward a new economic future and working toward more progress in the world, economic stability, and insuring the stability of all nations and a world of peace and cooperation.

Mr. President, in a country which has won its independence by long struggle, a country which has seen for hundreds of years the rule of foreign domination—and everything here has been achieved by struggle and by work, by toil, and sometimes by renouncing things which were necessary in order to insure economic and social progress of the country to make sure of its independence. That is precisely why we hoped so dearly from our hearts our own independent development, and that is why we understand so well the people who now wage their struggle for independence for economic and social development consonant with their own will.

The country is, I think, the decisive factor in the process of building a better world, a world with more justice, and world of lasting peace.

The peoples have reached great achievements in the fields of science and human knowledge in general. People now meet in the outer space and see eye to eye.

I think we should also set ourselves the goal to meet each other here on the Earth to understand each other, to work together with each other, in order to make it so that each nation can enjoy her fruits of science, technology, the advantages of everything that human civilization has created best.

It is in that spirit that Romania, my people, wish to cooperate closely with the people of America, with the United States of America, with all the peoples of the world, starting from a conviction that only on mutual respect and only on friendly cooperation can we note the future of human civilization,

can we build the world of peace for all.

With the conviction that the future will see even better cooperation between our two peoples and that your visit, sir, is going to give a new impetus to our cooperation, I would like once again to wish you to feel at home here during your brief visit to this country and to express my hope that at the appropriate time you might come again for a longer stay. I do hope that Mrs. Ford—as it happens the world over, given the private life of Presidents—in this respect will be successful in persuading you to come back to Romania for a longer stay.

May I ask all that are present in this hall to join me in this toast to the President of the United States of America and to the esteemed Mrs. Ford, for the continuous developments of friendly relations and cooperation between Romania and the United States, for the continued well-being and prosperity of the American people, for peace and cooperation among all the nations of the world, to the health of all of you.

President Ford

Mr. President, Mrs. Ceausescu, ladies and gentlemen: My visit to Romania is a very, very great pleasure. Because of some high-level meetings between our governments and the growing number of contacts at the ministerial level and between officials and specialists at all levels, we have witnessed in recent years improvement in U.S.-Romanian relations.

It seems very fortuitous and unique that within a day following the signing of the agreements in Helsinki that we have reaffirmed and expanded our fine personal relationship, that we have seen concrete evidence of better relations between the Romanian people and the American people, and that we have listened to the words of one of the leaders of the nations in Europe who has been strong and forthright that we should meet here on this occasion.

Our talks today, Mr. President, reaffirmed in the most positive terms our mutual interest in continuing to build our excellent bilateral relations.

Mr. President, my visit to Europe is significant for another reason. We both participated in the final stages of the European Security Conference at Helsinki.

As you, Mr. President, have pointed out on many, many occasions, the dynamics of change—social, technological, global, and dimensional—affect all nations. So can and should the results of Helsinki.

We welcome, Mr. President, the changing relationship being forged between East and West. This is a relationship in which Romania continues to assume a most important role. The efforts of the United States and Romania and those of the other 33 participating nations will be very useful, and deeds equal words.

Not the least result of the conference has been to show that smaller nations can make an independent, can make an equal and valuable contribution to the world.

On recognizing the importance of the conference's work, the United States views it as one important step in a continuing process. It is imperative that we work together to lessen the chances for conflict. Let all nations cooperate to lessen human poverty, human suffering, and human hunger.

The challenges we face require the best efforts and the best ideas of all concerned, and all nations must have a positive and active role to play.

Mr. President, my country fully recognizes the growing interdependence of mankind, the need for increased cooperation among the industrialized nations and a greater recognition of the concerns of the developing nations.

The United States will make full and fair contribution. We look to the other nations of the world to join with us in this important endeavor.

Mr. President, I came to Romania for another very important reason. This complex world is marked by diversity. We recognize the importance of close ties with a country that shows such independence and such vigor. We do not always agree, but we value the courage of a nation that wants to make its contribution to a better world by its own very special efforts.

Romania has won the admiration of the

American people for her positive contributions to world understanding. I am confident that Romania will contribute constructively in helping to find practical and durable solutions to the problems of today, as well as for tomorrow.

Mr. President, on behalf of Mrs. Ford and myself, I thank you and your very gracious wife for your warm hospitality. I raise my glass to you, Mr. President, and to the building of a more secure and prosperous international community in which both of our peoples will find peace and progress in the future.

REMARKS AT SINAIA, AUGUST 3⁴

President Ceausescu

Mr. President, gentlemen and comrades: I should like to express my satisfaction in connection with the signing of our communique today and the results of the visit paid to Romania by you, sir, and for discussions we had together as an expression of our mutual wish to extend our cooperation in all fields and to work together more closely in order to promote the policy of peace and international cooperation.

At the same time, we signed the documents whereby the two countries take note of the fact that the trade agreement has come into effect and have exchanged ratification instruments to that effect.

As a result, a better legal framework is being created for further expanding economic cooperation between our two countries.

I should like to express my satisfaction, the satisfaction of my government and of the Romanian people, with the fact that the relations between Romania and the United States have now been established on a mutually beneficial basis, that our two countries are now desirous to apply in the economic field the principles of mutual advantage through the mutual granting of the

most-favored-nation treatment.

During these two days, we had talks on many problems which pertained to the relations between the two countries and also to a number of international matters which are today of general concern to mankind and which are of interest today to our two countries as well.

I am glad to note that in these conversations of ours that the preoccupation and the common desire have emerged to find political solutions for the complex problems now confronting mankind and to insure the continued course toward détente, cooperation, and peace in the world.

That is why I should like to emphasize with great satisfaction that your visit to Romania, sir, although a short one, is now being concluded with the most favorable results, both with regard to the relations between Romania and the United States and the future prospects of these relations, as well as with respect to the need to take further action together in the service of peace and cooperation, in the service of building a world with more justice, a better world on our planet.

This setting in the mountains I think has also helped create a favorable climate, and I hope this will be reflected in the continued cooperation between our two countries and between the two of us, sir. I wish an ever better and better and fruitful cooperation between Romania and the United States. I wish that we can work together and to the good of our two peoples and of the cause of peace.

President Ford

Mr. President and distinguished guests: Let me say with great emphasis my appreciation for your warm hospitality and that of the Romanian people. It has been a wonderful experience for Mrs. Ford and myself to meet so many of your people, and it has been a glorious opportunity for me to not only see Bucharest but this superb area of your country where we are today.

I am especially grateful for the opportunity to have friendly, constructive, and frank discussions with you, not only on our

⁴ Made upon signing the joint communique and the notices of acceptance of the U.S.-Romanian trade agreement (text from White House press release (Sinaia)).

bilateral relations but those problems that we see on a worldwide basis.

For the last several years, Mr. President, you have taken the leadership in bringing about an exchange in the area of culture, scientific matters, economic problems, between your country and our country; and the net result has been mutually beneficial to both.

The documents that we have just signed make possible the kind of trade relationship between your country and mine that will enhance the prosperity of both, make the life of your people and mine richer, and will be beneficial on a worldwide basis.

What I have signed on behalf of my country has received the endorsement of our government—the executive, the legislative—and therefore it is a true contract between your country and my country for all of the benefits that we can share equally.

I thank you again, and I thank the Romanian people.

JOINT COMMUNIQUE SIGNED AT SINAIA AUGUST 3

White House press release (Sinaia) dated August 3

At the invitation of the President of the Socialist Republic of Romania, Nicolae Ceausescu, and Mrs. Elena Ceausescu, the President of the United States, Gerald R. Ford, and Mrs. Elizabeth Ford, paid an official visit to Romania on August 2-3, 1975.

The distinguished guests visited places of cultural and social interest at Bucharest and Sinaia. They were given a warm welcome everywhere as an expression of the esteem and high regard in which the Romanian people hold their friends, the American people.

During the visit, President Ford and President Ceausescu held talks regarding the present stage of relations between Romania and the United States, as well as an exchange of views on a wide range of international problems of mutual interest. The talks took place in a cordial and friendly atmosphere reflecting mutual esteem and respect as well as the favorable course of Romanian-American relations in recent years.

The two Presidents noted with satisfaction that bilateral relations in the political, economic, technical-scientific, cultural and other fields have developed and diversified in recent years in the spirit of the principles inscribed in the Joint Declaration signed at Washington on December 5, 1973.

Reaffirming the adherence of their countries to the

principles in the Joint Declaration, the two Presidents resolved to continue to develop relations between the two states on the basis of these principles, in order to promote peace, international cooperation and the traditional friendship between the Romanian and American peoples.

The two Presidents gave a positive assessment to the evolution of economic links between the two countries. They resolved to continue to act to expand economic, industrial and technical-scientific cooperation and trade based on the principles and provisions of the Joint Declaration on Economic, Industrial, and Technological Cooperation between Romania and the United States adopted at Washington on December 5, 1973.

They noted also the importance of actions taken in recent years to encourage and intensify bilateral commerce, among these being the establishment and activity of the Romanian-American Joint Economic Commission and the Romanian-U.S. Economic Council, as well as joint production and commercial ventures.

The two Presidents hailed with deep satisfaction the conclusion of the Trade Agreement between the Socialist Republic of Romania and the United States of America, which represents a major contribution to the expansion of economic relations between the two countries. The two sides expressed the conviction that the entry into force of the Trade Agreement on August 3, 1975, by exchange of notices of acceptance during the visit, will help Romanian-American trade to grow and diversify, thereby influencing favorably the entire range of relations between the two states.

The two Presidents, taking note of the positive evolution of cooperative ties between economic organizations of the two countries, resolved to encourage wider links through joint activities, including the establishment of joint production and commercial ventures. To this end, the Romanian-American Joint Economic Commission, whose next session is scheduled soon in Washington, will examine appropriate ways and measures. The two Presidents decided that appropriate departments will begin, as soon as possible, the negotiation of a long-term accord on economic, industrial and technical collaboration, as well as an agricultural agreement. Possibilities for a bilateral maritime agreement will also be discussed.

The two Presidents welcomed progress achieved in technical and scientific cooperation and expressed themselves in favor of exploring possibilities for mutually beneficial cooperation through the conclusion of collaborative agreements on energy, including nuclear energy, environmental protection, public health, and in other fields.

Both sides noted the conclusion, in December 1974, of the first long-term governmental agreement on cooperation and exchanges in the fields of culture, education, science and technology and will

continue to give it full support. The two sides stressed the importance of this agreement for better mutual understanding of spiritual and material values, for expansion of links in these fields between their respective institutions, organizations and associations, and for contacts between citizens of both countries. In this context, the two Presidents welcomed exchanges and contacts between youth groups.

Regarding the coming anniversaries of major events in the histories of both nations—the Bicentennial of the United States and the Centennial of Romanian State independence—the two Presidents agreed that these events will provide occasions for further expanding mutual understanding.

The two Presidents noted that, in the spirit of the 1973 Declaration, a number of humanitarian problems have been solved. They agreed to continue to take action in this field.

President Ford expressed his concern over the recent disastrous floods which had affected Romania. He voiced admiration for the valiant efforts of the Romanian people to overcome the effects of this natural calamity. President Ceausescu thanked President Ford for his concern and the aid extended by the United States.

The two Presidents agreed that the successful conclusion of the work of the Conference on Security and Cooperation in Europe represents an important step toward the achievement of greater security and cooperation on the continent. In order to achieve broader understanding among all the peoples of Europe, they stressed the need for abiding by and implementing all the provisions of the final act adopted at Helsinki. The two Presidents expressed their determination to strive for effective disarmament measures which strengthen the peace and security of all peoples in Europe.

The two Presidents emphasized their support for a just and equitable international order in which the right of each country, regardless of size or political, economic or social system, to choose its own destiny free from the use or threat of force will be respected. In such an international order, each country may develop freely on the basis of strict respect for independence, national sovereignty, juridical equality, and non-interference in its internal affairs.

During the talks, the two Presidents held an exchange of views on the complex economic problems which confront mankind. They noted that to solve these problems, account must be taken of the need to establish fair economic relations among all states and to create and consolidate an economic equilibrium which can assure stability on a world scale, in the interest of peace, international security and the general progress of all nations. Attention was given to effective means of reducing the gap between developed and developing countries.

The two Presidents reaffirmed the indissoluble link

between security and effective disarmament measures as well as the pressing need for continued vigorous negotiations toward further progress in the limitation of armaments, including nuclear armaments.

The two sides expressed their concern over the situation in the Middle East and underlined the need to reach, as soon as possible, a just and lasting peace in the region, in the spirit of Resolution 338 of the Security Council of the United Nations, taking into account the legitimate interests of all the peoples of the area, including the Palestinian people, and respect for the right to independence, sovereignty and security for all states in the area.

The two sides expressed concern over the evolution of the situation in Cyprus and favored a solution based on respect for the sovereignty, independence and territorial integrity of the Republic of Cyprus. They noted that the talks between the two communities on the island can contribute fruitfully to a solution of the situation.

The two Presidents agreed that good-neighborly relations of friendship among Balkan countries would contribute toward cooperation, security and improvement of the climate in Europe.

The two Presidents agreed to support the United Nations so that it may fulfill its mission of maintaining world peace and developing international cooperation and understanding.

The two Presidents welcomed the Romanian-American exchange of visits in many fields and at various levels which have taken place in recent years. In order to continue the positive direction of Romanian-American relations, they agreed to develop and intensify these periodic exchanges of views at all levels.

President Ford and Mrs. Ford expressed to President Nicolae Ceausescu and Mrs. Elena Ceausescu their deep appreciation for the extremely cordial reception which was accorded them in Romania.

The two sides agreed that this visit was another contribution to friendship and understanding between the Romanian and American Governments and peoples and to the valuable tradition of constructive dialogue which has evolved between the two countries.

SINAI, August 3, 1975.

GERALD R. FORD

President of the United States of America

NICOLAE CEAUSESCU

President of the Socialist Republic of Romania

ARRIVAL, BELGRADE, AUGUST 3

White House press release (Belgrade) dated August 3

President Tito, ladies and gentlemen:
Mrs. Ford, our son Jack, and I have looked

forward to this visit to Yugoslavia, a country of great beauty and a country with fierce pride in its independence.

It is also a very great pleasure for me to make my first visit here as President of the United States.

Twelve years ago I came to Yugoslavia as a Member of the Congress on a far less happy occasion—Skopje that day had been devastated by an earthquake. I remember the sad and very grim scene. Mrs. Ford and I visited Skopje. I am very pleased to learn that Skopje has been rebuilt into a beautiful and modern city.

This is representative of the progress made throughout Yugoslavia in recent years. It is a fine example of what creativity, hard work, and determination—well-known characteristics of the Yugoslav people—can achieve.

I am looking forward to my talks with you, Mr. President. You are truly respected in America and throughout the world as one of the great men of the postwar era. I am confident that our discussions of bilateral issues and questions affecting the peace and security and welfare of the world will add to our mutual understanding, to the friendly relations of our two countries, and the friendship between Yugoslavs and Americans.

Mr. President, you and I have just returned from Helsinki, where we attended the Conference on Security and Cooperation in Europe. This summit was another step in the continuing efforts to reduce tensions and increase international cooperation.

It represents progress which we, together with other conference participants, must build upon. Full implementation of the Helsinki documents promises greater security, greater cooperation, not only in Europe but among people everywhere.

The meeting of the United States, Yugoslavia, and 33 other states in Finland, also serves as the latest reminder that today's world finds the people of the world increasingly interdependent.

As we meet today and tomorrow in Belgrade, so soon after our participation together in the Helsinki Conference, we are

mindful of the need for cooperation by all nations on urgent international problems. I am confident that our discussions will make a very positive contribution in this direction.

Thank you—the people of Yugoslavia—for your gracious welcome to this great country.

Thank you very much.

TOAST BY PRESIDENT FORD, AUGUST 3⁵

Mr. President, Madame Broz, ladies and gentlemen: I am very, very delighted to be back in Yugoslavia. Twelve years is much too long to be away.

Mrs. Ford and I thank you most sincerely for the warm and wonderful welcome of your people and for your own very gracious remarks, Mr. President.

While I am deeply appreciative of the justly renowned Yugoslav hospitality shown to Mrs. Ford and to me personally, I am very mindful that this kind expression represents the friendship which the Yugoslav people feel for the American people.

I can assure you, Mr. President, that this sentiment is fully reciprocated on our part. We Americans have long valued our ties of friendship with Yugoslavia. Americans have particularly admired Yugoslavia's independent spirit. Whenever independence is threatened, people everywhere look to the example of the struggle of Yugoslavian people throughout their history. They take strength and they take inspiration from that example.

Mr. President, this spirit and your courageous leadership brought the Yugoslav people successfully through the harsh trials of World War II and its aftermath into an era of peace, stability, and economic growth.

Yugoslavia is confident of its place in the world and its prospects for the future, and I believe your confidence is fully justified.

American interest in Yugoslavia's continued independence, integrity, and well-being, expressed often in the past, remains undiminished. Tonight I have the pleasure

⁵ Given at a dinner hosted by President Tito at Belgrade (text from White House press release (Belgrade)).

to reassert my nation's positive interest in the future of your nation.

Yugoslavs and Americans have both benefited from many joint efforts to speed the economic development of Yugoslavia. Our bilateral trade continues to grow. It has more than doubled in five years. Yugoslav-American economic councils have been established in Belgrade and in New York City. Many American firms are working closely with Yugoslav enterprises, such as the construction of your country's first nuclear power facility. Our Export-Import Bank plays a very positive role in supplying loans and guarantees. Yugoslav-American scientific, technological, and cultural cooperation and exchanges are an increasingly important part of our bilateral relations.

But our mutual accomplishments in dealing with economic problems must be viewed from the perspective of the interdependence of all nations.

We have been distressed by the intransigence and irresponsibility reflected in some of the discussions of vital issues in U.N. forums. The growing alienation between developing nations can only harm the best interests of both and jeopardize the solution of universal problems.

I assure you, Mr. President, that the United States will play its full role and its full part in efforts to resolve these issues in the best interests of all people.

Yugoslavia has taken a very prominent role in international affairs under your guidance, Mr. President. The United States recognizes that your country's policy of nonalignment makes an active contribution to greater understanding among people.

Yugoslavia and the United States have consistently worked for cooperation based on the equality of all members of the international community under the U.N. Charter in the settling of outstanding international problems.

Our two countries, as in the case of all friends, have had differences; but we are able to discuss them openly, as friends do, and to resolve them. The main point is that we are never in doubt about the importance of common goals or about our deep commit-

ment to the continuity of friendly relations.

At this time, with the aims of the Conference on Security and Cooperation in Europe so clearly in our thoughts, let us emphasize the mutuality and the interdependence of our basic concerns for peace, security, and human progress in the years to come.

In that spirit, I ask you to join me in a toast to President Tito, whose courage, wisdom, and leadership have meant so much for Yugoslavia and the world, in which his country has played such an important part.

REMARKS AT CONCLUSION OF MEETINGS, AUGUST 4

White House press release (Belgrade) dated August 4

President Ford

The talks that we have had the last day have been too short, but we have discussed in great detail some of the very major matters that both of our countries are equally interested in.

We did discuss the bilateral relations between Yugoslavia and the United States. That included, of course, our economic relationships; it did, of course, include our military relationships. And in both instances I indicated very firmly that I would give both matters or problems my very personal attention because of their significance.

We did discuss the results of the CSCE Conference in Helsinki. It was agreed that this was a step forward, as both of us indicated in our speeches in Helsinki, but that we have to produce progress if we were to justify the action, and when we meet here in Belgrade two years from now, the success of Helsinki would be proven by the actions that have been taken in the interim.

We did, of course, discuss the problems of the Middle East. I indicated that the United States would continue its very vital interest in progress in the Middle East. I stated very emphatically that a stalemate in the Middle East was unacceptable. I indicated that moderation on the part of all parties was essential.

I also indicated that flexibility was neces-

sary if we were to achieve the kind of results that would avoid a potential serious development, a catastrophe, from the point of view of the world as a whole. Moderation, greater flexibility, are absolutely essential at the present time.

I, of course, thank the President for his cordial and friendly welcome, and I express to the Yugoslavian people my gratitude for the warm reception given to Mrs. Ford and myself and our son, and I look forward to an expanding and improving relationship between our peoples.

President Tito ⁶

It is a little difficult for me to make a statement, as the President of the United States has already said all that I wanted to say.

I must say that the talks have been going in a very cordial and constructive spirit.

When we start, bilateral relations—we found that such relations are already very good, but we agreed that they could be better and that we intended to expand them in the future.

Both sides have obviously expressed concern about the situation in the Middle East. I think [in] that our views are quite identical, especially after I heard what President Ford said about the actions the United States intends to take in the future.

As far as the international situation is concerned, we didn't discuss it in detail, but we discussed more the economic situation. We found together that the economic situation is very serious and that it will be a matter of serious discussion at the forthcoming special session of the United Nations. And after I heard what President Ford and Secretary of State Kissinger said about the attitude the United States are going to take, I think I can be hopeful that the special session will be a successful one.

I think the talks with President Ford and Secretary of State Kissinger were in the spirit of the joint declaration we adopted in Helsinki.

I wish to say that the visit has been a

⁶ President Tito spoke in Serbo-Croatian.

very successful one; it has enabled us to get to know each other a little better. I think President Ford has been able to see that the peoples of Yugoslavia—judging by the reception they gave you, sir—wish good relations with the United States of America.

So I thank you for your visit, which will be, I am sure, beneficial for both countries and for the future relations.

TOASTS BY PRESIDENT FORD AND PRESIDENT TITO, AUGUST 4 ⁷

President Tito

Mr. President: May I again express once again my great satisfaction for having you in our country. Your visit is one more important contribution to our traditionally good relation, and I am convinced that the further cooperation between our two countries will be promoted in all fields.

Although your stay was short, you could, Mr. President, see for yourself that the peoples of Yugoslavia lavish friendship toward the American people and they wish the existing ties to be consolidated and sanctioned.

Yesterday and today we had very interesting talks which showed that your country, as well as ours, are very interested to peace in the world and progress in international cooperation. On many questions we have the same views, and we are equally ready to contribute to the solution of major international problems.

I think we are on the good road, because even on the question on which our positions are different, there has been new consideration being expressed and recognized for further dialogue. We know that the United States has a great responsibility for peace in the world and the development of international cooperation and that on your involvement depends in a large measure the solution of many questions.

We appreciate the effort you are engaging in this direction. Applying consistently the principles of the policy of nonalignment,

⁷ Given at a working luncheon hosted by President Tito at Belgrade; President Tito spoke in Serbo-Croatian (text from White House press release (Belgrade)).

Yugoslavia endeavors—and we shall continue to do so in the future—to strengthen the spirit of cooperation between our peoples, to consolidate mutual confidence, and to build such international relations in which independence, equality, and cooperation among all peoples will come to more and more expression.

I wish, Mr. President, to assure you that the talks I had with you gave me great satisfaction. I hope that you will have again the opportunity to visit our country, to stay a little longer, and to get better to know our people and the effort they make in the building of a better life.

I would like, Mr. President, that you convey to the American people the feelings of sincere friendship of the peoples of Yugoslavia and our wishes for further prosperity of the United States of America.

I raise this glass to the good health and personal happiness of you personally, Mr. President, of Mrs. Ford and your family, to the health of your associates, to friendship between our two countries.

President Ford

Mr. President: As our visit in Yugoslavia draws to a close, let me express my deep appreciation on behalf of Mrs. Ford and our son Jack; and all of the American party join me in thanking you once more for the warm hospitality and deep friendship that you have shown us. We have had a marvelous time in Belgrade.

Mr. President, I especially appreciate having had this chance to hear your views on our bilateral questions and on the issues affecting the international community. I appreciate your long experience and wisdom reflected in each of the subjects discussed during our conversations here.

I have valued our discussions coming, as they do, immediately after the Conference on Security and Cooperation in Europe, in which both you and I participated, representing our two countries.

I am pleased, Mr. President, that you and I are agreed on the need for all participating states to implement its documents fully and

in good faith. If we do so, we will contribute to greater stability, increasing contacts between our peoples, greater cooperation throughout Europe. We will contribute, of course, to the important goal we both share—a world in which all peoples enjoy peace, prosperity, and security.

I am pleased that our views have been close on many, many of the matters facing our two peoples and all of mankind. It is essential that we now work to broaden our spirit of understanding and agreement, to achieve a better realization within the international community of the interdependence of human society and their problems. The need for cooperation in seeking solutions to the universal problems is very critical.

Mr. President, your country, with its own courageous determination to maintain its independence, can fully appreciate the importance to the American people of our celebration of our 200 years of freedom. It is a time for Americans to reflect upon the basic values that brought success to the original Thirteen Colonies' struggle for self-government.

We are proud of the significant contribution through the years of Yugoslav-Americans to our national growth and development. They constitute a bridge of understanding, good will, and kinship between Yugoslavia and the United States, and let us expand that bridge.

As I close, I raise my glass in deepest appreciation to you in a toast to you, Mr. President, and to Yugoslav-American friendship.

JOINT STATEMENT ISSUED AT BELGRADE AUGUST 4

White House press release (Belgrade) dated August 4

At the invitation of the President of the Socialist Federal Republic of Yugoslavia, Josip Broz Tito, the President of the United States of America, Gerald R. Ford, and Mrs. Ford paid an official visit to Belgrade, Yugoslavia, on August 3 and 4, 1975.

Continuing the established practice of regular contacts and consultations between the presidents of the two countries, Presidents Tito and Ford held cordial, open and constructive talks on a wide range of issues of mutual interest.

Taking part in the talks were:

From the Yugoslav side, Dr. Vladimir Bakaric, Vice President of the SFRY Presidency; Edvard Kardelj, Member of the SFRY Presidency; Dzemal Bijedic, President of the Federal Executive Council; Milos Minic, Vice President of the Federal Executive Council and Federal Secretary for Foreign Affairs; Dimce Belovski, member of the Council of the Federation; Lazar Mojsov, Deputy Federal Secretary for Foreign Affairs; Toma Granfil, Yugoslav Ambassador to the United States; Aleksandar Sokorac, Chief of Cabinet of the President of the Republic; Nikola Milicevic, Assistant Federal Secretary for Foreign Affairs; Andjelko Blazevic, Foreign Policy Adviser to the President of the Republic; Svetozar Starcevic, Director for the North American Department, Federal Secretariat for Foreign Affairs;

From the United States side, Henry A. Kissinger, Secretary of State and the Assistant to the President for National Security Affairs; Laurence H. Silberman, United States Ambassador to Yugoslavia; Robert T. Hartmann, Counselor to the President; Ronald H. Nessen, Press Secretary to the President; Lt. General Brent Scowcroft, Deputy Assistant to the President for National Security Affairs; Richard B. Cheney, Deputy Assistant to the President; Helmut Sonnenfeldt, Counselor, Department of State; Arthur Hartman, Assistant Secretary for European Affairs, Department of State.

The President of the Federal Executive Council, Dzemal Bijedic, called on President Ford and conducted talks with him on matters concerning bilateral cooperation.

Presidents Tito and Ford reiterated the particular importance which the governments of Yugoslavia and the United States of America attach to the maintenance of peace and stability by the peaceful settlement of disputes, and by adherence to the principles of independence, mutual respect and full equality of sovereign states, regardless of differences or similarities in their social, political and economic systems, and in full accord with the spirit and principles of the United Nations Charter.

President Ford's visit provided an occasion for a thorough review of bilateral relations which continue to develop successfully. President Tito and President Ford confirmed that the principles contained in the joint statement, issued in Washington in October 1971, represent the continuing basis for relations and cooperation between Yugoslavia and the United States of America. In conversations between President Ford and President Tito further stimulus was given to these relations. The two Presidents noted that additional progress has been achieved in cooperation in the economic area and agreed that possibilities exist for further mutually beneficial development of trade, investment and other contemporary forms of economic cooperation. Con-

crete ways to achieve expansion in this field were discussed.

The two Presidents once again emphasized the significant contribution of exchanges in the sphere of social and physical sciences, culture, education, information, etc., to the deepening of mutual understanding and respect and agreed to make efforts to further develop such exchanges.

President Ford greeted the readiness of the Yugoslav government to contribute to the celebration of the 200th anniversary of the United States of America through various cultural and artistic presentations.

The two Presidents emphasized the deep historical and cultural ties which exist between their countries, and especially the part which Americans of Yugoslav origin have long played in strengthening the bonds of friendship between their new and former homelands and agreed that these ties should be strengthened.

The two Presidents expressed their satisfaction over the recent conclusion of the Conference on Security and Cooperation in Europe. They consider that the consistent implementation of the provisions of the final act which the signatory countries pledged themselves to fulfill, will contribute significantly to the achievement of the Conference's important goals and encourage further efforts to strengthen peace and security in Europe and to improve political, economic and other relations among states and peoples.

President Tito and President Ford emphasized that the interdependence of all peoples and countries, developed and developing, is an essential factor in the search for a just and effective economic development. Reviewing the urgent problems facing mankind in the area of international economic relations, they agreed on the need to increase their efforts to find equitable solutions on the basis of improved international cooperation and respect for the interests of all.

The two Presidents reviewed a number of other important international problems, including the situation in the Middle East, the Mediterranean, Cyprus and the questions of disarmament.

President Tito particularly presented views on the importance of the policy of nonalignment in today's world. He also emphasized the significance of United States policies in international affairs. President Ford set forth United States positions on various matters including the significance of the Yugoslav policy of nonalignment in international affairs.

President Ford reaffirmed the steadfast interest of the United States and its support for the independence, integrity, and nonaligned position of Yugoslavia.

The two Presidents on this occasion reaffirmed the importance of periodic contacts and consultations at various levels in fields of mutual interest.

The principles set forth in this joint statement are

the foundation of United States-Yugoslav relations. They constitute the firm basis on which the friendly relations of the two countries will be conducted in the future.

ARRIVAL STATEMENT, ANDREWS AIR FORCE BASE, AUGUST 4⁸

I am, of course, very glad to be home, but I am also very glad that I went to Europe. By representing the United States of America at the 35-nation Conference on Security and Cooperation in Europe at Helsinki, I was able to deliver in person a message of enormous significance to all Europeans.

That message was: America still cares. The torch in the Statue of Liberty still burns bright. We will stand for freedom and independence in 1976 as we did in 1776. The United States of America still believes that all men and women everywhere should enjoy the God-given blessings of life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness in a world of peace.

The reception that I received from the peoples of the five countries I visited—West Germany, Poland, Finland, Romania, and Yugoslavia—was not a tribute to me so much as to the ideals and the continuing leadership of the United States in the worldwide effort for peace, progress, and prosperity for all nations.

That an American President could receive such warm and hospitable welcomes in the countries of Eastern Europe shows that the

⁸ As prepared for delivery; because of inclement weather, President Ford did not deliver the statement (text from White House press release).

message I brought to Helsinki came through loud and clear.

And we will continue to encourage the full implementation of the principles embodied in the CSCE declarations until the 1977 followup meeting to assess how well all the signatory states have translated these principles into concrete action for the benefit of their peoples and the common progress in Europe.

Europeans—East and West—will also be watching. If the principles of Helsinki are lived up to, as each leader solemnly pledged, then we can consider the conference a success in which we have played a significant part.

My reception in the Federal Republic of Germany and Finland and the personal talks that I was able to have with the leaders of our NATO allies and other governments were constructive and greatly gratifying. So were my discussions with General Secretary Brezhnev, which I am confident will lead to an accelerated disposition of some of the differences which existed before our meetings.

I believe we are on the right course and the course that offers the best hope for a better world. I will continue to steer that steady course, because this experience has further convinced me that millions of hopeful people, in all parts of Europe, still look to the United States of America as the champion of human freedom everywhere and of a just peace among the nations of the world.

I repeat: I am glad that I went; I am happy to be back.

President Ford Interviewed for Public Television

Following is an excerpt relating to foreign policy from the transcript of an interview with President Ford by Martin Agronsky and Paul Duke which was taped at the White House on August 7 and broadcast on Public Broadcasting Service stations that evening.¹

Mr. Duke: . . . your trip to Helsinki has encountered a substantial degree of hostility in this country, as you perhaps well know, and rightly or wrongly some people are suggesting that the Russians were the winners at Helsinki and we were the losers. What is your response to that criticism?

President Ford: I think that is a completely inaccurate interpretation concerning the CSCE [Conference on Security and Cooperation in Europe] Conference in Helsinki. I think it is a judgment some people make, but I thoroughly disagree with it.

Let me just put this in perspective, if I might. We predicated many of the decisions involving borders on what? Peace treaties signed by all of the countries in the 1940's and in subsequent years. No border was agreed to in Helsinki that wasn't previously agreed to by previous American Presidents or by previous governments in other countries.

We provided in that Helsinki agreement for peaceful change of borders. We made it far less likely that there will be military intervention by one country against another.

What we have really done is to make it possible for people in the East as well as in the West in Europe to communicate, to re-establish family relationships. We made it possible, if the agreement is lived up to.

Mr. Agronsky: If the agreement is lived up to?

President Ford: I will come to that in a minute, Martin.

We have made it possible for the news media to have greater freedom in all of the 35 countries.

Now, the question you ask is a very good one. Will the agreement be maintained? In my speech before the conference, I said, on paper this is good. We have two years between now and the next meeting in 1977, and the test will be, have all 35 countries lived up to the agreement? It offers a hope. The reality will depend upon the execution.

I happen to believe that world pressure will force all countries, Communist countries and other countries, to live up to the agreement.

Mr. Duke: But let's just take one example, Mr. President. You talk about a peaceful change in borders being in the agreement. Now realistically speaking, do you think that the Russians would give up the Baltic territory which they took over at the end of World War II? Do you think they would give up the Eastern European countries? Do you think that they would negotiate to give back these countries their independence?

President Ford: Let me put it the other way around. If we had not gone to Helsinki do you think the Russians would have permitted any of the things you are talking about? In Helsinki, they at least signed an agreement that says you can change borders by peaceful means.

Mr. Duke: But does it mean anything, Mr. President?

President Ford: Well, they have signed something that says you can change borders by peaceful means. Prior to Helsinki, there was no such agreement.

¹ For the complete transcript, see Weekly Compilation of Presidential Documents dated Aug. 11, 1975, p. 838.

Mr. Agronsky: Mr. President, you used a very good phrase at Helsinki. You said, "Peace is not a piece of paper," a very memorable phrase, and it conveys this idea that we are talking about now. Many of your critics—and let's take it all of the way from Solzhenitsyn to George Ball, a former Under Secretary of State—have voiced concern about legitimizing what, for example, George Ball calls the Soviet stolen empire, and asks, how do you reconcile that with Western ideals? The point Ball makes, the point Solzhenitsyn makes: that it is our obligation to follow policy that is more concerned with morality and principle than the acceptance of these borders would indicate.

President Ford: Well, Martin, I go back to the peace treaties of Yalta and Paris and Potsdam and the agreement by the Germans themselves to establish those borders. Those were peace treaties that established borders for all of Eastern Europe and all of Western Europe. Those are factual things done in the forties, the fifties, et cetera.

The Conference on European Security and Cooperation didn't change any of those; but it did say—and every one of the nations did sign something, that is different—that there can be peaceful adjustments of borders.

Mr. Duke: But despite what you are now saying, Mr. President, there is in this country, as you well know, a rising amount of criticism about détente itself, people questioning the value of détente. What is your feeling about this criticism, and do you think this is endangering détente?

President Ford: I hope it is not endangering détente, because I think there are many pluses to us and, yes, to the Soviet Union. It has to be a two-way street.

I believe that SALT One was an outgrowth of détente. Does anybody want to tear up SALT One? I don't think so. Anything that puts a lid or a limitation on the development of nuclear weapons, the expansion of nuclear weapons, any agreement that puts a lid or controls, that is good. So, détente helped achieve SALT One.

Détente may help—I hope it will—SALT Two, where we will put an actual cap on

nuclear weapons and other nuclear weapons systems.

Mr. Agronsky: One of the happiest dividends that détente could possibly produce would be a reduction of forces by the Soviet Union as well as the Western allies in Western Europe.

President Ford: I agree.

Mr. Agronsky: Was that raised at Helsinki? Did you get anywhere at all with that with Brezhnev [Leonid I. Brezhnev, General Secretary of the Central Committee of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union]?

President Ford: As you know, historically, when CSCE was originally agreed to as a program, it was also agreed to that there would be negotiations for mutual and balanced force reductions in Europe—MBFR. Those negotiations have been going on now for about two years. They are presently stalled; but now that we have the Helsinki agreement, it is my judgment that we have opened up encouraging prospects for additional movement in the MBFR negotiations.

I think the allies and the West are getting together for perhaps a new position. I believe that the Soviet Union and its allies are taking a look at the current stalemated negotiations and may come up with some agreement.

The prospects for a mutual and balanced force reduction in Europe have been enhanced by the Helsinki agreement—no question about that whatsoever.

Mr. Duke: Well, Mr. President, to go back to SALT One for a moment, you said at a recent news conference that according to your investigation the Russians had not cheated on the agreement limiting the use of certain strategic weapons. Your old friend Melvin Laird had written an article suggesting they had cheated. Since then, you have talked to Mr. Laird. Have you changed your mind about what you said earlier?

President Ford: I naturally investigated the allegations that were made by a number of people, including Mel. And after a thorough investigation, I have come to the conclusion that a person might legitimately make the charge there had been violations,

but on complete and total investigation I think any person who knew the facts as I know them would agree that there had been no violations of any consequence.

There are some ambiguities—I want to be frank about it—but all of the responsible, knowledgeable people in the Pentagon or in any of the other responsible agencies would agree with me there have been no serious violations, and any that have been called to their attention have been stopped.

Mr. Duke: But you are suggesting there have been some infractions, then?

President Ford: Very minor, but we have what we call a consultative group where if we think they are violating something we make that point. It is investigated, and, in the cases where there was any instance that might be an honest charge of a violation, they have been stopped.

The Soviet Union has raised some questions about certain activities that we have undertaken, and we have investigated them. And I think that arrangement of the consultative group has been very effective in making sure that SALT One was lived up to.

Mr. Duke: Let me turn now to the Middle East, Mr. President.

Mr. Agronsky: You beat me to it.

Mr. Duke: We have had intensive negotiations going on now for about two months to try to get a peace treaty moving in this area. What is the prospect?

President Ford: They are better today than they were yesterday, and they are a lot better today than they were last March when the negotiations unfortunately broke off.

Mr. Duke: Does this mean you are increasingly optimistic?

President Ford: I am optimistic on an increasing basis, but I have learned that until it is signed in black and white that I shouldn't predict that it will be finalized.

Mr. Agronsky: Let me ask you—

Mr. Duke: Pardon me, Martin. I want to just ask you one more question in this area. Do you find the Russians are now less trou-

blesome in the Middle East in the efforts to achieve a peace agreement?

President Ford: They have acted in a very responsible way, during my time, in the Middle East.

Let me just turn to the question of these negotiations that are going on between Israel on the one hand and Egypt on the other. Both of those countries have to understand that flexibility at this crucial time is important for the peace of that area of the world and possibly peace in the world. Israel has to be more flexible; I think Egypt has to respond. If there isn't movement in the Middle East right now, the potential for war is increased significantly. And a war in the Middle East today has broader potential ramification than any time in the past, and we have had four wars in the Middle East since 1946 or 1947.

A fifth one not only means that Israel will be fighting the Arabs, but the potential of a confrontation between the United States and the Soviet Union is a possibility.

Mr. Agronsky: You must have raised that with Brezhnev. How did he react to it?

President Ford: We talked about the Middle East. We told them, or I told him, what we were doing. Secretary Kissinger had had a previous meeting with Foreign Minister Gromyko.

I repeat what I said a moment ago, Martin—the Soviet Union has acted in a very responsible way. I think they understand the potential consequences of no progress for continued peace and understanding in the Middle East.

Mr. Duke: What do you see, sir, as our future policy toward South Viet-Nam? Do you think that we will recognize that Communist regime in the foreseeable future?

President Ford: Their current actions certainly do not convince me that we should recognize South Viet-Nam or North Viet-Nam.

Mr. Duke: What about their application to get into the U.N. General Assembly?

President Ford: We have taken a very strong stand that we would not agree to the

admission of South or North Viet-Nam unless and until South Korea is admitted. We believe in universality across the board. We don't believe in kicking nations out—kicking Israel out, for example. We think that would be bad policy.

Mr. Agronsky: Did Mr. Brezhnev say he agreed with you on that, they were supporting that movement?

President Ford: We let it be known very, very strongly that we believe Israel should be permitted to be a member of the United Nations. That is our position. But on the other hand, we also believe that if you believe in universality, which includes South and North Viet-Nam, you have to have South Korea.

Mr. Duke: Mr. President, when you first took office, you obviously relied a great deal upon Secretary of State Henry Kissinger. Do you now make more of the decisions on your own? Do you rely less upon Mr. Kissinger?

President Ford: I am not going to get into that discussion. Henry Kissinger and I have the closest possible rapport, personally and professionally. I see him every day for roughly an hour. We talk about the Middle East. We talk about SALT. We talk about our total foreign policy. It's a good relationship. It has been from the very first day. It is now. And I expect it to continue in the future. And I don't want to get into whether I do more or do less. We are a good team, and I think we have made some good decisions.

Mr. Duke: Are you aware, Mr. President, of the criticism at the Capitol—

President Ford: Oh, sure.

Mr. Duke: —from Republicans and not just Democrats, that in the Turkish aid fight, for example, that Mr. Kissinger was responsible for your losing that battle to lift the ban against military aid?

President Ford: I have heard those arguments, but I don't think they are valid. I think the Congress, or the House of Representatives in this case, made the most serious wrong decision since I have been in Washington, which is 27 years. The Congress

was totally wrong—or the House of Representatives. Why do I say that? First, they haven't solved the Cyprus problem. Number two, they have weakened NATO. Number three, because of the Turkish aid embargo, they have lessened our own national security capability by preventing us from using intelligence-gathering installations in Turkey.

Mr. Duke: Are you saying Congress is harming our foreign policy?

President Ford: There is no question about it. The decision of the House of Representatives to continue the Turkish arms embargo has seriously jeopardized our foreign policy and undercuts in a significant way our own national security, including that of NATO, and it hasn't solved—it has not solved the Cyprus problem.

Mr. Agronsky: Mr. President, doesn't there have to be a concern for law? There was a law that said that aid that was given to Turkey could not be used as it was used against Cyprus.

President Ford: We have lived up to the law. We have stopped, because Congress told us to, the shipment of military hardware that the Turks bought and paid for. And, incidentally, they bought and paid for the hardware, and because of congressional action the Turks are now being charged warehouse storage fees for equipment that they own that Congress said they couldn't get.

But anyhow, aside from that, which is, I think, a ridiculous development, we have lived up to the law. We are not sending them any military hardware and unfortunately the net result is what I told you.

But, Martin, I think you have to recollect a little bit. Who started the problem in Cyprus? It was the Greek Government, it was the previous Greek Government that tried to throw Makarios out and assassinate him and the previous Greek Government wanted to move in with Greek troops and take over Cyprus. And as a result of Greek violations, the Turks moved in and have, unfortunately, dominated the situation. But the whole program, or the whole problem, arose by the unwise action of the previous Greek Government.

Prime Minister Miki of Japan Visits the United States

Prime Minister Takeo Miki of Japan made an official visit to the United States August 2-10. He met with President Ford and other government officials at Washington August 5-6. Following are prepared texts of toasts exchanged by President Ford and Prime Minister Miki at a working dinner at the White House on August 5 and the texts of a U.S.-Japan joint announcement to the press and a joint statement by President Ford and Prime Minister Miki issued on August 6.

EXCHANGE OF TOASTS, AUGUST 5

President Ford ¹

Mr. Prime Minister: In the last 40 years, you have visited this country in many capacities—as a student, as a private citizen, as a representative of your government, as a statesman—but always as a good friend. Ten years ago, you came as Foreign Minister. We met two years ago when you visited Washington as Deputy Prime Minister. Today, I am honored to greet you as the Prime Minister of your great nation.

Mr. Prime Minister, you and I have participated in public life for many years. We appreciate the transformation in Japanese-American relations of the last 30 years. We understand the immense benefits our two peoples enjoy because of this very close friendship. The keystone of this relationship is a sound security accord. The United States remains firmly committed to the alliance with Japan—an undertaking we could not value more highly.

It is significant that your first trip abroad as Prime Minister is to the United States, just as my first overseas visit as President

was to Japan. These priorities reflect the order and standing of Japanese-American relations. They confirm our growing cooperation, which is basic to our respective foreign policies. Our visits accentuate the interdependence of our countries and the extent to which the security and prosperity of our two peoples have become interwoven in the second half of the 20th century.

Mr. Prime Minister, your visit provides a timely opportunity for us to review our cooperative efforts to deal with vital matters—food and energy, trade and development. Such issues will be the major focus of international relations for many years and perhaps for the remainder of this century.

The United States has admiration and respect for Japan's constructive contributions to the search for solutions to the world's economic and political problems. It is imperative that we continue working together. We can report to our peoples that our bilateral relations are respectfully intimate and remarkably free of trouble. We are approaching new international challenges with a growing knowledge of the underlying issues and with creative and responsive programs.

In your policy speech to the Diet in January, you said the whole of mankind shares a common fate aboard the ship called Earth. I agree completely. I would like Japanese-American relations to provide a pattern of cooperation for all countries. Mr. Prime Minister, Americans look forward with pleasant anticipation to the visit this fall of Their Imperial Majesties the Emperor and Empress. Our citizens will extend a warm welcome. I am convinced that the visit of Their Majesties will lend a new dimension to our relations. Mr. Prime Minister, I sincerely hope your visit with us will be as productive for you as my trip to Japan last year was for me.

¹ As prepared for delivery (text from White House press release).

Gentlemen, will you join me in a toast to His Imperial Majesty, to you, Mr. Prime Minister, to the people of Japan, to continued close cooperation between our two great countries.

Prime Minister Miki²

Mr. President, distinguished guests: I wish to express my heartfelt appreciation for the warm welcome extended to me and my party by you, Mr. President, and for the kind consideration of so many others in your government and of the American people.

When I met with you, Mr. President, in January of last year, you were Vice President and I was Deputy Prime Minister. To be honest, I could not anticipate at the time that our next round of talks would become a summit.

Since our very first meeting I, as a fellow parliamentarian, have felt a deep empathy with you for your devotion to harmony rather than confrontation in the conduct of public affairs. In my lengthy career as a parliamentarian, long before taking up the duties of Prime Minister, I too have consistently adhered to the principles of dialogue and reconciliation, rejecting violence and lawlessness.

Thus I sadly regret the persistence of movements which employ violence to impose their views on others. I yearn for the day when differences of opinion are reconciled by peaceful means, on the basis of mutual understanding and trust among human beings.

The unshakable friendship and mutual trust between our two peoples and the harmony of purposes we share as nations—these, Mr. President, are a great force for good in the world.

It is indeed our responsibility as heads of governments to protect, serve and advance the interests of our own peoples. Yet the goals we pursue together—world peace, stability, orderly economic progress, and the advancement of human dignity and toler-

² As prepared for delivery (text furnished by Embassy of Japan).

ance—these goals are also in the interests of all other peoples.

Believing this deeply, and in my heart, I truly welcome the great adventures and responsibilities which lie before us as Japan and the United States together work in permanent friendship to build a peaceful and better future for all mankind.

Mr. President, I ask all your guests to join me in toasting your health and the vigor and prosperity of the United States of America.

JOINT ANNOUNCEMENT, AUGUST 6

White House press release dated August 6

**U.S.-JAPAN JOINT ANNOUNCEMENT TO THE PRESS
FOLLOWING THE MEETINGS OF PRESIDENT GERALD
R. FORD AND PRIME MINISTER TAKEO MIKI,
AUGUST 6, 1975**

1. Prime Minister Miki and President Ford met in Washington August 5 and 6 for a comprehensive review of various subjects of mutual interest. The discussions between the two leaders, in which Minister for Foreign Affairs Miyazawa and Secretary of State Kissinger participated, were conducted in an informal and cordial atmosphere. Their meetings were productive and reflected the strength and breadth of the existing friendship between Japan and the United States.

2. The Prime Minister and the President reaffirmed the basic principles and common purposes underlying relations between Japan and the United States as set forth in the Joint Communiqué of November 20, 1974, on the occasion of the President's visit to Japan. In so doing, the Prime Minister and the President noted that Japan and the United States, while sharing basic values and ideals, differ in their national characteristics and the circumstances in which they are placed; and yet the two nations, acting together, have drawn upon the strengths inherent in such diversity to build a mature, mutually beneficial and complementary relationship.

They emphasized the fundamental importance in that relationship of constructive and creative cooperation between the two countries toward the shared goals of world peace and prosperity. Expressing satisfaction with the open and frank dialogue which has developed between the two Governments, they pledged to maintain and strengthen this consultation. To this end, the Minister for Foreign Affairs and the Secretary of State will review twice a year bilateral and global matters of common concern.

3. The Prime Minister and the President discussed developments in Asia following the end of armed conflict in Indochina. The President, recognizing the importance of Asia for world peace and progress, reaffirmed that the United States would continue to play an active and positive role in that region and would continue to uphold its treaty commitments there. The Prime Minister and the President welcomed the efforts being made by many nations in Asia to strengthen their political, economic and social bases. They stated that Japan and the United States were prepared to continue to extend assistance and cooperation in support of these efforts. They agreed that the security of the Republic of Korea is essential to the maintenance of peace on the Korean peninsula, which in turn is necessary for peace and security in East Asia, including Japan. They noted the importance of the existing security arrangements for maintaining and preserving that peace. At the same time they strongly expressed the hope that the dialogue between the South and North would proceed in order to ease tensions and eventually to achieve peaceful unification. In connection with the Korean question in the United Nations, the Prime Minister and the President expressed the hope that all concerned would recognize the importance of maintaining a structure which would preserve the armistice now in effect.

4. The Prime Minister and the President expressed their conviction that the Treaty of Mutual Cooperation and Security between Japan and the United States has greatly contributed to the maintenance of peace and security in the Far East and is an indispensable element of the basic international political structure in Asia, and that the continued maintenance of the Treaty serves the long-term interests of both countries. Further, they recognized that the United States nuclear deterrent is an important contributor to the security of Japan. In this connection, the President reassured the Prime Minister that the United States would continue to abide by its defense commitment to Japan under the Treaty of Mutual Cooperation and Security in the event of armed attack against Japan, whether by nuclear or conventional forces. The Prime Minister stated that Japan would continue to carry out its obligations under the Treaty. The Prime Minister and the President recognized the desirability of still closer consultations for the smooth and effective implementation of the Treaty. They agreed that the authorities concerned of the two countries would conduct consultations within the framework of the Security Consultative Committee on measures to be taken in cooperation by the two countries.

5. The Prime Minister and the President discussed various international issues of common concern. The President noted that the United States would con-

tinue to seek an early conclusion to negotiations of the second agreement between the United States and the Soviet Union on the limitation of strategic arms. The Prime Minister and the President expressed their strong hope that prompt progress be made through current efforts toward a peaceful settlement in the Middle East.

6. The Prime Minister and the President expressed their concern over the recent trend toward nuclear proliferation in the world, and agreed that Japan and the United States should participate positively in international efforts for the prevention of nuclear proliferation and the development of adequate safeguards. They emphasized that all nuclear-weapon states should contribute constructively in the areas of nuclear arms limitation, the security of non-nuclear weapon states, and the use of nuclear energy for peaceful purposes. The Prime Minister expressed his intention to proceed with the necessary steps to bring about Japan's ratification of the nuclear non-proliferation treaty at the earliest possible opportunity.

7. In light of the increasing economic interdependence of the nations of the world, the Prime Minister and the President agreed that Japan and the United States share a special responsibility toward the development of a stable and balanced world economy. They agreed that the two countries would work in close consultation toward the resolution in a manner beneficial to all nations of problems relating to the general condition of the world economy, international finance, trade, energy, and cooperation between developed and developing nations. They noted with satisfaction that trade and investment relations between the two countries are expanding in a steady and mutually beneficial manner.

8. Observing the importance of free and expanding trade to the world economy, the Prime Minister and the President emphasized the need for an open international trading system, and affirmed that Japan and the United States would continue to play a positive and constructive role in the Tokyo Round of multilateral trade negotiations currently underway in Geneva within the framework of the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade.

9. Recognizing that there remain elements of instability in the world energy situation, the Prime Minister and the President expressed their satisfaction with the progress thus far achieved in cooperation among consumer nations.

They agreed to maintain and strengthen cooperation between Japan and the United States in this field and in the development of their respective national energy efforts. Agreeing that mutual understanding and cooperation among all nations is fundamental to the solution of the international energy problem, they noted the urgent need for the develop-

ment of harmonious relations between oil producing and consuming nations. In this connection, they welcomed steps now being taken to resume the dialogue between oil producer and consumer nations, and expressed their determination that the two countries should further strengthen and coordinate their cooperative efforts for that purpose.

10. Noting the desirability of establishing adequate supply and distribution to meet the world's growing demand for food, the Prime Minister and the President agreed upon the importance of cooperation in agricultural development assistance to promote the food production capabilities of developing countries. The President further noted the need for the early establishment of an internationally coordinated system of nationally-held grain reserves. The Prime Minister stressed the need for a steady expansion of trade in agricultural products through cooperation between exporting and importing countries to their mutual benefit. The Prime Minister and the President reaffirmed the interest of the two countries in maintaining and strengthening the mutually beneficial agricultural trade between them.

11. Noting the need to assist the efforts of the developing countries to promote their own economic development and to meet the human aspirations of their peoples, the Prime Minister and the President agreed upon the importance of increased cooperation, both between Japan and the United States and with the developing countries, in such areas as development assistance and trade, including that of primary commodities.

12. The Prime Minister and the President expressed appreciation for the achievements recorded during the past decade by existing bilateral cooperative programs in the fields of medicine, science, and technology, and for the work underway in the panel for the review of Japan/U.S. Scientific and Technological Cooperation. They declared their satisfaction at the signing on August 5 by the Minister for Foreign Affairs and the Secretary of State of a new agreement between the two countries for cooperation in environmental protection. They recognized further that the promotion of mutual understanding through cultural and educational exchange is of basic importance to the strengthening of friendly relations between the Japanese and American peoples. In this regard, the Prime Minister expressed his intention of continuing to expand such exchange in addition to the promotion of Japanese studies in the United States and other projects thus far carried out by Japan, notably through the Japan Foundation. Welcoming the Prime Minister's statement, the President expressed his intention to continue his efforts to make expanded resources

available for further promoting cultural and educational exchange with Japan.

13. The Prime Minister conveyed on behalf of the people of Japan sincere congratulations to the people of the United States as they celebrate the 200th anniversary of their independence in the coming year. The President thanked the Prime Minister for these sentiments and expressed the deepest appreciation of the American people.

JOINT STATEMENT, AUGUST 6

White House press release dated August 6

JOINT STATEMENT BY PRESIDENT GERALD R. FORD AND PRIME MINISTER TAKEO MIKI, AUGUST 6, 1975

The Prime Minister of Japan and the President of the United States, recognizing that the Japanese and American peoples share fundamental democratic values and are joined together by ties of mutual trust and cooperation, affirm that their two nations will continue to work together to build a more open and free international community, and state as follows:

—A more stable and peaceful world order requires the acceptance by all nations of certain principles of international conduct, and the establishment of a creative international dialogue—transcending differences of ideology, tradition or stages of development.

—Those principles must include respect for the sovereignty of all nations, recognition of the legitimate interests of others, attitudes of mutual respect in international dealings, determination to seek the peaceful resolution of differences among nations, and firm commitment to social justice and economic progress around the globe.

—Japan and the United States pledge to support these principles, and to nurture a dialogue among nations which reflects them. They will expand and strengthen their cooperation in many fields of joint endeavor. Recognizing that equitable and durable peace in Asia is essential to that of the entire world, Japan and the United States will extend every support to efforts of the countries of the region to consolidate such a peace.

—International economic and social relations should promote the prosperity of all peoples and aspirations and creativity of individuals and nations. The interests of developed as well as developing countries, and of consumers as well as producers of raw materials, must be accommodated in a manner which advances the well being of all and brings closer the goal of social and economic justice.

—In a world made small by science and technology, as well as by trade and communications, interdependence among nations has become a reality affecting the lives and welfare of all peoples. International economic institutions and systems must function in a manner reflecting that interdependence and promoting a cooperative rather than a confrontational approach to economic issues.

—The suffering caused by disease and hunger is a most serious and poignant impediment to a humane international economic and social order. The financial, educational and technological resources of developed countries give them a special responsibility for the alleviation of these conditions. It is imperative that there be an increasingly effective sharing of knowledge, resources and organizational skill among all countries to hasten the day when these scourges will be eliminated from the earth. In these endeavors also, Japan and the United States will contribute fully.

U.S.-Japan Environmental Agreement Signed at Washington

DEPARTMENT ANNOUNCEMENT, JULY 31

The Department of State announced on July 31 (press release 391) that the recently negotiated U.S.-Japan environmental agreement would be signed by Secretary Kissinger and Japanese Foreign Minister Kiichi Miyazawa in a ceremony at the Department of State on August 5, in the presence of Prime Minister Miki of Japan.

This agreement aims at strengthening cooperation between the two countries in environmental protection through sponsorship of agreed cooperative projects, meetings, and visits as well as through an exchange of information. Coordination and review of these activities will reside with a joint planning and coordination committee which is scheduled to meet at ministerial level, as a rule once a year.

Nine major project areas have been selected for the initial activities under the agreement. These include photochemical smog, air-pollution-related meteorology,

automobile pollution control, solid waste management, sewage treatment technology, health effects of pollutants, management of bottom sediments containing toxic pollutants, environmental impact assessment, and identification and control of toxic substances. In all these areas Japanese and American cochairmen have been designated, and they have initiated correspondence to discuss specific areas of interest and set meeting dates. Work has already begun in some projects, and plans have been made for a conference in Cincinnati in October on sewage treatment technology and one in Tokyo in late November covering two areas, photochemical smog and air-pollution-related meteorology.

REMARKS AT SIGNING CEREMONY, AUGUST 5

Press release 404 dated August 6

Secretary Kissinger

Mr. Foreign Minister, Mr. Prime Minister: We are very pleased on the occasion of this very fortuitous visit to be able to sign this agreement on the protection of the environment.

Our two nations have a very special relationship in very many fields, and our two nations also have a very special obligation in many fields. We are two great industrial countries, and we are interdependent in many important respects.

Both of us face the problem of how man can realize his interdependence and make progress without at the same time despoiling the environment in which he lives and making all the advancements in science and technology a detriment rather than a benefit.

Our two nations, representing such a large part of the most advanced technological output of the world, can set an example for other countries of how we can deal with this problem.

And I am particularly happy that we can

sign this agreement today when our old friend the Prime Minister is visiting us for the first time, because, as Minister of Environmental Affairs in the Government of Japan, he played such a distinguished role in the negotiations with Mr. Train [Russell E. Train, Administrator, Environmental Protection Agency] and other American officials in bringing this document into effect.

Over three centuries ago the Japanese writer Kaibara Ekken described the inter-relationship of man and his environment. He was an avid amateur botanist, and he wrote:

All men in the world are children of nature and nature is the greatest parent of us all. Man should not, even in ignorance, oppose the way of nature or commit outrage against it. Nor should he waste, to gratify personal desire, the bounties that nature has provided.

For too long we have acted in ignorance, committed outrages against our environment, and wasted its bounties. With this agreement today, we take a small step toward the path set forth for us by this Japanese writer so long ago.

Foreign Minister Miyazawa

Mr. Prime Minister, Mr. Secretary of State, Administrator, Environmental Protection Agency: It is indeed a great pleasure and privilege for me to sign today the Agreement on Cooperation in the Field of Environmental Protection.

This agreement symbolizes the beginning of a new field of formal cooperation in a broad cooperative relationship. Environmental problems are one of the most important questions which many countries of the world, particularly advanced industrial countries, are now facing; and international cooperation is no doubt a useful means to cope with them.

I sincerely hope that the cooperation which has been successfully carried out in the past will be expanded and strengthened, on the basis of this agreement we have now signed, in the future. In concluding my remarks, I would like to express my heartfelt gratitude to those who worked for the conclusion of this agreement.

United States Extends Recognition to Sao Tome and Principe

Following is the text of a letter dated July 12 from President Ford to President Manuel Pinto da Costa of the Democratic Republic of Sao Tome and Principe.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: I am pleased to inform you that, as Sao Tome and Principe obtains its independence, the United States Government is extending recognition. With your agreement, it is our hope that diplomatic relations can be established between our countries and that the United States Ambassador to Gabon can be accredited as Ambassador to your country. Although he would reside in Gabon, he would maintain close contact with your Government.

I am confident that the friendship between our two countries will grow closer in the years ahead. You may be sure that we are in sympathy with your aspirations for the economic development of the islands and for the improved progress and welfare of your people.

Sincerely,

GERALD R. FORD.

THE WHITE HOUSE, July 12, 1975.

Eighth Round of U.S.-Spain Talks Held at Washington

Joint U.S.-Spain Communiqué¹

The eighth round of negotiations between Spain and the United States took place in Washington from July 21 to July 23. As in earlier rounds, the Spanish delegation was led by Under Secretary for Foreign Affairs Juan Jose Rovira, and the American delegation was led by Ambassador-at-Large Robert J. McCloskey. The Ambassador of Spain in Washington, His Excellency Jaime Alba, participated as a member of the Spanish delegation.

The two delegations continued their work

¹ Issued on July 23 (text from press release 385).

on the key aspects of the defense relationship between the two countries. The two delegation heads also discussed in private these and other matters, including the progress being made by working groups acting under their direction.

The Committee on Military Matters, one of the working groups, reviewed in detail a presentation made by the Spanish delegation at the previous round regarding Spain's plans for the modernization of its armed forces. Special technical questions regarding proposed implementing annexes to the eventual agreement were considered by another group of experts.

In the interest of further facilitating progress, it was agreed that work at the expert level would continue in the interval before the next negotiating round, and it is expected that a group on taxes and customs will meet in Madrid on August 4.

The delegations agreed to hold the ninth round of negotiations in Madrid on August 18.

Amendments to IMCO Convention Transmitted to the Senate

*Message From President Ford*¹

To the Senate of the United States:

I transmit herewith for the advice and consent of the Senate amendments to articles 10, 16, 17, 18, 20, 28, 31 and 32 of the Convention on the Intergovernmental Maritime Consultative Organization (IMCO), which were adopted on October 17, 1974, by the Assembly of IMCO at its fifth extraordinary session held at London from October 16 to 18, 1974.

These amendments enlarge the membership of the IMCO Council from eighteen to twenty-four, insure equitable geographic representation of member States on the Council, and open participation on the Mari-

¹ Transmitted on July 10 (text from White House press release); also printed as S. Ex. F., 94th Cong., 1st sess., which includes the texts of the amendments and the report of the Department of State.

time Safety Committee to all members of the Organization.

I transmit also, for the information of the Senate, the report of the Department of State with respect to the amendments.

Support for these amendments will contribute to the United States' demonstrated interest in facilitating cooperation among maritime nations. To that end, I urge that the Senate give early and favorable consideration to these amendments and give its advice and consent to their acceptance.

GERALD R. FORD.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *July 10, 1975.*

TREATY INFORMATION

Current Actions

MULTILATERAL

Aviation

Convention for the suppression of unlawful acts against the safety of civil aviation. Done at Montreal September 23, 1971. Entered into force January 26, 1973. TIAS 7570.

Ratification deposited: Romania (with a reservation), August 19, 1975.

Customs

Convention establishing a Customs Cooperation Council, with annex. Done at Brussels December 15, 1950. Entered into force November 4, 1952; for the United States November 5, 1970. TIAS 7063.

Accession deposited: Singapore, July 9, 1975.

Narcotic Drugs

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

Accession deposited: Jordan, August 8, 1975.

Property—Industrial

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

¹ Not in force.

entered into force April 26, 1970; for the United States September 5, 1970. TIAS 6923, 7727.

Notification from World Intellectual Property Organization that ratification of articles 1 through 12 deposited: Finland, July 21, 1975.

Racial Discrimination

International convention on the elimination of all forms of racial discrimination. Done at New York December 21, 1965. Entered into force January 4, 1969.²

Ratification deposited: Belgium, August 7, 1975.

Space

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.

Ratification deposited: Singapore, August 19, 1975.

Terrorism—Protection of Diplomats

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

Ratification deposited: Mongolia, August 8, 1975.

Wheat

Protocol modifying and further extending the wheat trade convention (part of the international wheat agreement) 1971 (TIAS 7144, 7988). Done at Washington March 25, 1975. Entered into force June 19, 1975, with respect to certain provisions and July 1, 1975, with respect to other provisions. *Ratification deposited: Israel, August 21, 1975.*

¹ Not in force.

² Not in force for the United States.

Correction

The editor of the BULLETIN wishes to call attention to the following error which appears in the July 28 issue:

p. 140, col. 1: The sixth line of the second paragraph of the statement should read: "Pioneer 11, which last December swept past".

Check List of Department of State Press Releases: August 18–24

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

No.	Date	Subject
*414	8/18	U.S. National Committee for the International Radio Consultative Committee Study Groups 10 and 11, Sept. 16.
*415	8/18	U.S. Advisory Commission on International Educational and Cultural Affairs, Sept. 24.
*416	8/18	Foreign journalists begin work-study tour of U.S.
*417	8/18	Shipping Coordinating Committee, Sept. 11.
*418	8/19	ABA Young Lawyers initiate legal services hotline for Vietnam refugees.
*419	8/19	Secretary's Advisory Committee on Private International Law, Study Group on Maritime Bills of Lading, Sept. 12.
*420	8/19	Secretary's Advisory Committee on Private International Law, Study Group on Recognition and Enforcement of Foreign Judgments, Cambridge, Mass., Sept. 13.
*421	8/19	Secretary's Advisory Committee on Private International Law, Sept. 19.
*422	8/21	American poet Clarence Major to attend Yugoslav festival.
†423	8/21	Kissinger: departure, Andrews AFB, Aug. 20.
†424	8/21	Kissinger, Allon: arrival, Jerusalem.
†426	8/22	Kissinger, Allon: statements following meeting, Jerusalem.
†427	8/22	Kissinger: arrival, Alexandria.
†428	8/22	Kissinger, Sadat: news conference, Alexandria.
†429	8/23	Kissinger, Fahmi: news conference, Alexandria.
†430	8/23	Kissinger: arrival, Damascus.
†431	8/23	Kissinger: departure, Damascus.
†432	8/24	Kissinger, Allon: questions and answers, Jerusalem.
†433	8/24	Kissinger, Allon: statements, Jerusalem.

* Not printed.

† Held for a later issue of the BULLETIN.

Canada. International Law, World Order, and Human Progress (Kissinger) 353

Congress
 Amendments to IMCO Convention Transmitted to the Senate (message from President Ford) 387
 Delegation to 7th Special Session and 30th U.N. General Assembly 362

Economic Affairs. International Law, World Order, and Human Progress (Kissinger) . 353

Environment. U.S.-Japan Environmental Agreement Signed at Washington (Department announcement, Kissinger, Miyazawa) 385

Europe. President Ford Interviewed for Public Television (excerpt from transcript) . . . 377

International Law. International Law, World Order, and Human Progress (Kissinger) . 353

Japan
 Prime Minister Miki of Japan Visits the United States (Ford, Miki, joint announcement, joint statement) 381
 U.S.-Japan Environmental Agreement Signed at Washington (Department announcement, Kissinger, Miyazawa) 385

Law of the Sea. International Law, World Order, and Human Progress (Kissinger) . 353

Maritime Affairs. Amendments to IMCO Convention Transmitted to the Senate (message from President Ford) 387

Middle East. President Ford Interviewed for Public Television (excerpt from transcript) 377

Military Affairs. Eighth Round of U.S.-Spain Talks Held at Washington (joint communique) 386

Presidential Documents
 Amendments to IMCO Convention Transmitted to the Senate 387
 President Ford Interviewed for Public Television (excerpt from transcript) 377
 President Ford Visits Romania and Yugoslavia Following European Security Conference 363
 Prime Minister Miki of Japan Visits the United States 381
 United States Extends Recognition to Sao Tome and Principe 386

Romania. President Ford Visits Romania and Yugoslavia Following European Security Conference (Ceausescu, Ford, Tito, U.S.-Romania communique, U.S.-Yugoslavia statement) 363

Sao Tome and Principe. United States Extends Recognition to Sao Tome and Principe (letter from President Ford to President Pinto da Costa) 386

Space. International Law, World Order, and Human Progress (Kissinger) 353

Spain. Eighth Round of U.S.-Spain Talks Held at Washington (joint communique) . . . 386

Terrorism. International Law, World Order, and Human Progress (Kissinger) 353

Treaty Information
 Amendments to IMCO Convention Transmitted to the Senate (message from President Ford) 387
 Current Actions 387
 U.S.-Japan Environmental Agreement Signed at Washington (Department announcement, Kissinger, Miyazawa) 385

Turkey. President Ford Interviewed for Public Television (excerpt from transcript) . . . 377

U.S.S.R. President Ford Interviewed for Public Television (excerpt from transcript) . . 377

United Nations
 Delegation to 7th Special Session and 30th U.N. General Assembly 362
 President Ford Interviewed for Public Television (excerpt from transcript) 377

Viet-Nam. President Ford Interviewed for Public Television (excerpt from transcript) 377

Yugoslavia. President Ford Visits Romania and Yugoslavia Following European Security Conference (Ceausescu, Ford, Tito, U.S.-Romania communique, U.S.-Yugoslavia statement) 363

Name Index

Bennett, W. Tapley, Jr 362
 Burke, J. Herbert 362
 Ceausescu, Nicolae 363
 Ford, President 363, 377, 381, 386, 387
 Fraser, Donald M 362
 Haugh, John H 362
 Kissinger, Secretary 353, 385
 Maymi, Carmen 362
 Miki, Takeo 381
 Mitchell, Clarence M., Jr 362
 Miyazawa, Kiichi 385
 Moynihan, Daniel P 362
 Myerson, Jacob M 362
 Sherer, Albert W., Jr 362
 Tito, Josip Broz 363
 White, Barbara M 362