



THE DEPARTMENT OF STATE BULLETIN

Volume LXXIII • No. 1898 • November 10, 1975

SECRETARY KISSINGER INTERVIEWED ON "MEET THE PRESS"

Transcript of Interview 657

SECOND PREPARATORY MEETING HELD FOR CONFERENCE
ON INTERNATIONAL ECONOMIC COOPERATION

*Statements by Under Secretary Robinson
and Texts of Final Declaration and Related Documents 665*

Boston Public Library
Superintendent of Documents

JAN 15 1976

DEPOSITORY

THE OFFICIAL WEEKLY RECORD OF UNITED STATES FOREIGN POLICY

For index see inside back cover

THE DEPARTMENT OF STATE BULLETIN

VOL. LXXIII, No. 1898

November 10, 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.

Secretary Kissinger Interviewed on "Meet the Press"

Following is the transcript of an interview with Secretary Kissinger on the NBC television and radio program "Meet the Press" on October 12. Interviewing the Secretary were Clifton Daniel, New York Times; Robert Keatley, Wall Street Journal; Peter Lisagor, Chicago Daily News; Richard Valeriani, NBC News; and Lawrence E. Spivak, "Meet the Press" moderator.

Mr. Spivak: Our guest today on "Meet the Press" is the Secretary of State, Henry A. Kissinger, who recently completed his second year in office. He serves concurrently as Assistant to the President for National Security Affairs, a position he has held since 1969. Secretary Kissinger was born in Germany in 1923 and came to the United States in 1938. He received his undergraduate and graduate degrees from Harvard and was a member of the faculty from 1954 to 1971. Among his many awards is the Nobel Peace Prize, which he won in 1973.

We will have the first questions now from Richard Valeriani of NBC News.

Mr. Valeriani: Mr. Secretary, Egyptian President Sadat has said that he will ask for American military aid when he comes to Washington later this month. What will be the Administration's response?

Secretary Kissinger: President Sadat has indicated to many visitors that he would ask for military aid, having interrupted his relationship with the Soviet Union. We don't know whether in fact he will have a specific shopping list or will ask for it in general.

I don't think we will be prepared at this moment to make any specific commitments of military aid, but we will be prepared to

discuss the problem with him in general terms.

Mr. Valeriani: Have you given him any assurances that you will give such a request sympathetic consideration or serious consideration?

Secretary Kissinger: We are prepared to discuss it with him, but at this time not in terms of specific shopping lists.

Mr. Valeriani: On the other side of the equation, Mr. Secretary, by making so many promises to Israel in order to get Israel in the right mood to make certain concessions in the Sinai agreement, haven't you really given up most of your leverage for getting Israel to make tougher concessions down the road in negotiations on the Golan Heights or the Palestinians?

Secretary Kissinger: First of all, the so-called concessions to Israel, or assurances to Israel, have to be seen in the historical context; and the assurances that were given in connection with this most recent agreement were not substantially different from assurances that have been given in connection with other agreements. When you are dealing with a country which has only one steady ally, assurances are of very great consequence.

Secondly, the relationship with Israel should not be conceived in terms of a pressure operation in which we must be able to pressure Israel before every negotiation, and finally, our basic relationship with Israel depends on a continuing need for close consultation and close cooperation between us and Israel. That fact is going to weigh heavily in Israeli considerations, whatever

decisions may have been made on this or that item.

So I believe that the nature of our relationship with Israel gives us sufficient opportunity to have our views heard sympathetically.

Mr. Valeriani: Why was it necessary to put all this in writing in specific terms now, if not so that Israel can avoid pressure in the future?

Secretary Kissinger: It is—the sort of understandings that have been published have been characteristic of American-Israeli relations through the whole history of American-Israeli relations.

The only difference is that in the past these documents—at least in recent years, these documents have been submitted to the Senate Foreign Relations Committee on a classified basis. This time they were published, and their being published gave them a formality and subjected them to a kind of textual analysis that was never intended and which, if one had brought them into the context of the overall and long-term relationships, would have made it clear that it was not an unusual event in our relationship.

U.S.-U.S.S.R. Strategic Arms Negotiations

Mr. Keatley: Mr. Secretary, the second Soviet-American strategic arms control agreement is about a year or so behind the schedule once expected. What are the prospects for concluding it any time during '75?

Secretary Kissinger: I wouldn't say it is a year behind schedule. It may be a few months behind the most optimistic schedule, which was June-July of this year.

I think the prospect of having a second strategic arms limitation agreement within the next months is good. Whether it will be in 1975 or in the early part of 1976, we will know more clearly after I receive a response to the propositions that we made to Foreign Minister Gromyko when he was here in October.

Mr. Keatley: Some people think delay is due to a Soviet effort to limit American

weapons while not restraining seriously its own programs. What convinces you that the Soviets do want an agreement that restrains both sides in roughly comparable ways?

Secretary Kissinger: I think in fairness one has to point out that most of the significant concessions over the last 18 months in the negotiations have been made by the Soviet Union—with respect to equal aggregates; with respect to taking forward-base systems out of the negotiations, which means that several hundred or close to a thousand American airplanes are not counted; and with respect to the verification procedures. I do not think it is fair to say that the issue is to limit our systems while not limiting the Soviet systems. The issue is that the two forces have been designed in a way which makes it difficult to compare the weapons on both sides and to know how to bring them into relation with each other.

Finally, we are down to only two or three issues and they can be settled at any time, after which it will take about four to six weeks of technical discussions to work out the final details. About 90 percent of the negotiation is substantially completed.

U.S. Commitments in Sinai Negotiations

Mr. Daniel: Mr. Secretary, you have remarked that our pledges to Israel have been published. But they were not published by the State Department. This latest agreement in the Middle East is going to cost us Americans billions of dollars and may involve us in highly dangerous commitments. Why can't we know formally, officially, and fully what has been promised in our names?

Secretary Kissinger: First of all, everything that has been published was submitted by the State Department within three days of the completion of the negotiations to the Congress; so there was absolutely no attempt to keep anything from the Congress.

Secondly, we were prepared to work out with the Congress an agreed summary that would have put before the public the essence of the American commitment so that the American public would have known precisely what it was we were really committed to.

What we attempted to avoid was formulations that in themselves were not legally binding, but indicated a general guidepost of policy, and to avoid forcing other governments to take a formal position with respect to understandings that in the past had always been handled on this basis.

Finally, I do not agree that this recent agreement cost the American public billions of dollars. Last year the Congress voted, in a combination of emergency and regular aid, \$3 billion for Israel without the agreement. Before the agreement Israel requested \$2.6 billion as its regular need for economic and security assistance, and we had set aside in our planning a certain amount to be asked for Egypt. In fact, we will ask for less than the Israeli request when we submit our aid package to the Congress, and the additional sums that this agreement costs are, if anything, relatively small. Beyond that, we have taken no commitments that involve actions by the United States that involve the threat of war, or the risk of war.

I think these are facts that have to be understood. And I repeat: We put everything before the Congress that was later published, and the only disagreement concerned the form of publication and whether we could work out with the Congress a form of publication that would [not] risk the foreign policy dangers.

Mr. Lisagor: Mr. Secretary, quite apart from the amounts involved, given the mood of the Congress, have you made commitments or promises or assurances in the Sinai negotiations that this Administration, or possibly the next Administration, will not be able to fulfill?

Secretary Kissinger: The basic commitments of the United States have been put before the Congress. There are two categories of actions—those that can be done on Presidential authority and those that require congressional authorization and appropriation.

Those that can be carried out on the basis of Presidential authority, we are certain we are able to fulfill either in this Administration or in succeeding Administrations.

Those that require congressional action have been carefully limited in all the documents we have agreed to, as being subject to congressional action. No specific amounts were mentioned, and there the mood that you describe may in fact be a factor. But we think it is terribly important that the American people understand that it is not the agreement that provides the need—that creates the need for assistance to the parties, but the long-term national interests of the United States, and that the assistance to the parties antedates the agreement.

Executive-Congressional Cooperation

Mr. Lisagor: Mr. Secretary, you have been met with a great deal of skepticism and suspicion in the Congress in the debate over the Sinai negotiations in your own testimony. Has this been a recoil against the secrecy that has gone on in the recent past and the lack of consultation that went on in other foreign policy matters recently?

Secretary Kissinger: I think in fairness to the Congress one has to point out, if one reads the whole transcript of all the sessions, executive and public, there was overwhelming support for the agreement. Its basic attitude—maybe not in front of television cameras, but the basic attitude in the relationship between the congressional committees and the executive was one of dealing with a common problem in a joint way.

However, there is profound concern in the Congress, much of which I can understand, that the pendulum had swung too far in the fifties and sixties in the direction of executive discretion, and the Congress wants to make very sure that it is not giving a blank check to the executive for consequences that the Congress never intended, as it believes it did in the case of the Tonkin Gulf Resolution. That intention, I think, is justified, and we are prepared to cooperate with it.

There is concern with excessive secrecy which, too, we are attempting to meet. On the other hand, one has to understand that a certain amount of confidentiality is essential or the diplomatic process will stop. So somewhere between those two extremes one

has to find a joint position between the Congress and the executive. But we are not complaining about what happens in the Congress.

Capacity of Democracies To Solve Problems

Mr. Spirak: Mr. Secretary, in his New York Times column of August 15, James Reston writes that you believe "the capitalist and Communist worlds are two bankrupt systems in conflict now, neither adequate to the requirements and possibilities of a safe and decent world." Does that accurately describe your analysis of the world situation today?

Secretary Kissinger: No. I think it is too abbreviated a formulation.

I was struck, on the trip to Europe with the President on the occasion of the European Security Conference, at the problems that it seemed to me the East European countries had in establishing widespread support.

One is also struck by the debates that are going on in Western Europe about the stability of the governments, and so I feel that the modern industrialized states have a basic problem of how to relate the complexity of their problems, the difficulty of the issues that the people face, to an overall national purpose that gains long-term support.

Basically I believe that the Western capitalist systems are more dynamic, with all their debates, than the ones on the other side; and therefore I am basically optimistic about the potentiality of the democratic systems to prevail and to defend themselves.

Response to Violations of Sinai Agreement

Mr. Valeriani: Another question on the agreement, Mr. Secretary. In the confidential assurances to Egypt, the United States promises to consult with Egypt in the event of an Israeli violation of the agreement on the significance of the violation and possible remedial action. Now, what does "remedial action" mean? Would that involve holding up supplies to Israel in the case of an attack?

Secretary Kissinger: First of all, exactly the same assurance was given to Israel, and both sides knew that the same assurance was given to the other side. What it meant was that the United States as the party that was the principal mediator in the negotiations, that knew the record of the negotiations, would make an effort, in case of a violation, to point out what its judgment was of the significance and of the possible cause of the violations.

What remedial action we would take has not been discussed with either side.

In the other two disengagement agreements, those between Syria and Israel and those between Egypt and Israel, what happened is that a violation will be brought to our attention and we then bring it to the attention of the side that is accused. In every case that I can remember a remedy has been found. This is one of those clauses that codifies existing practice and is not a novel departure.

Purpose of Forthcoming Visits to Peking

Mr. Keatley: Next week you will be in Peking, and next month President Ford will go there. Will these visits result in diplomatic recognition of the Peking government by the United States?

Secretary Kissinger: The basic purpose—the basic relationship between us and the People's Republic of China is the result of the congruence of some perceptions of the international environment, and therefore on many of these visits a significant part of the discussion concerns a review of the international situation and to see to what degree we agree or disagree.

The process of normalization of relations between the People's Republic and the United States has been established in the Shanghai communique. We intend to live up to this, and we intend to continue the process of normalization to its ultimate conclusion. I do not anticipate that it will be completed on the next visit, but I do not exclude that some progress would be made.

Realities Underlying U.S.-Soviet Relations

Mr. Daniel: Mr. Secretary, Warren Nutter, former Assistant Secretary of Defense, has published a study in which he says that your diplomacy in Russia has created too much détente and overrelaxation of tension, that the United States is giving away too much for too little. As you know, many conservatives are consequently very suspicious of détente. Does this mean that the Ford Administration is going to retain its full faith in détente, or will there be some change under the pressure of 1976 politics?

Secretary Kissinger: The impression is created that détente, which is a bad word anyway, is something that we grant to the Russians as a favor and that we withhold as a punishment.

The fact of the matter is that there are certain basic conditions that bring about this policy: the fact that the Soviet Union and the United States possess nuclear weapons capable of destroying humanity; the fact that we impinge upon each other in many parts of the world, so that we are, at one and the same time, rivals and yet we must regulate our conduct in such a way that we do not destroy humanity in conducting our disputes. We are ideological opponents; yet in a way we are doomed to coexist.

Those are the realities. They cannot be removed by rhetoric, and those are realities to which every President has been brought back throughout the history of the postwar period.

The foreign policy of this country will be conducted with concern for the national interest and for world peace, and it will not be affected by the Presidential campaign.

Confidentiality Within Executive Branch

Mr. Lisagor: Mr. Secretary, you are known for playing diplomacy close to the vest, and some former intelligence officials in the government have said that what you and the President, President Nixon as well as Ford, have talked about to foreign leaders

never got communicated through the system so that they could make expert appraisals of that. Are those charges true?

Secretary Kissinger: I sometimes suspect that if I started reading the most top-secret documents from the top of the Washington Monument we would still be accused of playing diplomacy close to the vest.

To some extent a certain amount of confidentiality is essential. This depends entirely on the relationship of confidence that exists between the head of the State Department Intelligence, for example, and the Secretary of State. The current Director of Intelligence in the Department of State attends every top-level meeting with Soviet and other key leaders, and he has no problem of receiving access.

There are some—in every Administration there have been some extremely confidential documents that were not necessarily distributed to every intelligence analyst in town. They are always distributed to some key advisers. Who the key advisers are depends on whom the Secretary of State and the President have confidence in, but it is in the interest of the President and the Secretary of State to get the widest possible relevant advice. So I would reject this particular charge.

Grain and Oil Negotiations With U.S.S.R.

Mr. Spivak: Gentlemen, we have less than three minutes.

Mr. Secretary, the President has just lifted the embargo on grain sales to Poland. Can you tell us what is holding up the decision on grain sales to the Soviet Union?

Secretary Kissinger: We are still discussing a long-term grain deal with the Soviet Union, and until that is completed we are not in a good position to judge the total availabilities in relation to the demands, but as the President indicated yesterday [in a news conference at Detroit, Mich., on October 10], we are making progress in that long-term grain deal.

Mr. Spivak: Are you certain that a deal will go through?

Secretary Kissinger: I am not certain, but I am optimistic.

Mr. Spivak: Will the United States be likely to attach any significant reciprocal conditions to a deal?

Secretary Kissinger: The context in which a deal is made is always clear. The conditions of the agreement themselves as they now stand and as they will be negotiated are, in our view, very favorable to the United States.

Mr. Valeriani: How close are you to making a deal, Mr. Secretary, and in that connection, do you think you can make a deal for buying Russian oil?

Secretary Kissinger: We are discussing both of these issues, not directly linked, but in a parallel framework. We are quite close to making a deal on grain. We still have some additional considerations to discuss in the case of oil, but we have made progress on that, too.

Mr. Spivak: We have less than a minute.

Mr. Keatley: If President Ford is elected next year and if he asks, will you stay on as Secretary of State?

Secretary Kissinger: I haven't—first of all, I haven't been asked yet, and that is a decision I will make then.

Mr. Daniel: Mr. Secretary, you seem to agree that we are now coming to the end of the step-by-step process of maintaining peace in the Middle East. Where do we go from here?

Secretary Kissinger: I think we then have to find some larger frameworks which combine several of the issues and several of the parties and maybe all of the issues and all of the parties. We are in a process of consultation about that now.

Mr. Spivak: I am sorry, but our time is up. Thank you, Secretary Kissinger, for being with us today on "Meet the Press."

Five-Year Grain Supply Agreement With U.S.S.R. Signed at Moscow

An agreement between the United States and the U.S.S.R. on the supply of grain was signed at Moscow on October 20 by Under Secretary of State for Economic Affairs Charles W. Robinson and Soviet Minister of Foreign Trade N. S. Patolichev. Following is a statement by President Ford issued at Washington that day, together with the text of the agreement.

STATEMENT BY PRESIDENT FORD

White House press release dated October 20

The American people—our many grain-farming communities, our workers, our farmers, and our consumers—will benefit from the agreement signed in Moscow today providing for regular and orderly sales of wheat and corn to the Soviet Union during the next five years. Under this agreement, the Soviet Union has committed to purchase 6 million metric tons of grain per year, representing \$1 billion in annual export earnings. Accordingly, I am today terminating the temporary suspension of sales of grain to the Soviet Union.

The benefits to the American economy are that we have:

- Obtained a stable long-term foreign market.

- Assured a more stable flow of payments from abroad.

- Assured the American farmer that the Soviet Union will be a regular buyer for grain at market prices.

- Increased incentives for full production by the farmer.

- Facilitated the hiring of labor, the purchase of new farming machinery, and the general stimulation of agriculture and business.

- Neutralized a great destabilizing factor in recent years.

- Provided jobs for American transportation workers and seamen.

The United States during this harvest season can rejoice over the best crop in years.

The favorable economic implications are obvious. We have obtained Soviet commitment that additional purchase of grain in the current crop year will not be so large as to disrupt the U.S. market. I have directed the Department of Agriculture to continue to monitor closely export sales and the Economic Policy Board-National Security Council Food Committee to follow closely grain market price trends and related matters.

The long-term agreement signed in Moscow today promotes American economic stability. It represents a positive step in our relations with the Soviet Union. In this constructive spirit, the two governments have also committed themselves to begin detailed negotiations on mutually beneficial terms for a five-year agreement for the purchase of Soviet oil. Negotiations will start this month.

AGREEMENT ON THE SUPPLY OF GRAIN

AGREEMENT BETWEEN THE GOVERNMENT OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA AND THE GOVERNMENT OF THE UNION OF SOVIET SOCIALIST REPUBLICS ON THE SUPPLY OF GRAIN

The Government of the United States of America ("USA") and the Government of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics ("USSR");

Recalling the "Basic Principles of Relations Between the United States of America and the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics" of May 29, 1972;

Desiring to strengthen long-term cooperation between the two countries on the basis of mutual benefit and equality;

Mindful of the importance which the production of food, particularly grain, has for the peoples of both countries;

Recognizing the need to stabilize trade in grain between the two countries;

Affirming their conviction that cooperation in the field of trade will contribute to overall improvement of relations between the two countries;

Have agreed as follows:

ARTICLE I

The Government of the USA and the Government of the USSR hereby enter into an Agreement for the purchase and sale of wheat and corn for supply to the USSR. To this end, during the period that this

Agreement is in force, except as otherwise agreed by the Parties, (i) the foreign trade organizations of the USSR shall purchase from private commercial sources, for shipment in each twelve month period beginning October 1, 1976, six million metric tons of wheat and corn, in approximately equal proportions, grown in the USA; and (ii) the Government of the USA shall employ its good offices to facilitate and encourage such sales by private commercial sources.

The foreign trade organizations of the USSR may increase this quantity without consultations by up to two million metric tons in any twelve month period, beginning October 1, 1976 unless the Government of the USA determines that the USA has a grain supply of less than 225 million metric tons as defined in Article V.

Purchases/sales of wheat and corn under this Agreement will be made at the market price prevailing for these products at the time of purchase/sale and in accordance with normal commercial terms.

ARTICLE II

During the term of this Agreement, except as otherwise agreed by the Parties, the Government of the USA shall not exercise any discretionary authority available to it under United States law to control exports of wheat and corn purchased for supply to the USSR in accordance with Article I.

ARTICLE III

In carrying out their obligations under this Agreement, the foreign trade organizations of the USSR shall endeavor to space their purchases in the USA and shipments to the USSR as evenly as possible over each 12-month period.

ARTICLE IV

The Government of the USSR shall assure that, except as the Parties may otherwise agree, all wheat and corn grown in the USA and purchased by foreign trade organizations of the USSR shall be supplied for consumption in the USSR.

ARTICLE V

In any year this Agreement is in force when the total grain supply in the USA, defined as the official United States Department of Agriculture estimates of the carry-in stocks of grain plus the official United States Department of Agriculture forward crop estimates for the coming crop year, falls below 225 million metric tons of all grains, the Government of the USA may reduce the quantity of wheat and corn available for purchase by foreign trade organizations of the USSR under Article I(i).

ARTICLE VI

Whenever the Government of the USSR wishes the foreign trade organizations of the USSR to be able

to purchase more wheat or corn grown in the USA than the amounts specified in Article I, it shall immediately notify the Government of the USA.

Whenever the Government of the USA wishes private commercial sources to be able to sell more wheat or corn grown in the USA than the amounts specified in Article I, it shall immediately notify the Government of the USSR.

In both instances, the Parties will consult as soon as possible in order to reach agreement on possible quantities of grain to be supplied to the USSR prior to purchase/sale or conclusion of contracts for the purchase/sale of grain in amounts above those specified in Article I.

ARTICLE VII

It is understood that the shipment of wheat and corn from the USA to the USSR under this Agreement shall be in accord with the provisions of the American-Soviet Agreement on Maritime Matters which is in force during the period of shipments hereunder.

ARTICLE VIII

The Parties shall hold consultations concerning the implementation of this Agreement and related matters at intervals of six months beginning six months after the date of entry into force of this Agreement, and at any other time at the request of either Party.

ARTICLE IX

This Agreement shall enter into force on execution and shall remain in force until September 30, 1981 unless extended for a mutually agreed period.

DONE at Moscow, this 20th day of October, 1975, in duplicate, in the English and Russian languages, both texts being equally authentic.

For the Government of the United States of America:	For the Government of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics:
---	--

CHARLES W. ROBINSON

N. S. PATOLICHEV

Congressional Documents Relating to Foreign Policy

94th Congress, 1st Session

United States Policy on Review of the United Nations Charter. Hearing before the Subcommittee on International Organizations of the House Committee on International Relations. July 17, 1975. 63 pp.

Arts and Artifacts Indemnity Act. Report of the Senate Committee on Labor and Public Welfare to accompany S. 1800. S. Rept. 94-289. July 21, 1975. 7 pp.

U.S. and U.S.S.R. Negotiating on Purchase of Soviet Oil

Following is a letter of intent dated October 20 signed by Charles W. Robinson, Under Secretary for Economic Affairs.

HIS EXCELLENCY

N. S. PATOLICHEV

Minister of Foreign Trade

Moscow, U.S.S.R.

DEAR MR. MINISTER: This is to confirm the understanding arising out of our discussions that our two Governments intend to commence negotiation promptly to conclude an Agreement concerning the purchase and shipment of Soviet oil. This Agreement will provide for the following:

(1) The Government of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics will, for a period of five years, offer for sale annually ten million metric tons of crude oil and petroleum products.

The Government of the United States may purchase the crude oil and petroleum products for its own use or, by the agreement of the Parties, the purchase of crude oil and petroleum products may be made by United States' firms.

(3) About 70 percent of the total quantity offered for sale will be crude oil. The remainder may be petroleum products, in particular diesel oil and naphtha.

(4) Some portion of the crude oil or petroleum products will be shipped to the United States, partly in tankers used to transport grain from the United States to the Soviet Union.

(5) Some portion of the crude oil or petroleum products may be delivered to Europe or other agreed marketing areas.

(6) Prices for crude oil and petroleum products will be mutually agreed at a level which will assure the interests of both the Government of the United States and the Government of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics.

In addition it is further understood that both Governments will work for the extension and expansion of the cooperative efforts already underway in the field of energy. Such efforts will be particularly directed toward the fuller application of the technological capability of both countries in increasing energy output from existing sources and in developing new sources of energy.

Sincerely yours,

CHARLES W. ROBINSON
Under Secretary of State
for Economic Affairs

Second Preparatory Meeting Held for Conference on International Economic Cooperation

A preparatory meeting for the Conference on International Economic Cooperation was held at Paris October 13-16. Following are statements made in the meeting on October 13 and 16 by Under Secretary for Economic Affairs Charles W. Robinson, who headed the U.S. delegation, together with the texts of the final declaration adopted by the meeting on October 16, the aide memoire attached to the French Government's letter of invitation dated September 15, and lists, submitted to the preparatory meeting by the United States and by the seven representatives of the developing countries, of proposed subjects for discussion by the four commissions to be created by the conference, which will be convened at Paris on December 16.

STATEMENTS BY UNDER SECRETARY ROBINSON

Statement of October 13

I am pleased to be in Paris to meet again—with a renewed sense of dedication and common commitment—to address questions of the highest importance to us and to all nations.

At our initial meeting in April, despite a lack of concrete progress we more clearly defined the issues and established the need for a continuing process of constructive dialogue to further international economic cooperation. Shortly after that meeting, Secretary of State Kissinger affirmed the determination of the United States to build new, constructive relationships among developed and developing countries. He encouraged active efforts to resume this dialogue on a basis that would promise positive results.

In the six months since the April meeting of this group in Paris, I have spent much of my time visiting many of the countries represented at this meeting and consulting with all other participants. These opportunities for a frank and thorough exchange of views have, I believe, been extremely helpful in contributing to the planning of this meeting. I am indebted to all of you for the cooperation and support we received in this effort.

The presence of the U.S. delegation here today reflects my country's sense of dedication to a serious dialogue. The problems we will address are fundamental to the health of the world economy and central to our growing interdependence. Some of them will be extremely complex. Only our most diligent efforts can achieve concrete and practical solutions. We may perceive some problems very differently, and we need to harmonize and resolve these differences. We may perceive other problems similarly, and we need to build on such foundations of agreement. But for all these problems, I believe that cooperative solutions are overwhelmingly in our common interest. As Secretary of State Kissinger stated in his September 1 speech to the U.N. special session:

We profoundly believe that neither the poor nor the rich nations can achieve their purposes in isolation. . . .

The reality is that ample incentives exist for cooperation on the basis of mutual respect.

The United States views this preparatory conference as an essential step in our search for a new global consensus based on cooperation. We seek a consensus to:

—Further human progress and understanding.

—Contribute to the world's basic economic security and sustained economic growth.

—Lay the basis for moving forward on the vital global issues of energy, raw materials, food, and economic development.

—Address the needs of the poorest countries, whose economies most urgently need the regenerative flow of capital and technology which only a new environment of cooperation and understanding will insure.

At this meeting we can begin to construct a framework for developing this consensus. But it will take great determination and a capacity for finding compromise to realize the outcome that we all deeply desire: the launching of a concerted effort to achieve significant progress on the great issues of economic interdependence between our peoples.

The United States believes that a prerequisite—essential although by no means sufficient—for the economic progress of the developing countries is a stable and expanding world economy. Without this it will be far more difficult to undertake the other measures that are necessary to assure that the developing countries are able to accelerate their economic growth. We should recognize this shared interest and work together to lay the foundations for world economic prosperity.

Similarly, the fundamental economic health of the developing world is important to progress and growth in the industrialized countries. We accept the reality of economic interdependence. We recognize that what diminishes the economic success of the developing nations can diminish our own. We wish to share the fruits of increased economic growth and the responsibilities for shaping a world economy that promotes this growth.

A number of dramatic developments have created new challenges. The world energy market has changed profoundly as a result of large oil price increases since 1973. This has created problems as well as opportunities. Those countries with large and growing

surpluses have the opportunity to marshal resources for the good of their peoples and others. Those countries in deficit, particularly the developing countries, have the problem of sustaining growth. Our global task is to best use these opportunities and to solve these problems to the satisfaction of all.

In this preparatory meeting, and in the Conference of Ministers to follow, the United States will work toward relationships with developing countries that reflect these realities. Proposals we make will take account of our interdependence and the continual change in our economic and political relationships. They will indicate our concern that all countries participate in international decisions according to their capabilities and in accordance with their responsibilities. We will search for consensus on measures to assure stability and security in the basic requirements for economic growth.

In short we seek—and expect—to engage in a constructive dialogue characterized by reason and cooperation.

Finally, we should like to commend the President of the French Republic and the French Government, whose substantial efforts and hospitality have been instrumental in enabling this meeting to reconvene. We are fully in accord with the consensus upon which this resumed dialogue is based. The language of the French consensus memorandum appears to accommodate the interest of all participants. It embodies understandings which should facilitate the progress we all desire and provides guidance which should permit the commissions to determine the most effective and expeditious ways to address their areas of responsibility without undue restrictions. We trust that all participants will continue to support this plan.

With regard to the work of the four commissions, there are a number of specific proposals in Secretary Kissinger's address to the seventh special session which could profitably be discussed. Other participants will have their own conceptions of what sub-

jects should be considered. We will welcome the opportunity of exchanging views with them.

Our efforts at this preparatory meeting are essentially procedural. The important substantive work comes later. It is our purpose to agree on when, where, and how this is to be pursued. My government very much welcomes this step. We look forward to working with all participating countries with a renewed spirit of cooperation. We pledge our best efforts and good will in moving toward a successful conclusion.

Statement of October 16

We returned to Paris this week to resume the dialogue with solid hopes founded in the consensus proposal circulated by the Government of France. I am very pleased to say that our hopes were fulfilled.

The consensus which brought us back to Paris was the work of six months of intensive contacts and frank exchanges among our governments following our April meeting. These six months brought major changes—in the world itself, in our perceptions, and in our official views. My government, for example, further developed its policies in this area, with the resulting initiatives that were elaborated in Secretary Kissinger's speech to the U.N. seventh special session.

There is now throughout the world a heightened sensitivity to the problems of the poorest countries. We also see a deeper recognition of the interdependence of all the nations of the world. As Secretary Kissinger said at the U.N. special session: "... neither the poor nor the rich nations can achieve their purposes in isolation." The improvement of life in each of our countries is linked to progress in all of our countries and in the world economy. In a world where so many more interests join than divide us, we have also come to realize that shared responsibilities underlie international relations.

At no time during this conference have I

doubted that we would succeed. Given the needs and problems that brought us here, we had an obligation to succeed—to persevere and confirm the understandings that will carry us into the next stage of this dialogue.

With hard bargaining, but in an atmosphere of good will, compromise, and mutual understanding, we now have taken the step which enables us to launch the dialogue between our countries. Our purpose is to strengthen international economic cooperation in the critical areas of energy, development, raw materials—including foodstuffs—and related financial matters.

I wish to congratulate and thank all my colleagues from the various delegations for their constructive contributions both during and prior to this meeting. I would also like to join with my colleagues in acknowledging the special credit due the Government of France. It was instrumental in achieving the consensus upon which this dialogue was based. As our gracious hosts last April and this week—and as our hosts-to-be in December—our French friends have helped greatly to bring us together as human beings as well as official representatives of our countries. I would like particularly to thank the chairman of the conference, M. de Guiringaud [Louis de Guiringaud, Permanent Representative of France to the United Nations], for his tireless efforts in making this meeting a success.

Particularly difficult and challenging international economic problems have emerged in the last two years. Our aim is to meet these problems and to convert them—as much as we can—into opportunities, seeking practical results through cooperative action. We see this as a joint venture among developed and developing countries.

We have no illusions about the difficulties ahead in building a new global consensus. However, one thing is clear: through the efforts and good will of all participants, we can look forward to a true dialogue, in which the participants—with increasing convergence in their perceptions of the problems—

will hear each other out on all subjects of interest which fit within the agreed framework.

The preparatory meeting this week has achieved its purpose by clarifying and reconfirming the consensus. My government is determined now to move ahead. We look forward to the December Conference of Ministers to launch the dialogue on which our hopes are based. Beyond the conference, we look to the prompt engagement of the four commissions in the substantive issues of the dialogue. We have taken an important step at this meeting in establishing the dialogue which can and must contribute significantly to human progress and to the well-being of all of our peoples.

TEXT OF FINAL DECLARATION ¹

FINAL DECLARATION OF THE PREPARATORY MEETING FOR THE CONFERENCE ON INTERNATIONAL ECONOMIC CO-OPERATION

PARIS, 16 October 1975.

1. The participants in the Preparatory Meeting for the international Conference proposed by the President of the French Republic, which was held in Paris from 7 to 15 April 1975, met again at the International Conference Centre from 13 to 16 October 1975 under the technical chairmanship of Mr. de Guirineau, Ambassador of France, with a view to pursuing preparation for the dialogue on energy, raw materials, problems of development, including all related financial questions.

2. The ten delegations confirmed the agreement of their authorities on the convening of an international conference on these questions. They decided that the Conference will be called the "Conference on International Economic Co-operation", that it will be held in Paris, that it will be composed of 27 members designated as indicated below, and that it will be convened at ministerial level on 16 December 1975 for a session of two or possibly three days. The Secretary-General of the United Nations will be invited to the Ministerial Conference.

3. The European Economic Community, the United States and Japan, on the one hand, and the seven developing countries participating in the Preparatory Meeting (Algeria, Brazil, India, Iran, Saudi Arabia, Venezuela, Zaïre), on the other hand, will assume

responsibility for the designation, from among their respective groups and according to the procedures which the industrialized countries and the developing countries, respectively, deem appropriate, of five industrialized countries and twelve developing countries, to be added to the present participants so as to bring to twenty-seven the number of participants in the Conference. The French Government will be notified, within a period which should not exceed one month, of the list thus established of the delegations to be invited to the Ministerial Conference.

4. The ten delegations also decided that the Conference should have two co-chairmen chosen respectively by each of the two participating groups from among its members, and that they should preside alternately over the meetings in a manner to be agreed between them. The participants in the Preparatory Meeting recommend that the two co-chairmen should be designated as soon as possible after the lists of participants in the Conference have been completed, and they suggest that the two co-chairmen should begin, immediately after being designated, to take together all necessary steps, in liaison with the host country, to ensure that the Ministerial Conference proceeds satisfactorily.

5. The Preparatory Meeting proposes to the Ministerial Conference that it set up a commission for energy, a commission for raw materials, a commission for development and a commission for financial affairs. Each of these commissions should consist of fifteen members, ten of them representing developing countries and five representing industrialized countries, chosen by each of the two groups of participants in the Conference from among its members.

6. In determining the composition of its representation in each commission, each of the two groups at the Conference should choose from among its members those who, because of their special interest and the overall significance of their participation, seem best suited to take part in order that the work may be carried out in an effective and responsible manner.

7. The chairmanship of each of the commissions should be assumed by two co-chairmen designated by each of the two groups respectively. Joint meetings of the co-chairmen of the commissions may be planned if the need arises.

8. The Preparatory Meeting recommends that the intergovernmental functional organizations which are directly concerned with the problems considered, and which the Ministerial Conference deems to be able to make a useful contribution to their discussion, be represented on a permanent basis in the corresponding commissions by observers with the right to speak but without the right to vote, and hence not participating in the formation of a consensus. In addition to the United Nations Secretariat, the list of these organizations should include, in

¹ Preparatory meeting doc. RP/II/12; adopted by consensus.

particular, OPEC, IEA, UNCTAD, OECD, FAO, GATT, UNIDO, UNDP, IMF and IBRD.² Furthermore, each commission may invite appropriate inter-governmental functional organizations to participate as observers *ad hoc* in the examination of specific questions.

9. Members of the Conference wishing to follow the work of a commission to which they do not belong should be entitled to appoint a representative in the capacity of auditor without the right to speak.

10. The activities of the four commissions whose establishment is recommended by the Preparatory Meeting will proceed on the basis of the relevant paragraphs of the Aide-Memoire annexed to the French Government's invitation to this Meeting, in the light of the following clarifications and interpretations:

(a) It is understood that the Commission on Energy will facilitate all arrangements which may seem advisable in the field of energy.

(b) It is understood that the Commission on Raw Materials will take into account the progress made in other international forums and will be entrusted with facilitating the establishment or reinforcement, as the case may be, of arrangements which may seem advisable in the field of raw materials—including foodstuffs—which are of particular interest to developing countries.

(c) It is understood that the Commission on Development will take into account the progress in other international forums and the results achieved, and will be entrusted with facilitating the establishment or reinforcement, as the case may be, of arrangements for accelerating the development of developing countries, on the basis of close co-operation.

(d) It is understood that the Commission on Financial Affairs may discuss financial issues, including their monetary aspects, of importance to member countries, while respecting the jurisdiction of international institutions (IMF, IBRD).

(e) It is understood that the four Commissions should function in parallel and that the results of their work are linked and should be submitted to the Ministerial Conference.

11. It is agreed that any delegation may raise any

subject relevant to the themes of the dialogue for discussion in the Commissions.

12. It has been agreed in accordance with the relevant paragraphs of the above-mentioned Aide-Memoire that the Ministerial Conference will be called upon to set the general guidelines for the work of the Commissions.

13. The Preparatory Meeting recommends to the Ministerial Conference that the relevant paragraphs of the above-mentioned Aide-Memoire, as interpreted and clarified above, as well as the above-mentioned principle that any relevant subject may be raised for discussion in the Commissions, serve as the general guidelines for the Commissions.

14. Some delegations have already tabled with this Preparatory Meeting documents proposing subjects to be discussed in the Commissions. The Preparatory Meeting recommends that the Ministerial Conference agree that these and any other proposals which may be tabled subsequently in accordance with the general guidelines be discussed in the Commissions.

15. As regards the practical measures, the Preparatory Meeting recommends that the Conference adopt English, Arabic, Spanish and French as official languages and working languages.

16. The Preparatory Meeting recommends that the Conference adopt the Rules of Procedure which it itself had adopted, and which are based, in particular, on the principle of "consensus", according to which decisions and recommendations are adopted when the Chair has established that no member delegation has made any objection.

17. The Preparatory Meeting considers that the Conference should have an international secretariat with an exclusively administrative and technical function, the Ministerial meeting being responsible, on the basis of proposals by the two co-chairmen, for determining its organization, establishing its operational procedure and allocating the financial costs in respect of it. It is understood, however, that pending a decision on the provisions to be adopted for the continuation of the work, the French Government will assume responsibility and provide the secretariat for the Ministerial meeting scheduled for December 1975, under the conditions in which these services were provided for the Preparatory Meeting.

18. The Preparatory Meeting finally recommends that the Ministerial Conference decide to meet again at ministerial level in about twelve months' time. One or several meetings of the Conference at the level of government officials could possibly be held at least six months after the first meeting of the Conference at ministerial level.

19. In conclusion, the participants paid tribute to President Giscard d'Estaing for the initiative taken by him, thanks to which a dialogue was successfully initiated, and to the French Government for all the efforts it has made towards that end.

² Organization of Petroleum Exporting Countries; International Energy Agency; United Nations Conference on Trade and Development; Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development; Food and Agriculture Organization; General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade; United Nations Industrial Development Organization; United Nations Development Program; International Monetary Fund; International Bank for Reconstruction and Development.

TEXT OF AIDE MEMOIRE ATTACHED TO LETTER OF INVITATION

AIDE MEMOIRE ATTACHED TO THE FRENCH GOVERNMENT'S LETTER OF INVITATION DATED SEPTEMBER 15, 1975

1.1. It has been agreed that the questions to be discussed during the dialogue between industrialized countries and developing countries are energy, raw materials and the problems of development, including all related financial questions.

1.2. These questions will be dealt with on equal footing. The participants in the dialogue will in particular spare no effort to advance toward constructive solutions on each of these subjects.

2.1. A new preparatory meeting will be held in Paris at as early a date as possible, and no later than October 15, comprising the same members, at the same level and in accordance with the same rules of procedure (particularly as regards observers) as the preparatory meeting last April.

2.2. The name of this meeting will be: "Preparatory meeting for the conference between industrialized countries and developing countries" or "Preparatory meeting for the conference on international economic cooperation".

2.3. The task of the preparatory meeting will be:

—To confirm the consensus reached at the April preparatory meeting on the convening of a limited but representative conference, on the number of its participants and on the procedure for their selection.

—To submit to the conference proposals on the setting up of commissions and their composition (members and observers).

2.4. The preliminary meeting should be prepared in such a way that it reaches a consensus within no more than two to three days.

3.1. The preparatory meeting will be followed up, within a maximum of two months, by the conference itself. The conference will comprise 27 members, eight from the industrialized countries and 19 from the developing countries. Each of these two groups will select its representatives to the conference within one month after the preparatory meeting.

3.2. The conference will open at the ministerial level. In order to ensure the actual participation of all the ministers, it would be preferable that its duration does not exceed three days.

3.3. The essential task of the conference will be to decide on the proposals to be submitted for its approval by the preparatory meeting.

3.4. This should induce it to set up four commissions, corresponding to the themes of the dialogue, to determine their composition, to set general guidelines for them within the framework of paragraphs

4.3. to 4.6. inclusive and to agree on what follow-up their work should have.

4.1. These commissions will not have more than 15 members. In determining its representation in each commission, each of the two groups at the conference will choose from among its members, those who, because of their special interest and the overall significance of their participation seem best suited to take part in order that the work may be carried out in an effective and responsible manner. The chairmanship of each of the commissions will be assumed by two co-chairmen designated by each of the two groups respectively.

4.2. The commissions will be composed of high-level experts representing their government.

4.3. The commission on energy, within the framework of an overall study of prospects for energy production and consumption in the world, including hydrocarbons, will be entrusted with facilitating through suitable ways and means the arrangements between oil producers and consumers which may seem advisable.

4.4. The commission on raw materials, through suitable ways and means and taking the existing situation into account, will be entrusted with facilitating the arrangements which may seem advisable in the area of raw materials—including food products—which are of particular interest to the developing countries.

4.5. The commission on development, through suitable ways and means and taking the existing situation into account, will be entrusted with facilitating the arrangements which may seem advisable in the area of cooperation for development.

4.6. The commission on financial affairs, while respecting the jurisdiction of international institutions (IMF, World Bank) will study all financial problems, including their monetary aspects, related to the work of the three preceding commissions. It will be composed of an appropriate number of members from each of these three commissions.

4.7. The commissions on raw materials and development will, in particular, take into consideration the work carried out by other appropriate international bodies and will establish the necessary contacts with these groups.

4.8. Joint meetings of the co-chairmen of these commissions may be planned if the need arises.

4.9. Observers from organizations which are directly concerned with the problems being discussed will be able to attend the commissions and will have the right to speak.

5.1. The conference will meet again at the ministerial level in about 12 months.

5.2. One or several meetings of the conference at the level of government officials may possibly be held at least six months after the first meeting of the conference at the ministerial level.

U.S. LIST OF SUBJECTS ³

LISTS OF SUBJECTS TO BE DISCUSSED BY THE COMMISSIONS, AS PROPOSED BY THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

Commission on Energy:

- (1) Oil prices, their relationship to long term demand and supply for energy and to world economic progress;
- (2) Security of supply and markets for oil and oil products;
- (3) Cooperation among developed and developing countries to promote increased energy supplies.

Commission on Raw Materials:

- (1) Access to supply and markets for raw materials;
- (2) Problems of stability of export earnings;
- (3) Growth and diversification of export trade;
- (4) Enhancement of long run supply of raw materials through application of capital, management, and technology with mutual respect for contractual obligations;
- (5) Enhancement of functioning and stability of markets for commodities, including food, on a case-by-case basis.

Commission on Development:

- (1) Problems caused by payments deficits of developing countries particularly the most seriously affected;
- (2) Financial assistance, arrangements conducive to the transfer of technology, international investment and capital market access to accelerate growth in developing countries;
- (3) Promotion of agricultural and food production through, inter alia, enlargement of world food production capacity, particularly in developing countries, and food aid;
- (4) Promotion of development through enhanced trade opportunities among developed and developing countries;
- (5) Policies for promoting rapid industrial growth.

Commission on Financial Affairs:

Financial issues related to work of other commissions, for example:

On Energy

- Financial consequences of energy prices;
- Conditions for international investment; including placement of surplus oil funds.

On Raw Materials

- Financial implications of commodity arrangements;
- Export earnings stabilization.

On Development

- Financing of investment projects in the developing countries;
- Financing of food imports of developing countries and increased agricultural production;
- Approaches to payments deficits of developing countries.

DEVELOPING COUNTRIES' LIST OF SUBJECTS ⁴

DOCUMENT SUBMITTED BY ALGERIA, SAUDI ARABIA, BRASIL, INDIA, IRAN, VENEZUELA AND ZAIRE, IN CONNECTION WITH THE SUBJECTS TO BE DISCUSSED BY THE COMMISSIONS

The delegations of the countries mentioned above recommend that the general guidelines be inspired by the provisions of the Resolution 3362 of the Seventh Special Session of the United Nations General Assembly on "Development and International Economic Cooperation", and also take into account, inter alia, the following:

1.— The Commission on Energy should consider: development and conditions of supply and demand of energy, hydro-carbons and other resources, including the protection of the purchasing power of energy export earnings.

2.— The Commission on Raw Materials should consider: development and supply conditions of raw materials in respect of development needs of developing countries, including the revalorization and protection of the purchasing power of developing countries export earnings.

3.— The Commission on Development should consider: trade (access to markets for products of developing countries, etc.); accelerated industrialization; transfer of technology; development of agriculture; development of infrastructure; problems of supply of food and fertilizers (special attention to devising measures for ensuring adequate supplies of food and fertilizers at reasonable prices to developing countries); special and urgent attention to the question of the grave difficulties of MSAC's [most seriously affected countries] created by the current economic situation; and the need to increase present assistance to meet their pressing requirements.

4.— The Commission on Financial Affairs should consider: relevant aspects of international monetary problems; financial co-operation and investment; and financial flows and investments in industrialized countries, including the problems of long-term investments, the protection of the real value of finan-

³ Preparatory meeting doc. RP II/11, Oct. 13, 1975.

⁴ Preparatory meeting doc. RP II/10 and Corr.

cial assets, and problems of the international financial markets.

15 OCTOBER 1975

World Law Day, 1975

A P R O C L A M A T I O N¹

Recognizing the need to destroy the discriminatory barriers of legal inequality which confront women throughout the world, the United Nations General Assembly proclaimed 1975 as International Women's Year.

At home, the President, by Proclamation No. 4262, set aside the year 1975 as International Women's Year in the United States, and, by Executive Order No. 11832, created a National Commission on the Observance of International Women's Year. In 1972, the Congress adopted a proposed constitutional amendment which would ensure the equality of men and women before the law. If a few more States ratify that proposed amendment, it will become a fitting constitutional heritage of our Bicentennial era.

Our efforts at home have been linked with those of other nations. This year, citizens of the United States participated in the world Conference on International Women's Year held in Mexico City on June 19 through July 2, 1975, to develop guidelines for a sustained, long-term effort to achieve the objectives of International Women's Year.

Also this year, members of our Nation's legal profession will be joined by lawyers, professors and jurists from more than one hundred nations during the week of October 12, 1975, at a World Law Conference, under the auspices of the World Peace Through Law Center, held in our Nation's capital. The agenda of the World Law Conference will deal with a host of international legal issues, ranging from the role of multinational companies to laws governing oil pollution at sea.

The theme of the World Law Conference is the achievement of legal equality between men and women. A portion of the agenda will be devoted to discussing the elimination of discrimination against women.

The President of the United States, along with the leaders of other nations, for more than a decade has encouraged the significant international efforts represented by these World Law Conferences. With its theme of legal equality between men and women, it is fitting, during this International Women's Year, to do so again.

NOW, THEREFORE, I, GERALD R. FORD, President of the United States of America, do hereby designate

Sunday, October 12, 1975, as World Law Day in the United States.

I call upon all Americans, men and women, especially members of the legal, educational and religious communities, to give recognition to the importance of law in our Nation's international quest for peace, human dignity and equality before the law for women and men.

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

GERALD R. FORD.

Presidential Determination on Military Sales to Turkey

MEMORANDUM OF OCTOBER 10, 1975¹

Military Sales to the Government of Turkey

[Presidential Determination No. 76-4]

MEMORANDUM FOR THE SECRETARY OF STATE

THE WHITE HOUSE,
Washington, October 10, 1975.

Pursuant to the authority vested in me by section 2(b)(1)(A) of the Act of October 6, 1975 to authorize appropriations for the Board of International Broadcasting for fiscal year 1976; and to promote improved relations between the United States, Greece, and Turkey, to assist in the solution of the refugee program on Cyprus, and to otherwise strengthen the North Atlantic Alliance, I hereby determine and certify that

a) The furnishing to the Government of Turkey of those defense articles and defense services with respect to which contracts of sale were signed under section 21 or section 22 of the Foreign Military Sales Act on or before February 5, 1975; and

b) The issuance of licenses for the transportation to the Government of Turkey of arms, ammunition, and implements of war (including technical data relating thereto),

are important to the national security interests of the United States.

You are requested on my behalf to report this determination and certification to the Congress as required by law.

This determination and certification shall be published in the FEDERAL REGISTER.

GERALD R. FORD.

¹ No. 4398; 40 *Fed. Reg.* 46085.

¹ 40 *Fed. Reg.* 49073, Oct. 21, 1975.

U.S. Discusses Issues in Direct Television Broadcasting and Remote Sensing by Satellite

Following is a statement made in Committee I (Political and Security) of the U.N. General Assembly by U.S. Representative W. Tapley Bennett, Jr., on October 13.

USUN press release 116 dated October 13

Nineteen seventy-five has been an extremely active year both in the actual exploration and use of outer space and in the work of the Outer Space Committee. There have been a number of developments in each which we believe are worthy of attention as the First Committee reviews the question of the peaceful uses of outer space.

During the past year the United States has continued to participate actively with other nations in the exploration of outer space. We have, for example, launched Ariel-5, the fifth in a series of scientific satellites, undertaken in cooperation with Great Britain; the Intasat, an ionospheric satellite prepared by Spain; and Helios-1, the first of two solar probes built by the Federal Republic of Germany and designed to fly closer to the sun than any previous spacecraft.

In addition, consistent with our pledge to provide nondiscriminatory reimbursable launch assistance for foreign satellite projects for peaceful purposes, we have provided four launches within the past year. These have included two French and German Symphonie communications satellites; the Telesat-3, a Canadian communications satellite; and Cos-B, a European Space Agency satellite for gamma radiation studies.

International cooperation has also played an increasing role in the development of the Space Transportation System, a new approach to space flight which will eventually replace costly expendable launch vehicles and

provide expanded opportunities for useful space activities throughout the world. The European Space Agency has proceeded on schedule with the development of Spacelab, an orbiting manned laboratory which will provide 7-to-30-day missions in space. International planning for the first shuttle mission is already underway. The development by Canada of the remote manipulator system will permit shuttle astronauts to deliver, service, and retrieve payloads in space.

One of the most dramatic examples of international cooperation in space this year was the Apollo-Soyuz Test Project, which was successfully flown last July. We believe that this mission was more than a technical success in space exploration. We hope that it will stand in the perspective of time as a general landmark demonstration of the feasibility of highly complex technical projects among nations when there is the will to work toward common objectives.

Finally, I wish to mention two cooperative projects which particularly illustrate the potential benefits for developing as well as developed countries from the use of outer space. One was the inauguration August 1 of Indian educational broadcasting through the U.S. ATS-6 satellite directly into augmented community receivers in more than 2,000 Indian villages. An additional 3,000 villages are reached through terrestrial rebroadcast stations. We have heard very positive reports from the first few weeks of this Satellite Instructional Television Experiment, and we look forward to learning about its continued progress.

The second project relates to the continuation of an experiment in remote sensing of the Earth's natural environment; namely,

the launching last January of Landsat 2. At the present time, scientists sponsored and funded by 55 countries and five international organizations have participated in Landsat investigations. Canada, Brazil, and Italy already have ground stations operating for direct reception of Landsat data, and so far in 1975 additional station agreements have been concluded with Chile, Iran, and Zaïre.

While these and other developments were occurring in outer space, extremely important related work was also taking place here at U.N. Headquarters in the deliberations of the Committee on the Peaceful Uses of Outer Space and its Legal and Scientific and Technical Subcommittees.

The two primary areas of interest before those bodies are direct television broadcasting by satellite and remote sensing of the Earth's natural environment and resources. Both of these subjects entail extremely important and complex issues, and I would like to comment on the principal questions raised.

Direct Television Broadcasting by Satellite

During its 1975 session the Legal Subcommittee devoted considerable time to developing the texts of 14 draft principles to guide those conducting direct television broadcasting by satellite.¹ Even though substantial portions of those draft principles remain unagreed, development of these texts was nevertheless a substantial accomplishment which resulted from very careful and detailed consideration of the many important issues involved. We have made significant progress; we also have considerable work before us.

The question of prior consent to broadcasting is probably the most difficult of the remaining issues under debate. Although risking the pitfalls of generalization and oversimplification, I believe it is reasonable to describe the debate as one in which one point of view is that direct television broadcasting through satellites should not be undertaken without the prior consent of the governments of all states where those signals may be received. The other principal

point of view is essentially that, within the scope of reasonable voluntary guidelines developed on a cooperative basis, broadcasters should be able to air programs without the constraint of prior program-content censorship and that concerns about an imbalance of cultural impacts should be accommodated by encouraging a two-way flow of ideas and information rather than simply a one-way communication.

The United States has since the beginning of this debate encouraged the development and beneficial use of this new technology. We believe that increased communication among peoples reduces prejudices and misunderstandings whereas inhibited and restrictive communication encourages them. We believe that the potential benefits for developing and developed countries far outweigh the potential risks.

The adoption of a prior-consent regime is, in our view, undesirable in principle; and it is probably infeasible in practice, unless we wish simply to set this technology aside. As a practical matter, a system in which the prior consent of every receiving state were required would be a system in which very little broadcasting would ever take place except domestically within the largest countries. Even with substantial progress in beam shaping, regional broadcasts in most areas of the world would be receivable in a considerable number of states, and I think it is a realistic, if unfortunate, assessment that there are few areas of the world with sufficient political compatibility that all states in a region would give their consent. The result would be that the benefits of such communications would not be attainable, even if they were desired by a majority of states and population in an area.

The United States continues to believe that with imagination and good will a formula can be found which will not deny to the world the potential benefits of direct television broadcasting and which at the same time will give reassurance to those who have legitimate concerns about the potential impact of this new communications technology.

For example, there are a number of important considerations of a technical nature

¹ U.N. doc. A/AC.105/147, annex II.

which deserve attention. Those include the incompatibility of television transmitters in some countries with the receivers in others. In addition, local governments have the ability to regulate the sale and possession of essential signal adaptors.

We have closely reviewed proposals that the agreement of states in an anticipated reception area be obtained before a direct television broadcasting satellite is launched, thereby attempting to provide for agreement to the activity without getting into program-content evaluation. This carefully developed proposal has many reasonable elements but, unfortunately, in the end does not seem to solve the basic problem. It still would permit a single state to prohibit broadcasting over an entire region, regardless of the desires of others. In addition, there would be nothing to prevent a state from making its agreement to the launch dependent on prior censorship of program content. Also, this proposal would not seem to offer protection from the possibility that consent might be withdrawn sometime after it was initially given. If, for instance, a group of states had invested in a regional broadcasting system and then one of them suddenly withdrew its agreement, either the prior-consent requirement would have to be discarded or the regional broadcasting system abandoned. A unilateral right to prohibit open communications could be much more dangerous than a unilateral right to initiate broadcasts which may or may not have the prior consent of every single state concerned.

We recognize that the differences among states are significant on this issue and that divergent views, including ours, are strongly held. The United States has been strongly advocating the principles of maximizing the free and open exchange of information and ideas, principles which we believe are in the interests of all peoples, not simply of citizens of the United States. At the same time we recognize the concerns of others. In order to assist these deliberations, we tabled in 1974 a paper containing draft principles on direct broadcasting which reflected the approach which we felt the international community should adopt to deal with this

new technology.² We have continued to give serious consideration to additional ways of reconciling differences among states on this issue.

Proposal for Notification and Consultation

Based on our review of the points and interests raised in the debates on direct broadcasting during the last year, we would like to propose a new approach which we believe might serve as an effective basis for reconciling many of our divergent interests.

In his August statement on international law before the American Bar Association meeting in Montreal, Secretary of State Kissinger suggested that any system for direct television broadcasting by satellite should be accompanied by full consultations among the countries concerned. I wish to elaborate on the meaning of this suggestion. In particular, we are proposing that before direct television broadcasting is undertaken, states within the reception area should be notified of the intention to broadcast. Those who broadcast should be prepared, on a reciprocal basis, to assume an obligation to give formal notification to states within the likely broadcast area. In addition, those who broadcast should agree to consult fully with the governments of the states in the intended reception area if the latter so request, with the intention of making good-faith efforts to reconcile problems that may be raised.

We believe that this approach would offer protection for any state which has legitimate concerns about direct television broadcasting into its territory, without establishing an international scheme based on prior consent. We do not envisage establishment through these procedures of a right of any state to prohibit others from undertaking broadcasting. We do envisage that such notification and consultation requirements would go substantively beyond the technical consultations now provided for within the ITU [International Telecommunication Union].

It is our belief that the actual process of consultations, which would cause the parties to deal expressly with problems which may

² For text, see BULLETIN of Apr. 22, 1974, p. 450.

arise, would go very far to reconcile differences. The very process of bona fide consultations would give the broadcaster considerable incentive to work out mutually satisfactory solutions and would guarantee those in the reception area a full opportunity to resolve problems they may foresee. Broadcasters would clearly not wish to alienate prospective audiences and hence would desire to reconcile differences. The natural dynamic of the dialogue would work in favor of reconciliation.

Neither the United States nor others who are attempting to ensure continued opportunities for the beneficial development of the new communications technology wish this technology itself to become a source of international discord or friction. On the contrary, it is through such developments that we would hope for the growth of better communication and understanding among peoples, and hence the gradual reduction of tensions. We have proposed this formula, not in anticipation of satisfying everyone completely, an accomplishment which does not seem possible with such great divisions, but in genuine hope of accommodating at least the most essential interests of both sides of this debate. Advocates of both points of view obviously must demonstrate some flexibility if we are ever to reach agreement. It is our hope that this approach will be a helpful and constructive basis for our further discussion in the Legal Subcommittee on this issue.

Remote Sensing of the Earth

Nineteen seventy-five has also been a notable year both in space and at the conference table for remote sensing of the Earth's natural environment and resources. As I mentioned earlier in these remarks, in January the United States launched its second experimental remote sensing satellite, the Landsat 2. In the spring at its 14th session, the Legal Subcommittee for the first time devoted a significant amount of time to the question of the legal implications of remote sensing and took the first small but important step toward a thorough, detailed, and constructive

analysis of the issues involved. In May the Scientific and Technical Subcommittee devoted a considerable portion of its 12th session to the technical and organizational aspects of remote sensing.

As in the case of direct television broadcasting, the Outer Space Committee is dealing with a set of issues of broad scope and considerable complexity. In February the U.S. Representative to the Legal Subcommittee introduced a working paper in order to express more clearly the approach which we believe the international community should take in order to insure for all countries, regardless of their stages of economic and technological development, the maximum opportunities to share in the benefits of remote sensing.³

As is reflected in the U.S. working paper, we strongly believe that substantial benefits for all states, at every stage of economic and technical development, can be obtained from an open and shared system of earth observation from satellites such as the Landsat space platforms with which we are experimenting. Convincing evidence of the potential benefits already realized can be easily found in the experiments of over 50 states now participating directly in the Landsat program.

Our total shared understanding about the natural features and resources of the Earth has been greatly expanded. That understanding will continue to grow as scientists throughout the world continue to improve their analytical techniques and as we pool and share with each other the knowledge gained. Although our body of information will be greatly increased by periodic coverage of the world's surface, the United States has already shared and continues to make available to all interested parties at least one-time coverage of over 90 percent of the Earth's land surface. The peaceful exploration and use of outer space has given us all an invigorating common cause in the interests of all countries and has given us an encouraging example that openness and

³ For text of the working paper, see BULLETIN of Mar. 31, 1975, p. 423.

sharing can be to our common benefit, rather than to our collective or individual detriment.

U.S. Support for Open Sharing of Data

The Legal Subcommittee also has before it two proposals which would restrict data dissemination, proposals which we believe would reverse the beneficial pattern of international cooperation which so many of us have been attempting to build for these many years. If adopted and applied, either of these would almost inevitably result in a monopoly on remote sensing data by highly industrialized states which have their own satellites.

For example, if the United States and other countries with such remote sensing satellites were to agree not to make available to third countries data of a sensed country without the latter's consent, we would in fact be able to share very little with anyone outside of the United States, although it would be our intention to continue to make the data available here. The natural swath of the satellite sensors commonly cuts across many national boundaries. The exercise of separating the billions of data bits along the lines of political boundaries is both financially prohibitive and scientifically disadvantageous. Absent such separation, in many parts of the world the consent of every country in a region might have to be obtained, through a time-consuming and complicated process which would insure at the very least that the data release to countries without satellites would be much delayed and probably that it would be prohibited completely. There would be little incentive to pursue such a process.

How, for example, could we or any other country continue to permit most other states to operate ground receiving stations under such a restrictive data-dissemination system? Normal coverage by a ground station is a circle approximately 3,000 kilometers in radius. For example, a station in the middle of South America could pick up data of at least part of every country on that conti-

nent. In other areas of the world it would be more; in some areas fewer. Under a restrictive data-dissemination proposal, we could not permit such a ground station to read out the data without the prior consent of all the countries in the region, because the operator of that ground station would be a third country; that is, neither the sensed nor the sensing country.

Such a system, in our view, would exacerbate the divisions between the rich and poor, the technologically advanced and the less advanced, and the large and the small, in ways that the vast majority of states have been calling out to reverse, not to perpetuate. We do not believe such a policy is in the interest of the international community.

This result would be contrary to the spirit of the 1967 Outer Space Treaty, which urges that such activities be undertaken in the interests and for the benefit of all countries, and would run squarely against the conclusions of the very body that we last year requested to examine the organizational aspects of this question. I refer in particular to paragraph 27 (iii) of the report of the 12th session of the Scientific and Technical Subcommittee.⁴

There the subcommittee noted with satisfaction that receiving stations in various countries were set up or planned to work with the Landsat program and recognized the importance of these stations for obtaining coverage of most of North and South America, most of Europe, and large parts of Africa and West Asia. The subcommittee also expressed the hope that countries in other regions would set up similar stations and that all countries planning to do so would associate with them data storage, data dissemination, and training facilities that could be made available on reasonable terms to other countries in their regions. In addition, the subcommittee expressed the view that states should operate ground stations in such a manner as to maximize their contribution to scientific research concerning problems of a global nature.

The results of the open data-dissemina-

⁴ U.N. doc. A/AC.105/150.

tion provisions in the agreements establishing those ground stations are a practical daily demonstration that open dissemination can increase benefits without harm.

The United States believes that the Scientific and Technical Subcommittee adopted the proper conclusions on this issue in its report, conclusions which when followed by responsive action in the Legal Subcommittee would insure an equitable opportunity for all states to share in the benefits from these new technological developments. The report of the Outer Space Committee's 30th session, which was held just last June,⁵ contains the recommendation that the Legal Subcommittee should inter alia take into account the discussions, views, and conclusions concerning organizational, economic, and technical aspects of remote sensing in the Scientific and Technical Subcommittee. We support that recommendation and will do our part to insure that it is respected.

We look forward to the resumption in the Legal Subcommittee of our efforts toward a thorough and detailed examination of the legal implications of remote sensing. On the basis of issues raised in that examination, we will be looking for common elements of agreement, and when it appears that any of those common elements could be developed into general statements of principle, we along with others will endeavor to develop them.

In the remote sensing area we believe that a policy of open sharing, coupled with active programs of assistance in learning how to analyze and use the data, can continue to provide valuable opportunities for all states to share in the potential benefits from remote sensing. The United States has no desire to force upon any other country data from our space programs. We would urge the international community, however, to pursue a policy in which more countries, not fewer, participate in such sharing, a policy in which more knowledge, not less, is made universally available in order to help us all improve the state of our common experience here on Earth.

⁵ U.N. doc. A/10020, supp. 20.

U.S. Rejects Call by Cuba in U.N. for Puerto Rican Independence

Following is a statement in exercise of the right of reply made in plenary session of the U.N. General Assembly by U.S. Representative Carmen Maymi on October 8.

USUN press release 111 dated October 8

Earlier this afternoon, the Cuban Representative saw fit once again to attempt to intervene in the internal affairs of the United States and the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico. My government regrets that the Cuban delegation makes it necessary for us to state once more the facts of the case and our very strong and well-known views on the subject.

The people of Puerto Rico attained self-government by fully and freely participating in a referendum in 1952 in which they voted to establish a Commonwealth freely associated with the United States and in which they adopted a Constitution for that Commonwealth. They have repeatedly reaffirmed that decision in free elections conducted on the basis of universal adult suffrage in 1956, 1960, 1964, 1968, and 1972 and in a status referendum in 1967.

The eighth session of the General Assembly of the United Nations in 1953 specifically recognized Puerto Rico's attainment of self-government by adopting Resolution 748, which states in operative paragraph 5 that:

... the people of Puerto Rico have been invested with attributes of political sovereignty which clearly identify the status of self-government attained by the Puerto Rican people as that of an autonomous political entity;

Operative paragraph 6 of the same resolution states that:

... the Declaration regarding Non-Self-Governing Territories and the provisions established under it in Chapter XI of the Charter can no longer be applied to the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico;

The 26th session of the General Assembly in 1971 endorsed these decisions on the self-governing status of Puerto Rico by rejecting a proposal to include an item on Puerto Rico in its agenda.

In 1972, as in previous elections, the over-

whelming majority of the Puerto Rican people supported the Commonwealth and Statehood Parties. Only slightly more than 4 percent of the electorate voted for the Independence Party.

Misrepresentations in this forum will not change these facts, nor will such attacks weaken the adherence of the United States and the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico to decisions made by the people of Puerto Rico in free democratic elections.

TREATY INFORMATION

Current Actions

MULTILATERAL

Agriculture

International agreement for the creation at Paris of an International Office for Epizootics, with annex. Done at Paris January 25, 1924. Entered into force January 17, 1925; for the United States July 29, 1975.

Proclaimed by the President: October 18, 1975.

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.

Accession deposited: Morocco (with a reservation), October 24, 1975.

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

Accession deposited: Morocco (with a reservation), October 24, 1975.

Coffee

Protocol for the continuation in force of the international coffee agreement 1968, as amended and extended (TIAS 6584, 7809), with annex. Approved by the International Coffee Council at London September 26, 1974. Entered into force October 1, 1975.

Acceptance deposited: Netherlands, August 26, 1975.

Accession deposited: Japan, October 10, 1975; Papua New Guinea, October 15, 1975.

Ratifications deposited: Brazil, August 6, 1975; Jamaica, Mexico, Portugal, September 30, 1975; Yugoslavia, September 24, 1975.

Consular Relations

Vienna convention on consular relations. Done at Vienna April 24, 1963. Entered into force March 19, 1967; for the United States December 24, 1969. TIAS 6820.

Accession deposited: Greece, October 14, 1975.

Copyright

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

Ratification deposited: Mexico, July 31, 1975.

Accession deposited: Bangladesh, May 5, 1975.

Protocol 1 annexed to the universal copyright convention as revised, concerning the application of that convention to works of stateless persons and refugees. Done at Paris July 24, 1971. Entered into force July 10, 1974. TIAS 7868.

Accession deposited: Bangladesh, May 5, 1975.

Protocol 2 annexed to the universal copyright convention, as revised, concerning the application of that convention to the works of certain international organizations. Done at Paris July 24, 1971. Entered into force July 10, 1974. TIAS 7868.

Accession deposited: Bangladesh, May 5, 1975.

Health

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

Acceptance deposited: Spain, October 10, 1975.

Oil Pollution

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

Ratification deposited: Netherlands, September 19, 1975.²

Property—Intellectual

Convention establishing the World Intellectual Property Organization. Done at Stockholm July 14, 1967. Entered into force April 26, 1970; for the United States August 25, 1970. TIAS 6932.

Accession deposited: Congo (Brazzaville), September 2, 1975.

Space

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

Signature: Austria, October 14, 1975.

¹ Not in force.

² Extended to Surinam and the Netherlands Antilles.

Convention on international liability for damage caused by space objects. Done at Washington, London, and Moscow March 29, 1972. Entered into force September 1, 1972; for the United States October 9, 1973. TIAS 7762.
Accession deposited: Yugoslavia, October 20, 1975.

BILATERAL

Barbados

Agreement relating to a cooperative program for operation and maintenance of a rawinsonde station at Seawell Airport, Barbados. Effected by exchange of notes at Bridgetown October 13, 1975. Entered into force October 13, 1975; effective July 1, 1970.

Chile

Memorandum of understanding concerning direct access by a Chilean ground station to data generated by NASA Landsat satellites and availability to the National Aeronautics and Space Administration of the data so acquired. Signed at Santiago and Washington July 24 and September 8, 1975. Entered into force September 8, 1975.

Israel

Agreement amending the agreement for sales of agricultural commodities of December 16, 1974 (TIAS 7978). Effected by exchange of notes at Washington October 17, 1975. Entered into force October 17, 1975.

Malta

Agreement providing for consultations on problems of market disruption caused by cotton textile or cotton textile product exports from Malta. Effected by exchange of notes at Floriana and Valletta September 17 and 22, 1975. Entered into force September 22, 1975.

Mexico

Agreement amending the agreement of November 9, 1972 (TIAS 7697), concerning frequency modulation broadcasting in the 88 to 108 MHz band with annexes and related notes. Effected by exchange of notes at Mexico August 21, 1975. Entered into force August 21, 1975.

Agreement to indemnify and safeguard the United States Government, its personnel, and contractors for liability arising out of aircraft operations training in support of the cooperative program to curb illegal narcotics traffic. Effected by exchange of letters at Mexico September 12, 1975. Entered into force September 12, 1975.

PUBLICATIONS

GPO Sales Publications

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

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

Australia	Cat. No. S1.123:AU7/2 Pub. 8149 8 pp.
Chile	Cat. No. S1.123:C43 Pub. 7998 8 pp.
Finland	Cat. No. S1.123:F49 Pub. 8262 6 pp.
German Democratic Republic	Cat. No. S1.123:G31/2 Pub. 7957 7 pp.

Assistance for Children and Mothers. Agreements with the United Nations Children's Fund amending the agreement of December 26 and 30, 1974. TIAS 8031. 4 pp. 25¢. (Cat. No. S9.10:8031).

Refugee Relief in the Republic of Viet-Nam, Laos and the Khmer Republic. Agreement with the International Committee of the Red Cross. TIAS 8032. 14 pp. 30¢. (Cat. No. S9.10:8032).

Furnishing Federal Catalog Data and Services. Agreement with Iran. TIAS 8034. 3 pp. 25¢. (Cat. No. S9.10:8034).

Surplus Property Settlement. Agreement with India. TIAS 8035. 2 pp. 25¢. (Cat. No. S9.10:8035).

Air Transport Services. Agreement with Panama amending the agreement of March 31, 1949, as amended. TIAS 8036. 11 pp. 30¢. (Cat. No. S9.10:8036).

Agriculture. Five-Year Grain Supply Agreement With U.S.S.R. Signed at Moscow (Ford, text of agreement)	662
Arms Control. Secretary Kissinger Interviewed on "Meet the Press"	657
China. Secretary Kissinger Interviewed on "Meet the Press"	657
Congress	
Congressional Documents Relating to Foreign Policy	664
Secretary Kissinger Interviewed on "Meet the Press"	657
Cuba. U.S. Rejects Call by Cuba in U.N. for Puerto Rican Independence (Maymi)	678
Economic Affairs. Second Preparatory Meeting Held for Conference on International Economic Cooperation (Robinson, final declaration, French aide memoire, U.S. and developing countries' lists of subjects for discussions by commissions)	665
Egypt. Secretary Kissinger Interviewed on "Meet the Press"	657
Europe. Secretary Kissinger Interviewed on "Meet the Press"	657
Human Rights. World Law Day, 1975 (proclamation)	672
International Law. World Law Day, 1975 (proclamation)	672
International Organizations and Conferences. Second Preparatory Meeting Held for Conference on International Economic Cooperation (Robinson, final declaration, French aide memoire, U.S. and developing countries' lists of subjects for discussions by commissions)	665
Israel. Secretary Kissinger Interviewed on "Meet the Press"	657
Middle East. Secretary Kissinger Interviewed on "Meet the Press"	657
Petroleum. U.S. and U.S.S.R. Negotiating on Purchase of Soviet Oil (letter of intent)	664
Presidential Documents	
Five-Year Grain Supply Agreement With U.S.S.R. Signed at Moscow	662
Presidential Determination on Military Sales to Turkey	672
World Law Day, 1975 (proclamation)	672
Publications. GPO Sales Publications	680
Space. U.S. Discusses Issues in Direct Television Broadcasting and Remote Sensing by Satellite (Bennett)	673
Treaty Information	
Current Actions	679
Five-Year Grain Supply Agreement With U.S.S.R. Signed at Moscow (Ford, text of agreement)	662
Turkey. Presidential Determination on Military Sales to Turkey (text)	672
U.S.S.R.	
Five-Year Grain Supply Agreement With	

U.S.S.R. Signed at Moscow (Ford, text of agreement)	662
Secretary Kissinger Interviewed on "Meet the Press"	657
U.S. and U.S.S.R. Negotiating on Purchase of Soviet Oil (letter of intent)	664
United Nations	
U.S. Discusses Issues in Direct Television Broadcasting and Remote Sensing by Satellite (Bennett)	673
U.S. Rejects Call by Cuba in U.N. for Puerto Rican Independence (Maymi)	678

Name Index

Bennett, W. Tapley, Jr	673
Ford, President	662, 672
Kissinger, Secretary	657
Maymi, Carmen	678
Robinson, Charles W	665

**Check List of Department of State
Press Releases: October 20-26**

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

No.	Date	Subject
†532A	10/19	Kissinger: Interview for Time Magazine.
*533	10/20	Drug abuse treatment specialists from 18 countries to tour U.S.
†534	10/20	Kissinger: news conference, Anchorage, Alaska, Oct. 18.
†535	10/20	Kissinger, Ch'iao Kuan-hua: toasts, Peking, Oct. 19.
536	10/20	Kissinger: letter to House Select Committee on Intelligence, Oct. 14 (printed in Nov. 3 issue).
*537	10/23	U.S. and Canada request International Joint Commission review of Garrison Diversion Unit.
†538	10/22	Kissinger, Ch'iao Kuan-hua: toasts, Peking.
*539	10/23	Shipping Coordinating Committee, Subcommittee on Safety of Life at Sea, working group on radio communications, Nov. 20 and Dec. 18.
†540	10/23	Kissinger: interview with three networks, Tokyo.
*541	10/24	Program for the state visit of President Anwar al-Sadat of Egypt to the U.S., Oct. 26-Nov. 5.
†542	10/25	Kissinger: U.N. Day concert.
†543	10/25	Kissinger: toast, U.N. Day dinner.

* Not printed.

† Held for a later issue of the BULLETIN.