

The original documents are located in Box 11, folder “Foreign Policy Address (2)” of the Ron Nessen Papers at the Gerald R. Ford Presidential Library.

Copyright Notice

The copyright law of the United States (Title 17, United States Code) governs the making of photocopies or other reproductions of copyrighted material. Ron Nessen donated to the United States of America his copyrights in all of his unpublished writings in National Archives collections. Works prepared by U.S. Government employees as part of their official duties are in the public domain. The copyrights to materials written by other individuals or organizations are presumed to remain with them. If you think any of the information displayed in the PDF is subject to a valid copyright claim, please contact the Gerald R. Ford Presidential Library.

THE WHITE HOUSE

WASHINGTON

ADDRESS TO THE JOINT SESSION OF CONGRESS

U. S. Capitol

Thursday - April 10, 1975

Departure: 8:40 P.M.

From: Terry O'Donnell ^{TOD}

BACKGROUND:

This is your fourth Presidential address to a Joint Session of Congress, the others occurring on August 15, 1974, following your inauguration; October 8, 1974, on the economy; and January 15, 1975 on the State of the Union.

In addition to Members of Congress and the First Family (Mrs. Ford, Susan and Jack), representatives of the Diplomatic Corps, the Cabinet, the Joint Chiefs of Staff, Cabinet Members' wives, wives of the Supreme Court Justices, and special guests will attend.

The Address will be carried "live" by the television networks.

SEQUENCE:

8:40 p.m. You, Mrs. Ford, Jack and Susan board the limousine on South Grounds and depart en route U.S. Capitol.

NOTE: The Vice President will have proceeded to the Senate Chamber at 8:25 p.m. to convene the Senate.

8:50 p.m. Arrive South Door of the Capitol (House Wing) where you will be met by Mr. Ken R. Harding, House Sergeant-at-Arms and Mr. George White, Architect of the Capitol.

OFFICIAL PHOTO

You proceed inside the South Door entrance en route the Holding Room (H-210), escorted by Mr. Ken Harding.

Mrs. Ford and Jack and Susan will be escorted to their seats in the Executive Gallery by Mr. Jim Rohan.

- 8:25 p. m. Arrive Holding Room (H-210) and join the Cabinet.
- 8:54 p. m. The Cabinet proceeds from H-210 to the House Chamber Floor.
- 8:56 p. m. Mrs. Ford and Jack and Susan arrive their seats in the Executive Gallery.
- 8:57 p. m. The Escort Committee arrives outside the Holding Room:
- Senator James O. Eastland (D-Miss)
 - Senator Mike Mansfield (D-Mont)
 - Senator Hugh Scott (R-Pa)
 - Senator Robert Byrd (D-W. Va)
 - Congressman Thomas O'Neill, Jr. (D-Mass)
 - Congressman John Rhodes (R-Ariz)
 - Congressman John McFall (D-Ca)
 - Congressman Bob Michel (R-Ill)
- 8:58 p. m. Depart Holding Room en route House Chamber, escorted by Mr. Ken Harding and Mr. Bill Wannell (Senate Sergeant at-Arms) and the Escort Committee en route center door of the House Chamber where you will pause.
- 9:00 p. m. Announcement by Jim Molloy, the Doorkeeper.
- 9:01 p. m. Proceed down center aisle, escorted by Jim Molloy and the Escort Committee, then around to your left to the Clerk's Desk (middle level) where you will remain standing. You will give a copy of the Address to both the Speaker of the House and the President Pro Tem of the Senate.

3.

9:02 p.m.

The Speaker calls the Joint Session to order and formally presents you.

9:03 p.m.

PRESIDENTIAL ADDRESS.

LIVE NATIONWIDE TELEVISION

9:30 p.m.

Address concludes. You depart House Chamber via the entrance route, escorted by the two Sergeants-at-Arms and the Escort Committee, and proceed to motorcade for boarding.

9:31 p.m.

Mrs. Ford and Jack and Susan depart their gallery seats en route motorcade.

9:34 p.m.

You are joined by Mrs. Ford and Jack and Susan in the hallway and proceed outside South Entrance, board the motorcade, and depart en route South Lawn.

9:45 p.m.

Arrive South Lawn.

#####

PRESIDENT FORD'S
FOREIGN POLICY ADDRESS TO CONGRESS

April 10, 1975

Major Points

In a major address to the Congress and the nation on the international situation and American foreign policy, the President stresses the imperative of dynamic American leadership in foreign affairs and calls for national unity, a strong defense and close partnership with Congress in meeting the challenges of today's world. He reaffirms his basic confidence in America's strengths, in "a time of testing and a time of change." He warns that no nation should doubt our resolve.

Noting that a "vast human tragedy has befallen our friends in Vietnam and Cambodia," the President asks Congress to provide the necessary military and humanitarian assistance in order to stabilize conditions and permit the chance of a negotiated settlement. He also requests the authority to use American forces if needed to evacuate Vietnamese to whom the U.S. has a special obligation along with American citizens. Without casting blame, he appeals to the Congress in the name of the national interest, because the United States "cannot abandon our friends while our adversaries support theirs."

Our relations with Japan are excellent; our friendship and solidarity are crucial to our mutual prosperity and to stability in Asia. The Emperor and Empress will visit the United States later this year.

Our relations with Western Europe have never been stronger. The President expects an early NATO Summit meeting in order to consult and reaffirm the cohesion and common destiny of the members.

Greece and Turkey are both valued allies. The President asks Congress to lift the American arms embargo against Turkey, an ally vital to the security of the West and to stability in the Eastern Mediterranean. There could be no better contribution to a just Cyprus settlement.

In the Middle East, the President reaffirmed that the United States is determined to continue its active role to prevent another war and help the parties achieve a peaceful settlement.

The President intends to continue to work with the Soviet Union to build a stable relationship and lessen international tensions. He believes that American strength and resolve are essential to detente. The attempt to use trade and economic sanctions to influence internal Soviet policies has been self-defeating. The President offers to work with the Congress to correct this situation and avoid further harm to our foreign policy.

The President will visit the People's Republic of China later this year to reaffirm our new relationship and to seek ways to accelerate the improvement in our relations.

On the new issues of global interdependence, the United States has a vital role of leadership in the areas of food, energy, use of the oceans, environment, and economic reform and development. The collaboration of the major energy consuming nations is a major success story of international cooperation. The strong domestic energy program proposed in January remains an urgent national need and a top priority for Congressional action.

The President calls for a strong defense posture and for Congressional cooperation in ensuring the effectiveness of our intelligence agencies, and warns against dismantling or demoralizing these vital national institutions.

The President emphasizes that "we are one nation, one government and we must have one foreign policy." He asks Congress to help keep America strong and its word good throughout the world, which looks to us for vigorous, constructive leadership. "We cannot afford indecision, disunity, or disarray in the conduct of our foreign affairs."

EMBARGOED FOR RELEASE
AT 9:00 P. M. , EDT

APRIL 10, 1975

Office of the White House Press Secretary

THE WHITE HOUSE

TEXT OF AN ADDRESS BY THE PRESIDENT
TO BE DELIVERED TO A JOINT SESSION OF CONGRESS

Mr. Speaker, Mr. President, distinguished guests, my good friends in the Congress and fellow Americans:

In my report on the State of the Union in January I concentrated on two subjects which were uppermost in the minds of the American people -- urgent actions for the recovery of our economy and a comprehensive program to make the United States independent of foreign sources of energy.

I thank the Congress for the action it has taken thus far in response to my economic recommendations. I look forward to early approval of a national energy program to meet our country's long range and emergency needs.

Tonight it is my purpose to review our relations with the rest of the world, in the spirit of candor and consultation which I have sought to maintain with my former colleagues and with our countrymen from the time I took office. It is the first priority of my Presidency to sustain and strengthen the mutual trust and respect which must exist among Americans and their government if we are to deal successfully with the challenges confronting us at home and abroad.

The leadership of the United States of America, since the end of World War II, has sustained and advanced the security, well-being and freedom of millions of human beings besides ourselves. Despite some mistakes and some setbacks, the United States has made peace a real prospect for us and for all nations. I know firsthand that Congress has been a partner in the development and support of the American foreign policy which five Presidents before me have carried forward, with changes of course but not of destination.

The course which our country chooses in the world today has never been of greater significance -- for ourselves as a nation and for all mankind.

We build from a solid foundation.

Our alliances with the great industrial democracies in Europe, North America and Japan remain strong, with a greater degree of consultation and equity than ever before.

With the Soviet Union we have moved across a broad front toward a more stable, if still competitive relationship. We have begun to control the spiral of strategic nuclear armaments.

After two decades of mutual estrangement we have achieved an historic opening with the People's Republic of China.

In the best American tradition we have committed -- often with striking success -- our influence and good offices to help contain conflicts and settle disputes in many regions of the world. We have, for example, helped the parties of the Middle East take the first steps toward living with one another in peace.

(MORE)

We have opened a new dialogue with Latin America looking toward a healthier hemispheric partnership. We are developing a closer relationship with the nations of Africa. We have exercised international leadership on the great new issues of our interdependent world, such as energy, food, environment and the law of the sea.

The American people can be proud of what their nation has achieved and helped others to accomplish. But we have, from time to time, suffered setbacks and disappointments in foreign policy. Some were events over which we had no control; some were difficulties we imposed upon ourselves.

We live in a time of testing and a time of change. Our world--a world of economic uncertainty, political unrest, and threats to the peace--does not allow us the luxury of abdication or domestic discord. I recall the words of President Truman to the Congress when the United States faced a far greater challenge at the end of the Second World War: "If we falter in our leadership, we may endanger the peace of the world--and we shall surely endanger the welfare of this nation."

President Truman's resolution must guide us today. Our purpose is not to point the finger of blame; but to build upon our many successes; to repair damage where we find it; to recover our balance; to move ahead as a united people. Tonight is a time for straight talk among friends about where we stand, and where we're going.

A vast human tragedy has befallen our friends in Vietnam and Cambodia.

Tonight I shall not talk only of obligations arising from legal documents. Who can forget the enormous sacrifices in blood, dedication and treasure that we made in Vietnam? Under five Presidents and seven Congresses the United States was engaged in Indochina. Millions of Americans served, thousands died, and many more were wounded, imprisoned, or lost. Over \$150 billion have been appropriated for that war by the Congress of the United States. And after years of effort, we negotiated under the most difficult circumstances a settlement which made it possible for us to remove our military forces and bring home with pride our prisoners. This settlement, if its terms had been adhered to, permitted our South Vietnamese ally, with our material and moral support, to maintain its security and rebuild after two decades of war.

The chances for an enduring peace after the last American fighting man left Vietnam in 1973 rested on two publicly stated premises: First, that if necessary the United States would help sustain the terms of the Paris Accords it signed two years ago; and second, that the United States would provide adequate economic and military assistance to South Vietnam. Let us refresh our memories for a moment. The universal consensus in the United States at that time was that if we could end our own involvement and obtain the release of our prisoners we would provide adequate material support to South Vietnam.

(MORE)

The North Vietnamese, from the moment they signed the Paris Accords, systematically violated the cease-fire and other provisions of the agreement. Flagrantly disregarding the ban on infiltration of troops into the South, they increased Communist forces to the unprecedented level of 350,000. In direct violation of the agreement, they sent in the most modern equipment in massive amounts. Meanwhile, they continued to receive large quantities of supplies and arms from their friends.

In the face of this situation, the United States -- torn as it was by the emotions of a decade of war -- was unable to respond. We deprived ourselves by law of the ability to enforce the agreement -- thus giving North Vietnam assurance that it could violate that agreement with impunity. Next we reduced our economic and arms aid to South Vietnam. Finally we signalled our increasing reluctance to give any support to that nation struggling for its survival.

Encouraged by these developments, the North Vietnamese in recent months began sending even their reserve divisions into South Vietnam. Eighteen divisions, virtually their entire army, are now in South Vietnam. The Government of South Vietnam, uncertain of further American assistance, hastily ordered a strategic withdrawal to more defensible positions. This extremely difficult maneuver, decided upon without consultations, was poorly executed, hampered by floods of refugees, and thus led to panic. The results are painfully obvious and profoundly moving.

In my first public comment on this tragic development, I called for a new sense of national unity and purpose. I said I would not engage in recriminations or attempts to assess blame.

In the same spirit I welcomed the statement of the distinguished Majority Leader of the United States Senate earlier this week that: "It is time for the Congress and the President to work together in the area of foreign as well as domestic policy."

Let us start afresh.

I am here to work with the Congress. In the conduct of foreign affairs, Presidential initiative and the ability to act swiftly in emergencies are essential to our national interest.

With respect to North Vietnam, I call upon Hanoi -- and ask the Congress to join me in this call -- to cease military operations immediately and to honor the terms of the Paris agreement. The United States is urgently requesting the signatories of the Paris Conference to meet their obligation to use their influence to halt the fighting and enforce the 1973 Accords. Diplomatic notes to this effect have been sent to all members of the Paris Conference, including the Soviet Union and the People's Republic of China.

The situation in South Vietnam and Cambodia has reached a critical phase requiring immediate and positive decisions by this government.

The options before us are few, and time is short.

- On the one hand, the United States could do nothing more; let the government of South Vietnam save itself and what is left of its territory if it can; let those South Vietnamese civilians who have worked with us for a decade save their lives and families if they can; in short, shut our eyes and wash our hands of the whole matter -- if we can.

(MORE)

- Or, on the other hand, I could ask Congress for authority to enforce the Paris Accords with our troops and our tanks and our aircraft and our artillery, and to carry the war to the enemy.

There are two narrower options:

- First, stick with my January request that the Congress appropriate \$300,000,000 for military assistance for South Vietnam and seek additional funds for economic and humanitarian purposes
- Or, increase my requests for both emergency military and humanitarian assistance to levels which by best estimates might enable the South Vietnamese to stem the onrushing aggression, to stabilize the military situation, permit the chance of a negotiated political settlement between the North and South Vietnamese, and, if the very worst were to happen, at least allow the orderly evacuation of Americans and endangered South Vietnamese to places of safety.

Let me now state my considerations and conclusions:

I have received a full report from General Weyand, whom I sent to Vietnam to assess the situation. He advises that the current military situation is critical, but that South Vietnam is continuing to defend itself with the resources available. However, he feels that if there is to be any chance of success for their defense plan, South Vietnam needs urgently an additional \$722 million in very specific military supplies from the United States. In my judgment, a stabilization of the military situation offers the best opportunity for a political solution.

I must, of course, consider the safety of some 6,000 Americans who remain in South Vietnam, and tens of thousands of South Vietnamese employees of the United States Government, of news agencies, of contractors and businesses for many years whose lives, with their dependents, are in grave peril. There are tens of thousands of other South Vietnamese intellectuals, professors and teachers, editors and opinion-leaders who have supported the South Vietnamese cause and the alliance with the United States, to whom we have a profound moral obligation.

I am also mindful of our posture toward the rest of the world, and particularly on our future relations with the free nations of Asia. These nations must not think for a minute that the United States is pulling out on them or intends to abandon them to aggression.

I have therefore concluded that the national interests of the United States and the cause of world stability require that we continue to give both military and humanitarian assistance to the South Vietnamese.

Assistance to South Vietnam at this stage must be swift and adequate. Drift and indecision invite far deeper disaster. The sums I had requested before the major North Vietnamese offensive and the sudden South Vietnamese retreat are obviously inadequate. Half-hearted action would be worse than none. We must act together and decisively.

MORE

I am asking the Congress to appropriate without delay \$722 million for emergency military assistance and an initial sum of \$250 million for economic and humanitarian aid for South Vietnam.

The situation in South Vietnam is changing rapidly and the need for emergency food, medicine and refugee relief is growing. I will work with the Congress in the days ahead to develop additional humanitarian assistance to meet these pressing needs.

Fundamental decency requires that we do everything in our power to ease the misery and pain of the monumental human crisis which has befallen the people of Vietnam. Millions have fled in the face of the Communist onslaught and are now homeless and destitute. I hereby pledge in the name of the American people that the United States will make a maximum humanitarian effort to help care for and feed them.

(60-days)

(1) War Power.
(2) Cooper-Church?

I ask Congress to clarify immediately its restrictions on the use of U.S. military forces in Southeast Asia for the limited purposes of protecting American lives by ensuring their evacuation, if this should become necessary.

I also ask prompt revision of the law to cover those Vietnamese to whom we have a special obligation and whose lives may be endangered, should the worst come to pass.

*rule to protect American lives.
Cong. authorize to retreat if some lives of hostilities? No authority now. Would risk themselves.*

I hope that this authority will never be used, but if it is needed there will be no time for Congressional debate.

Because of the urgency of the situation, I urge the Congress to complete action on all these measures not later than April 19.

In Cambodia the situation is tragic. The United States and the Cambodian Government have each made major efforts -- over a long period and through many channels -- to end that conflict. But because of their military successes, steady external support, and American legislative restrictions, the Communist side has shown no interest in negotiation, compromise, or a political solution.

And yet, for the past three months the beleaguered people of Phnom Penh have fought on, hoping against hope that the United States would not desert them, but instead provide the arms and ammunition they so badly need.

I have received a moving letter from the new acting President of Cambodia, Sautham Khoy.

"Dear Mr. President," he wrote. "As the American Congress reconvenes to reconsider your urgent request for supplemental assistance for the Khmer Republic, I appeal to you to convey to the American legislators our plea not to deny these vital resources to us, if a non-military solution is to emerge from this tragic 5 year old conflict.

"To find a peaceful end to the conflict we need time. I do not know how much time, but we all fully realize that the agony of the Khmer people cannot and must not go on much longer. However, for the immediate future, we need the rice to feed the hungry and the ammunition and weapons to defend ourselves against those who want to impose their will by force of arms. A denial by the American people of the means for us to carry on will leave us no alternative but inevitably abandoning our search for a solution which will give our citizens some freedom of choice as to their future. For a number of years now the Cambodian people have placed their trust in America. I cannot believe that this confidence was misplaced and that suddenly America will deny us the means which might give us a chance to find an acceptable solution to our conflict."

(MORE)



This letter speaks for itself. In January, I requested food and ammunition for the brave Cambodians. I regret to say that as of this evening, it may be too late.

Members of the Congress, my fellow Americans, this moment of tragedy for Indochina is a time of trial for us. It is a time for national resolve.

It has been said that the United States is overextended; that we have too many commitments too far from home; that we must re-examine what our truly vital interests are and shape our strategy to conform to them. I find no fault with this as theory, but in the real world such a course must be pursued carefully and in close coordination with solid progress toward overall reduction in worldwide tensions.

We cannot in the meantime abandon our friends while our adversaries support and encourage theirs. We cannot dismantle our defenses, our diplomacy or our intelligence capability while others increase and strengthen theirs.

Let us put an end to self-inflicted wounds. Let us remember that our national unity is a most priceless asset. Let us deny our adversaries the satisfaction of using Vietnam to pit Americans against Americans.

At this moment, Mr. President, Mr. Speaker, this nation must present to the world a united front.

Above all, let us keep events in Southeast Asia in their proper perspective. The security and progress of hundreds of millions of people everywhere depend importantly on us.

Let no potential adversary believe that our difficulties of our debates mean a slackening of our national will.

We will stand by our friends.

We will honor our commitments.

We will uphold our country's principles.

The American people know that our strength, our authority and our leadership have helped prevent a third World War for more than a generation. We will not shrink from this duty in the decades ahead.

Let me now review with you the basic elements of our foreign policy, speaking candidly about our strengths and our difficulties.

We must first of all face the fact that what has happened in Indochina has disquieted many of our friends, especially in Asia. We must deal with this situation promptly and firmly. To this end, I have already scheduled meetings with the leaders of Australia, New Zealand, Singapore and Indonesia, and I expect to meet with leaders of other Asian countries as well.

A key country in this respect is Japan. The warm welcome I received in Japan last November vividly symbolized for both our peoples the friendship and solidarity of this extraordinary partnership. I look forward with very special pleasure to welcoming the Emperor when he visits the United States later this year.

(MORE)

We consider our Security Treaty with Japan the cornerstone of stability in the vast reaches of Asia and the Pacific. Our relations are crucial to our mutual prosperity. Together we are working energetically on the international multilateral agenda--in trade, energy and food. We will continue the process of strengthening our friendship, mutual security and prosperity.

Also of fundamental importance is our mutual security relationship with the Republic of Korea, which I reaffirmed on my recent visit. Our relations with Western Europe have never been stronger. There are no peoples with whom America's destiny has been more closely linked. There are no peoples whose friendship and cooperation are more needed for the future. For none of the members of the Atlantic community can be secure, none can prosper, none can advance unless all do so together. More than ever, these times demand our close collaboration in order:

- to maintain the sure anchor of our common security in this time of international riptides;
- to work together on the promising negotiations with our potential adversaries;
- to pool our energies on the great new economic challenges that face us.

In addition to this traditional agenda, there are new problems, involving energy, raw materials, and the environment. The Atlantic nations face many and complex negotiations and decisions. It is time to take stock, to consult on our future, to affirm once again our cohesion and our common destiny. I therefore expect to join with the other leaders of the Atlantic Alliance, at a Western Summit in the very near future.

Before this NATO meeting, I earnestly ask Congress to weigh the broader consequences of its past actions on the complex Greek and Turkish dispute of Cyprus. Our foreign policy cannot be simply a collection of special economic or ethnic or ideological interests. There must be a concern for the overall design of our international actions. To achieve this design for peace and to assure that our individual acts have coherence, the Executive must have flexibility in the conduct of foreign policy.

United States military assistance to an old and faithful ally-Turkey--has been cut off by action of the Congress. This has imposed an embargo on military purchases by Turkey, extending even to items already paid for--an unprecedented act against a friend. These moves, I know, were sincerely intended to influence Turkey in the Cyprus negotiations. I deeply share the concern of many citizens for the immense human suffering on Cyprus. I sympathize with the new democratic government in Greece. We are continuing our earnest efforts about equitable solutions to the problems which exist between Greece and Turkey. But the result of the Congressional action has been:

- to block progress toward reconciliation, thereby prolonging the suffering on Cyprus;
- to complicate our ability to promote successful negotiations:

(MORE)

-- to increase the danger of a broader conflict.

Our longstanding relationship with Turkey is not simply a favor to Turkey; it is clear and essential mutual interest. Turkey lies on the rim of the Soviet Union and at the gates to the Middle East. It is vital to the security of the eastern Mediterranean, the southern flank of Western Europe and the collective security of the Western Alliance. Our U.S. military bases in Turkey are as critical to our own security as they are to the defense of NATO.

I therefore call upon the Congress to lift the American arms embargo against our Turkish ally by passing the bipartisan Mansfield-Scott Bill, now before the Senate. Only this will enable us to work with Greece and Turkey to resolve the differences between our two allies. I accept -- and indeed welcome -- the bill's requirement for monthly reports to the Congress on progress toward a Cyprus settlement. But unless this is done with dispatch, forces may be set in motion within and between the two nations which could not be reversed.

At the same time, in order to strengthen the democratic government of Greece, and to reaffirm our traditional ties with the people of Greece, we are actively discussing a program of economic and military assistance. We will shortly be submitting specific requests to the Congress.

A vital element of our foreign policy is our relationship with the developing countries -- in Africa, Asia and Latin America. These countries must know that America is a true and concerned friend, reliable in word and deed.

As evidence of this friendship, I urge the Congress to reconsider one provision of the 1974 Trade Act which has had an unfortunate and unintended impact on our relations with Latin America, where we have such long ties of friendship and cooperation. Under this legislation all members of OPEC were excluded from our generalized system of trade preferences. This punished two old South American friends, Ecuador and Venezuela, as well as other OPEC nations such as Nigeria and Indonesia none of which participated in last year's oil embargo. This exclusion has seriously complicated our new dialogue with our friends in this hemisphere.

I therefore endorse the amendments which have been introduced in the Congress to provide Executive authority to waive those restrictions of the Trade Act that are incompatible with our national interest.

The interests of America as well as our allies are vitally affected by what happens in the Middle East. So long as the state of tension continues, it threatens military crisis, the weakening of our alliances, the stability of the world economy, and confrontation among the nuclear superpowers. These are intolerable risks.

Because we are in the unique position of being able to deal with all the parties, we have at their request been engaged for the past year and a half in a peacemaking effort unparalleled in the history of the region.

(MORE)

Our policy has brought remarkable successes on the road to peace. Last year two major disengagement agreements were negotiated and implemented with our help. For the first time in 30 years a process of negotiation on the basic political issues was begun -- and is continuing.

Unfortunately, the latest efforts to reach a further interim agreement between Israel and Egypt have been suspended. The issues dividing the parties are vital to them and not amenable to easy or quick solutions. However, the United States will not be discouraged.

The momentum toward peace that has been achieved over the last 18 months must and will be maintained.

The active role of the United States must and will be continued. The draft toward war must and will be prevented.

I pledge the United States to a major effort for peace in the Middle East -- an effort which I know has the solid support of the American people and their Congress. We are now examining how best to proceed. We have agreed in principle to reconvene the Geneva conference. We are prepared as well to explore other forums. The United States will move ahead on whatever course looks most promising, either towards an overall settlement or interim agreements, should the parties desire them. We will not accept stagnation or a stalemate, with all its attendant risks to peace and prosperity and to our relations in and outside of the region.

The national interest -- and national security -- require as well that we reduce the dangers of war. We shall strive to do so by continuing to improve relations with potential adversaries.

The United States and the Soviet Union share an interest in lessening tensions and building a more stable relationship. During this process we have never had any illusions. We know that we are dealing with a nation that reflects different principles and is our competitor in many parts of the globe. Through a combination of firmness and flexibility, the United States has in recent years laid the basis of a more reliable relationship founded on mutual interest and mutual restraint. But we cannot expect the Soviet Union to show restraint in the face of United States weakness or irresolution. As long as I am President, America will maintain its strength, its alliances, and its principles -- as a prerequisite to a more peaceful planet. As long as I am President, we will not permit detente to become a license to fish in troubled waters. Detente must be a two-way street.

Central to U.S. - Soviet relations today is the critical negotiation to control strategic nuclear weapons. We hope to turn the Vladivostok agreements into a final agreement this year at the time of General Secretary Brezhnev's visit to the United States. Such an agreement would for the first time put a ceiling on the strategic arms race. It would mark a turning point in postwar history and would be a crucial step in lifting from mankind the threat of nuclear war.

Our use of trade and economic sanctions as weapons to alter the internal conduct of other nations must also be seriously re-examined. However well-intentioned the goals, the fact is that some of our recent actions in the economic field have been self-defeating. They are not achieving the objectives intended by the Congress. And they have damaged our foreign policy.

MORE

The Trade Act of 1974 prohibits most-favored nation treatment, credit and investment guarantees and commercial agreements with the Soviet Union so long as their emigration policies fail to meet our criteria. The Soviet Union has therefore refused to put into effect the important 1972 trade agreement between our two countries.

As a result, Western Europe and Japan have stepped into the breach. They have extended credits exceeding \$8 billion in the last six months. These are economic opportunities -- jobs and business -- which could have gone to Americans.

There should be no illusions about the nature of the Soviet system -- but there should also be no illusions about how to deal with it. Our belief in the right of peoples of the world freely to emigrate has been well demonstrated. This legislation, however, not only harmed our relations with the Soviet Union but it seriously complicated the prospects of those seeking to emigrate. The favorable trend, aided by our quiet diplomacy, by which emigration increased from 400 in 1968 to over 33,000 in 1973, has been seriously set back. Remedial legislation is urgently needed to further our national interest.

With the People's Republic of China we are firmly fixed on the course set forth in the Shanghai Communique. Stability in Asia and the world require our constructive relations with one-fourth of the human race. After two decades of mutual isolation and hostility, we have in recent years built a promising foundation. Deep differences in our philosophies and social systems will endure. But so should our mutual long-term interests and the goals to which our countries have jointly subscribed in Shanghai.

I will visit China later this year to reaffirm these interests and to accelerate the improvement in our relations.

The issues I have discussed are the most pressing on the traditional agenda of foreign policy. But ahead of us also is a vast new agenda of issues in an interdependent world. The United States -- with its economic power, its technology, its zest for new horizons -- is the acknowledged world leader in dealing with many of these challenges. If this is a moment of uncertainty in the world, it is even more a moment of rare opportunity:

- We are summoned to meet one of man's most basic challenges -- hunger. At the World Food Conference last November in Rome, the United States outlined a comprehensive program to close the ominous gap between population growth and food production over the long-term. Our technological skill and our enormous productive capacity are crucial to accomplishing this task.
- The old order -- in trade, finance, and raw materials -- is changing, and American leadership is needed in the creation of new institutions and practices for worldwide prosperity and progress.
- The world's oceans, with their immense resources and strategic importance, must become areas of cooperation rather than conflict. American policy is directed to that end.
- Technology must be harnessed to the service of mankind while protecting the environment. This too is an arena for American leadership.

(MORE)

-- The interests and aspirations of the developed and developing nations must be reconciled in a manner that is both realistic and humane. This is our goal in this new era.

One of the finest success stories in our foreign policy is our cooperative effort with other major energy-consuming nations. In little more than a year, together with our partners,

- we have created the International Energy Agency;
- we have negotiated an emergency sharing arrangement which helps to reduce the dangers of an embargo;
- we have launched major international conservation efforts;
- we have developed a massive program for the development of alternative sources of energy.

But the fate of all of these programs depends crucially on what we do at home. Every month that passes brings us closer to the day when we will be dependent on imported energy for 50% of our requirements. A new embargo under these conditions would have a devastating impact on jobs, industrial expansion, and inflation at home. Our economy cannot be left to the mercy of decisions over which we have no control.

I call upon the Congress to act.

In a world where information is power, a vital element of our national security lies in our intelligence services. They are as essential to our nation's security in peace as in war. Americans can be grateful for the important, but largely unsung, contributions and achievements of the intelligence services of this nation.

It is entirely proper that this system be subject to Congressional review. But a sensationalized public debate over legitimate intelligence activities is a disservice to this nation and a threat to our intelligence system. It ties our hands while our potential enemies operate with secrecy, skill and vast resources. Any investigation must be conducted with maximum discretion and dispatch, to avoid crippling a vital national institution.

As Congress oversees intelligence activities it must organize itself to do so in a responsible way. It has been traditional for the Executive to consult with the Congress through specially-protected procedures that safeguard essential secrets. But recently those procedures have been altered in a way that makes the protection of vital information next to impossible. I will work with the leaders of the House and Senate to devise procedures which will meet the needs of the Congress for review and the needs of the nation for an effective intelligence service.

Underlying any successful foreign policy is the strength and credibility of our defense posture.

We are strong and we are ready. We intend to remain so.

Improvement of relations with adversaries does not mean any relaxation of our national vigilance. On the contrary, it is the firm maintenance of both strength and vigilance that makes possible steady progress toward a safer and more peaceful world.

(MORE)

The national security budget I have submitted is the minimum the United States needs in this critical hour. The Congress should review it carefully. But it is my considered judgment that any significant reduction would endanger our national security and thus jeopardize the peace.

Let no ally doubt our determination to maintain a defense second to none. Let no adversary be tempted to test our readiness or our resolve.

History is testing us today. We cannot afford indecision, disunity or disarray in the conduct of our foreign affairs.

You and I can resolve here and now that this nation shall move ahead with wisdom, assurance, and national unity.

The world looks to us for the vigor and vision that we have demonstrated so often before at great moments in our history.

--I see a confident America, secure in its strength and values--and determined to maintain both.

--I see a consiliatory America, extending its hand to allies and adversaries alike, forming bonds of cooperation to deal with the vast problems facing us all.

--I see a compassionate America, its heart reaching out to orphans, to refugees and to our fellow human beings afflicted by war and tyranny and hunger.

As President, entrusted by the Constitution with primary responsibility for the conduct of our foreign affairs, I renew the pledge I made last August: To work cooperatively with the Congress.

I ask that the Congress help to keep America's word good throughout the world. We are one nation, one government, and we must have one foreign policy.

In an hour far darker than this, Abraham Lincoln told his fellow citizens:

"We cannot escape history. We of this Congress and this Administration will be remembered in spite of ourselves. No personal significance or insignificance can spare one or another of us."

We who are entrusted by the people with the great decisions that fashion their future can escape neither our responsibilities nor our consciences.

By what we do now the world will know our courage, our constancy, and our compassion.

The spirit of America is good and the heart of America is strong. Let us be proud of what we have done and confident of what we can yet do. And may God ever guide us to do what is right.

#

THE WHITE HOUSE
WASHINGTON

LATEST PHONE CALL UPDATE

As of 10 a.m. April 11

Pro: 253
Con: 294
Comment: 3

THE WHITE HOUSE
WASHINGTON

4/11/75

PHONE CALL UPDATE AS OF 4:00 PM

PRO	443
CON	1125
COMMENT	164

TELEGRAM UPDATE AS OF 4:00 PM

PRO	590
CON	1311
COMMENT	208

Foreign Policy Address - April 10, 1975

TELEGRAM COUNT

(as of 10:10 p.m. - April 10, 1975)

PRO----- 8
CON ----- 100
COMMENT ----- 9

(as of 10:30 p.m.)

PRO ----- 18
CON ----- 140
COMMENT ----- 17

(as of 10:45 p.m.)

PRO ----- 27
CON ----- 170
COMMENT ----- 24

(as of 10:45 p.m. Western Union has a back-log of 500 in their computer)

(as of 11:00 p.m.)

PRO -----29
CON ----- 195
COMMENT ----- 26

NBC via Phone:

THE WHITE HOUSE
WASHINGTON

Podsi:

"The blood of 6,000 Americans
could be on the hands of
Congress if they do not
approve the money and
clarify the Law."

Why not an immediate
evacuation.

↑
Call shown
to be inaccurate
transcript.



THE WHITE HOUSE

WASHINGTON

April 11, 1975

Mr. President:

Here is a transcript of what Vice President Rockefeller actually said during the NBC interview.

The earlier quote "blood on their hands" was phoned to us by NBC but as you can see by the attached transcript, the Vice President never said it. Therefore, no White House reaction is needed or will be given.

Ron Nessen

Attachment

NBC on ROCKEFELLER -- Friday, April 11, 1975

A. When the Members of Congress face, as I think they have to face, the question of whether they are going to let 6,000 Americans stay and perhaps all of them be executed -- lose their lives -- or whether they are going to take the steps necessary to avoid that possibility, that they will choose for the latter.

Q. Do you think the safety of the 6,000 Americans depends on the \$700 million?

A. I think it is dependent upon the change of the law and the funds.

THE WHITE HOUSE
WASHINGTON

April 11, 1975

Mr. President:

Here is a transcript of what Vice President Rockefeller actually said during the NBC interview.

The earlier quote "blood on their hands" was phoned to us by NBC but as you can see by the attached transcript, the Vice President never said it. Therefore, no White House reaction is needed or will be given.

Ron Nessen

Attachment

NBC on ROCKEFELLER -- Friday, April 11, 1975

A. When the Members of Congress face, as I think they have to face, the question of whether they are going to let 6,000 Americans stay and perhaps all of them be executed -- lose their lives -- or whether they are going to take the steps necessary to avoid that possibility, that they will choose for the latter.

Q. Do you think the safety of the 6,000 Americans depends on the \$700 million?

A. I think it is dependent upon the change of the law and the funds.

THE WHITE HOUSE
WASHINGTON

TELEPHONE CALL UPDATE AS OF 5:45 PM

525	PRO
549	CON
4	COMMENT

TELEGRAM UPDATE AS OF 5:45 PM

645	PRO
1,360	CON
238	COMMENT

TELEPHONE COUNT

(as of 10:45 p.m. - April 10)

PRO ----- 106

CON ----- 164

COMMENT ----- 1

PHONE CALLS

4/11/75

As of midnight last night

223 Pro

258 Con

2 Comment

LATEST PHONE CALL UPDATE

As of 10 a.m. April 11

Pro: 253

Con: 294

Comment: 3



THE WHITE HOUSE
WASHINGTON

TELEGRAMS

4/11/75

As of 8:00 AM

376 Pro

953 Con

111 Comment

FOR IMMEDIATE RELEASE

April 11, 1975

Office of the White House Press Secretary

THE WHITE HOUSE

TEXT OF LETTERS FROM THE PRESIDENT TO THE
SPEAKER OF THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
AND THE PRESIDENT OF THE SENATE

April 11, 1975

Dear Mr. Speaker: (Dear Mr. President:)

I hereby transmit draft legislation to carry out the recommendations made in my April 10, 1975 address to the Congress with respect to Indochina.

The enclosed draft bills authorize additional military, economic, and humanitarian assistance for South Vietnam, and also clarify the availability of funds for the use of the Armed Forces of the United States for humanitarian evacuation in Indochina, should this become necessary.

I urge the immediate consideration and enactment of these measures.

Sincerely,

GERALD R. FORD

#

A BILL

To authorize additional military assistance for
South Vietnam, and for other purposes.

1 Be it enacted by the Senate and the
2 House of Representatives of the United States
3 of America in Congress assembled, That para-
4 graph (1) of section 401(a) and subsection
5 (b) of Public Law 89-367, approved March 15,
6 1966 (80 Stat. 37), as amended, are amended by
7 striking out "\$1,000,000,000" each place it
8 appears and inserting in lieu thereof
9 "\$1,422,000,000".

A BILL

To authorize additional economic assistance for
South Vietnam, and for other purposes.

1. Be it enacted by the Senate and the House
2 of Representatives of the United States of
3 America in Congress assembled, That, in addition
4 to amounts otherwise authorized for such purposes,
5 there is authorized to be appropriated to the
6 President not to exceed \$73,000,000 to carry out
7 the purposes of part V of the Foreign Assistance
8 Act of 1961, as amended, for South Vietnam for
9 the fiscal year 1975. Funds made available for
10 economic and humanitarian assistance for Indo-
11 china shall be available after the date of
12 enactment of this Act for obligation without
13 regard to the limitations contained in sections
14 36 and 38 of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1974,
15 Public Law 93-559, approved December 30, 1974 (88
16 Stat. 1795).

A BILL

To clarify restrictions on the availability of funds
for the use of United States Armed Forces in
Indochina, and for other purposes.

1 Be it enacted by the Senate and the House
2 of Representatives of the United States of
3 America in Congress assembled, That nothing
4 contained in section 839 of Public Law 93-437,
5 section 741 of Public Law 93-238, section 30 of
6 Public Law 93-189, section 806 of Public Law 93-155,
7 section 13 of Public Law 93-126, section 108 of
8 Public Law 93-52, section 307 of Public Law 93-50,
9 or any other comparable provision of law shall be
10 construed as limiting the availability of funds
11 for the use of the Armed Forces of the United
12 States to aid, assist, and carry out humanitarian
13 evacuation, if ordered by the President.

THE WHITE HOUSE

WASHINGTON

April 11, 1975

MEMORANDUM FOR: GENERAL SCOWCROFT

FROM: RON NESSEN

Here is a list of questions most likely to be asked at my news briefing, growing out of the President's speech last night.

May I have the answers by 11 a. m. ?

Thank you.

April 10, 1975

PRESS QUESTIONS - THE PRESIDENT'S STATE OF THE WORLD SPEECH

1. The President called upon Hanoi to cease military operations immediately and to honor the terms of the Paris Agreement. How does the United States plan to do this?
2. He said that the United States is urgently requesting the signatories of the Paris Conference to meet their obligation to use their influence to halt the fighting and to enforce the 1973 Accords. Will he call for a plenary meeting of the signatories?
3. He said that diplomatic notes have been sent to all members of the Paris Conference including the Soviet Union and the Peoples' Republic of China. When were these notes sent, through what channels and what, in reality, do you expect to come out of this initiative, particularly in the case of China and the USSR who are the principal suppliers of the enemy. Release text of notes?
4. President Ford spoke of "permitting the chance of a negotiated political settlement between the North and South Vietnamese." Are we promoting or arranging such a settlement and does this mean that we are prepared to agree to an arrangement, if necessary, for the removal of President Thieu?
5. When will the bills requesting an additional \$722 million for emergency military assistance and an initial sum of \$250 million for economic and humanitarian aid for South Vietnam be submitted to the Congress?
6. The President says that he will work with the Congress in the days ahead to develop additional humanitarian assistance. Is the President speaking of a bilateral program or would he be willing to channel these funds through international organizations?
7. Specifically, how will the President ask Congress to clarify immediately its restrictions on the use of U. S. military forces in Southeast Asia for the limited purposes of protecting American lives by ensuring their evacuation? Will he submit recommended draft legislation to this effect or how does he expect the Congress to proceed?

8. What has happened to aid to Cambodia? The President said that "it may be soon too late." Does he still want \$222 million in assistance for Cambodia?

9. When and where will the scheduled meetings with the leaders of Australia, New Zealand, Singapore and Indonesia take place. Will it be a joint meeting? When and where will he meet with "leaders of other Asian countries?" Will he visit those countries or invite their leaders to Washington? Will they be bilateral sessions or is he calling for an emergency summit of Asian powers?

10. Where and when will the Western summit be held? What will the agenda cover?

11. When will the President submit specific requests to the Congress for economic and military assistance to Greece? What are the amounts and categories of assistance?

12. With respect to the Middle East, the President said we have agreed in principle to reconvene the Geneva Conference but we are prepared as well to explore other forums. Is he talking about sending Secretary Kissinger back to the Middle East? Or is he considering asking Middle Eastern leaders to come to Washington? What would be the timing? Is the U.S. now prepared to offer detailed settlement proposals of its own?

13. What does the President intend to do specifically with respect to requesting "remedial legislation" to deal with the matter of trade with the Soviet Union?

14. Why didn't the President mention the critical situation in Portugal at any point in this major speech on foreign affairs?

15. The President said that it has been traditional for the Executive to consult with the Congress through specially-protected procedures that safeguard essential secrets but that recently those procedures have been altered in a way that makes the protection of vital information next to impossible. In what way have those procedures been altered? Who is responsible for such alteration? As a result of this action has any vital information become public? How will the President work with the leaders of the House and Senate to devise new procedures? Will he include in his recommendation safeguards to make certain that our intelligence services can no longer be used for unconstitutional domestic spy operations.

16. How many endangered South Vietnamese would have to be evacuated? Where would they be taken?
17. Why didn't the President talk about evacuating Cambodians who have been associated with the United States? Does he plan to evacuate any Cambodians? If so under what authority? Why didn't the President ask for a clarification of the law relating to military forces in connection with an evacuation of Americans from Phnom Penh?
18. Why did the President select April 19 as the deadline for Congressional approval of his Indochina proposals?
19. If Congress gives permission for American troops to be used for the evacuation of Americans and Vietnamese would these American troops be authorized to shoot back if shot at? Could American air power be used as part of an evacuation plan?
20. What did the President mean when he said, "We cannot expect the Soviet Union to show restraint in the face of United States weakness or irresolution?"

THE WHITE HOUSE
WASHINGTON

TELEGRAM UPDATE -- 4/15/75 9:30 AM

1,114 PRO

1,671 CON

455 COMMENT

PHONE CALL UPDATE 9:30 AM

593 PRO

578 CON

9 COMMENT

THE WHITE HOUSE
WASHINGTON

4/14/75

TELEPHONE CALL UPDATE
AS OF 10:30 AM

PRO -- 569

CON -- 565

COMMENT -- 5

TELEGRAM UPDATE AS OF
9:30 AM

PRO -- 989

CON -- 1,626

COMMENT -- 432

Out of the Past

The foreign policy that President Ford outlined to Congress Thursday night was out of the past. That was reassuring as it affected the broad design for detente, for a stronger Atlantic community and for economic commitments to a largely developing world. But it was, in terms of events in Indochina, a monumental disappointment.

To the new Asian crisis he gave the old answer: more American arms, and more American economic assistance.

Only in connection with Cambodia was there a new tone of reality—recognizing the defeat, the necessity to withhold any further military assistance for the good of the suffering Cambodians themselves.

But he drew a sharp distinction between the hopelessness of Cambodia and the situation in South Vietnam. For Saigon, he proposed not only \$250 million in humanitarian assistance, so obviously needed, but also \$722 million more in arms to supplement the \$700 million already authorized for this fiscal year.

"So let's start afresh," he had said. But what came was a stale concoction, a missed opportunity, a lapse of leadership.

Gen. Frederick C. Weyand, Army chief of staff, had proposed the level of new military aid after a personal inspection, the President reported. Extraordinary. Here, in the face of overwhelming evidence of defeat, of the uselessness of prolonging the battle, were the head of the American Army and the American President calling for a massive new intrusion of arms.

Furthermore, the President appealed for clarifications from Congress to broaden his authority to

use American armed forces to evacuate Americans "if this should be necessary," without ever explaining why these Americans are not now being removed, before they are caught in the crossfire, before their removal raises the danger of another confrontation between American armed forces and Vietnamese armed forces.

And he has asked Congress to reconsider the limitations it placed on his use of the armed forces in another sense, to make possible the protection of Vietnamese who have worked with the United States, an authority ambiguous enough to invite quick rejection by Congress.

In the address, Ford appealed for unity, for cooperation with Congress. Yet he also repeated his recriminations against Congress in connection with the impending fall of Phnom Penh—recriminations as absurd as they are destructive.

If there was candor in the speech, it was the recognition of doubt that has accompanied recent setbacks for American foreign policy not only in Asia but also in the Middle East and Europe. It was useful for Ford to reaffirm the dependability of the United States as an ally.

But he would have been more persuasive if he could have drawn a clear distinction between the acceptance of defeat in Indochina and the commitment to peace and stability in the Middle East and Europe. His proposal for more guns for Saigon inevitably communicated the continuing failure of American leaders to accept a mistake of the past and chart a surer course for the future.

Vietnam has had more than enough bullets. To send any more would only enlarge the suffering. It is food and medicine that the Vietnamese now need, to cushion the shock of the final tragedy.

Mercy for Our Own

The words compassion and humanitarianism are being heard more often in this country as the horror mounts in South Vietnam and Cambodia. But that same spirit of mercy is being denied American casualties of the conflict in Southeast Asia.

We support, then, a bipartisan effort in the U.S. Senate to revive the prospect of amnesty for young Americans guilty of violating military and draft laws during the Vietnam era.

Only 24,000 of the 125,000 eligible for clemency had taken advantage of it when President Ford's deadline for applications ran out March 31. But that was no reason for closing the door on the 101,000 who had not yet come forward.

In fact, the President chose not to extend the deadline exactly when violators were responding in ever-greater numbers.

Sens. Gaylord Nelson (D-Wis.) and Jacob K. Javits (R-N.Y.) are coauthors of legislation that would remove all time limits for clemency applications. They argue, and we agree, that there are huge

numbers of young Americans who have violated the law to continue to base their case on false grounds—that most violators are military deserters or draft dodgers who fled the country to avoid war service. But only one in seven falls into that category. The rest are veterans who left the service with less-than-honorable discharges, or civilians who already have paid the penalty for draft offenses. For these, clemency is no more than an opportunity to clear their records.

The Nelson-Javits legislation contains two other recommendations, both affecting violators living abroad. One would let them come back and submit themselves to clemency procedures, but return to their countries of refuge if they found the clemency board's decisions unacceptable. Another recommendation is that draft evaders and military deserters living abroad should be given 30-day non-immigrant visas once a year to visit their families in this country.

Those proposals probably will encounter stiff opposition in Congress. But logic and compassion

tion" to enable intelligent decisions communities, and

I am willing ment views in t you at the sam that you have di refute those vi that you are n rather meeting y

But I have dou ple, the news is profits (especiall yet polls show t people are convi something like s actual profits.

I become distu stories tell us profits have dras they express the lars or as a pe profits. Those fig perspective by sh a percent of sales and fair story." company's incret overseas, while, tually lost mone was practically Such stories lea tions that most profits.

I share your quoting of name concern about t large newspaper. But I am equ the practice of when that person ly on a subject little informati ty to be accurat of such quotes a consumer advoc at an industry basis. This also ir ment people who ty to accuracy. curate, not only readers but may people.

I do indeed ag —and other powerful. I agre bad if they lost t trol what they every freedom as title of the article not, however, be established, be too much toward press and not en sponsibility of the

As a reader 1934, albeit not its editorial pers handed treatme establishment n congratulate T seen self-assess tate. If his contem



MEDIA REACTION REPORT

WORLDWIDE TREATMENT OF CURRENT ISSUES

President's Foreign Policy Address

No. 30

April 14, 1975

interroge
lilité
européen

Le Monde

Frankfurter Allgemeine

賣新聞

EL TIEMPO

YOMIURI SHIMBUN

THE TIMES



STANDARD

Aftenposten

AUSTRALIAN

EUROPE 1

Straits Times

TADO DE S. PA

2161111

XATLAC DAILY

The Economist

FIGARO LA LIBRE BELGI

CORRIERE DELLA SERA DAGENS

The Daily Telegraph



ПРАВДА

Summary

Foreign media gave extensive coverage to President Ford's foreign policy address to Congress. Widespread comment included satisfaction and disappointment, praise and criticism, and indications that for some he had left a number of questions unanswered.

Observers felt that in his attempt "to restore faith in the foreign policy of the U.S.," Mr. Ford "succeeded only to a limited extent" (The Times of London). They judged nevertheless, as the foreign editor of Turin's La Stampa pointed out, that "the impact of the Indochinese debacle on American credibility... must not be overestimated (for) the American superpower still carries weight..."

Those who had looked for radically new directions in U.S. foreign policy professed disappointment: "Worn-out rhetoric, old patterns of thought and out-of-date policy proposals..." (NRC Handelsblad, Rotterdam); the speech "lacked logical consistency and showed impatience in America's foreign policy" (NHK television, Japan); "the monologue of a powerless person" (Die Welt, Hamburg).

A few were reassured, but some of them not entirely. Seoul's Hankuk Ilbo, for instance, declared: "The U.S. Government's attitude is encouraging... but we are worried about the future attitude of the Congress and public opinion."

Many analysts puzzled over the President's tactic in increasing his request for aid, wondering with The Sunday Times' Henry Brandon "whether he was still hoping to salvage something of South Vietnam or whether it was just a game of mirrors to prevent an immediate collapse."

London: Awareness of Ford Dilemma

Britain's influential Sunday papers and the "quality" press of Saturday and today reported widely on the Indochina situation and commented on President Ford's Thursday evening address, generally in tones sympathetic to the President in his multi-faceted dilemma.

"Stressed U.S. Responsibility for Evacuation"

The independent London Financial Times today saw Congress facing "its most difficult decision" on the question of evacuation of Saigon, now considered inevitable--"the only possible interpretation of President Ford's foreign policy address." It said "experience suggests that (the Congress) will not lightly abandon American citizens to their fate, but the rescue of tens of thousands of Vietnamese in conditions that could be appallingly adverse is another matter.

"Yet the thought clearly running through President Ford's address was that the U.S. has a responsibility to attempt it. Even with the end in sight, there is no escape from the dilemma."

"Arms Request a Blind"

Washington correspondent Fred Emery* reported today in the independent Times of London that "the most senior Administration officials have told their staffs that Mr. Ford's new request for arms for Saigon has significance only as a 'blind' to mislead the South Vietnamese. It is suggested that Congress need have no worry that the money will ever be spent--because the collapse would come well before that. But Congress is being asked to go through the motions of appropriation in the hope of holding potentially hostile South Vietnamese forces at bay.

"The only justification offered for this cynicism is desperation based on the assumption that disaster in Saigon could be only hours away."

"Restored Faith--to an Extent"

On Saturday the paper said that in his Thursday speech Mr. Ford "did his best... to restore faith in the foreign policy of the U.S.

"He succeeded only to a limited extent... But there will be no sudden world-wide loss of confidence in the U.S. if South Vietnam collapses.

"People are mostly perceptive enough to understand the differences between Vietnam and other areas of American interest. They also see that the acceptance of failure in one area does not lead automatically to loss of will everywhere.

"On the other hand, there is no doubt that the U.S. is going through a very difficult phase and that its position in the world could be badly eroded over the next few years if it does not rediscover a role which it can pursue with confidence and a reasonable degree of political unity. The width of the present gulf between the Executive and Congress means that the Executive cannot negotiate effectively with foreign governments because nobody can be sure whether it will be backed by Congress."

The paper held that "diminishing" U.S. power to sustain its influence in the world caused the Western world to become "less confident of its defenses against both external military pressure and internal threats to its institutions and its political principles." Nevertheless, it added, if the U.S. "can still convince people of the success of its political system and of its basic dedication to freedom, justice and social progress, it will not be by any means without influence.

"It could even become stronger if it gives up some of its imperial policy for a slightly narrow definition of national interests-- provided the definition is not too narrow. It need not be, and judging by President Ford's speech, it is not."

"Profound Concern About Uncertainties"

Henry Brandon, Washington correspondent of the independent London Sunday Times, suggested that "behind the solemnity of President Ford's address... lay his profound concern about the nature of the final drama now being played out in South Vietnam.

"The dire uncertainties inherent in the situation presented Mr. Ford with a pitiful conundrum of options before his speech. He had to plan for a sudden surrender and the panic it could create; for an orderly surrender; for no surrender but bitter last-ditch fighting; for continued resistance by the South Vietnamese; and for a political rather than a military settlement.

"No wonder his request for \$722 million of military aid left many wondering whether he was still hoping to salvage something of South Vietnam or whether it was just a game of mirrors to prevent an immediate collapse in Saigon."

The latter hypothesis emerged also in comments by the independent London Sunday Observer, the conservative Sunday Telegraph, and the liberal Manchester Guardian.

Report of "Decision to Abandon"

Washington correspondent Simon Winchester reported in The Guardian on Saturday that "the White House and the Pentagon were privately undismayed... at the wave of opposition that has swamped Washington" on the President's aid request because, "in spite of the tough tone of the President's speech, it has now been learned from senior Government sources that a decision has been taken effectively to abandon South Vietnam and Cambodia. That decision is being backed by military advice that any proposed evacuation of 'loyal' Vietnamese from the battle zone would be logistically impossible and consequently not worth undertaking."

"Not Necessarily Hypocritical"

In an editorial, the paper was more generous in interpreting Administration motives and the President's feelings in making the aid request, saying that "perhaps, in anguish, he is trying to show the South Vietnamese that he tried. Perhaps he hopes that if he gives the Congressmen the chance to snub him to the tune of \$722 millions for military purposes they will be more inclined to give him \$250 millions for humanitarian ones.

"In either case, the motive would not be ignoble. Nor is it necessarily hypocritical. In spite of the objectionable publicity which surrounded the baby lift there is no reason to doubt that the President is deeply concerned about the likelihood of suffering in South Vietnam and about the fate of people who have helped the Americans."

The conservative Daily Telegraph said on Saturday that "while there is much sympathy for Mr. Ford's predicament and some admiration for the way he has emphasized the implications of the Vietnamese debacle, there is little hope of any

British initiative to help. Officials point out that the chances of getting China, Russia, Poland, Hungary, and other signatories of the February agreement to find common cause on halting the Communist advance were nil.

"Whitehall has, however, drawn some satisfaction from the President's readiness to fly to Europe at the end of May for a NATO meeting to thrash out Western policies."

"Not an Opening for Soviet Gambits"

In an editorial, the paper concluded that there was "no reason for America's allies in other parts of the world to feel that their alliances with America have immediately become so much waste paper because of what has happened in Indochina.

"All nations have to learn, and the U.S. is relatively new to the world power game, just as Russia is. Conversely, it would be the height of folly and danger for herself for Russian to feel that the way was now open to her for daring gambits. Americans can turn very quickly."

West Germany: Critical Tone of Treatment

The tone of West German press and television comment on President Ford's speech was generally critical. However, some writers credited him with attempting to chart the future U.S. policy role in Asia and the world.

Several papers including independent General-Anzeiger of Bonn carried the report of Washington correspondent Emil Boelte that "Asia is the nerve point in Ford's policy" and his assertion that the President "took no heed of public opinion in his demands regarding Saigon."

Boelte judged that it was not surprising that Democratic leaders reacted with "puzzled disagreement...to the high and mighty demands to supply Saigon with replaceable weapons" for those it had "lost, thrown away or surrendered..."

"He did in fact go beyond Vietnam to sketch a future U.S. policy in Asia. As key countries for Asian stability he named Japan and South Korea.... Turning still further from the subject of Vietnam, he went into contemplation of continuing detente efforts with the USSR and China..."

"The reason Ford avoided making threats to Hanoi in his speech to Congress was this: The President could appeal, as he did, to Hanoi to halt at once the advances of the whole North Vietnamese army. But he knew he could not back up his demand to Hanoi since Congress has made any U.S. military engagement impossible...

"All in all, Ford summed up everything for many countries when he said it is time to take inventory and to consult about the future."

"Self-confidence Could Be Contagious"

Washington correspondent Herbert von Borch reported in left-of-center Sued-deutsche Zeitung of Munich that the speech showed "a world power...in search of a new role.... This is praiseworthy and in fact necessary..."

"But the first time applause broke out...was when he said, 'Let us make a fresh start'.... The unsuspecting, perhaps naive U.S. self-confidence that emerged from Ford's speech could, nevertheless, be contagious. Congress, even its more sophisticated members, might react positively..."

"A Disappointing Message"

Independent Koelner Stadt-Anzeiger of Cologne ran a byliner's assertion that the speech showed "the weaknesses of a world power. It was a disappointing message. There are lessons in it for all the allies.... It was an illusion to assume that the U.S. could solve all the world's problems by itself..."

Right-center Die Welt of Hamburg carried the report of correspondent Heinz Barth that "this was the monologue of a powerless person.... In Congress Ford found only ears that were deaf to his Vietnam appeal."

TV: "Why Does a President Again Get Involved?"

Washington correspondent Carl Weiss of West Germany's first-network television said the speech, "heralded for days as the big foreign policy spectrum of the U.S. in President Ford's own hand, turned out to have come from the pen of Henry Kissinger..."

Washington correspondent Wolf von Lojewski asked on the same network, "Why does an American President again get fully involved in a lost cause? Why did he use the final act of the Vietnamese drama--a symbol of American failure--to announce to the nation and the world his Government's concept of foreign policy? When Gerald Ford makes a promise these days, the world has good reason to doubt its validity. It would be safer to turn to Congress or the public opinion polls."

Paris: "Death Knell of Old Vietnam Policy. . ."

Washington correspondent Henri Pierre wrote Friday in independent Le Monde:

"The President, in the last analysis, rang the death knell of the Vietnam policy conducted by his predecessors and approved by successive Congresses. . . . Cambodia has been written off under profit and loss. . . ."

Pierre wondered why "the President requested credits for Vietnam which he knows in advance will be refused or drastically reduced." He said that "if Congress refuses the massive effort requested, the Government will have demonstrated to international opinion that it did its utmost to live up to its commitments. . . and although high officials deny that a scapegoat is being sought, refusal by Congress will assign the responsibility. . . ."

"... Appears to Restate Nixon-Kissinger Policy"

Washington correspondent Adalbert de Segonzac said Friday in moderate-left France-Soir:

"At first blush, President Ford's TV address gives the impression of being a restatement of the policy followed by President Nixon and Henry Kissinger over the past years. . . . More interesting than the speech are the private explanations of it made by officials. . . . What emerges from all this is that privately Ford acknowledges that Indochina is virtually lost. He wants to save the maximum possible and above all create the conditions under which Americans and South Vietnamese friendly to America can be evacuated."

A byliner contended Friday in liberal Catholic La Croix of Paris that "President Ford chose the path of obstinacy." He asked, "Is this obstinacy a desperate justification of Henry Kissinger, who is indispensable to Ford at this time? Washington circles are beginning to fear this."

The byliner also wondered whether it should be viewed as an indication of "the inexperience of a President deluded by advisers who are themselves increasingly divided. Such an explanation hardly seems more reassuring."

"The Eagle Pulls Out"

An article in today's moderate-right L'Aurore by Roland Faure was titled, "Cambodia: The Eagle Successfully Pulls Out." Faure said, "What a painful reflection on the drama of current events it is to see the U. S. Ambassador taking away under his arm the American and Cambodian flags, one serving as a shroud for the other..."

Washington correspondent Jacques Renard said in today's moderately conservative Figaro:

"Now it is known that when he delivered his state-of-the-world message President Ford had already turned the Cambodian page. The closing of the Phnom Penh embassy and the evacuation of the Americans were awaiting nothing more than the order of execution..."

On French second-network television Friday evening a correspondent in Washington said the President's speech was more of "a warning to the Congress than to the Communists." Speaking of Mr. Ford's difficulties with Congress he remarked, "There are 589 'little Presidents' in Congress and that makes a lot of people."

Milan: "Emphasized Congress' Responsibility"

U. S. correspondent Ugo Stille wrote in today's independent Corriere della Sera of Milan that "behind a conciliatory facade, Ford emphasized the responsibility of Congress for the Indochinese catastrophe. The main impression in Washington is that the White House considers the Indochina chapter over but that it intends to reduce the repercussions elsewhere and obtain closer cooperation from Congress."

"Chooses Selective Revision of Commitments"

In Christian Democratic Il Popolo of Rome a byliner noted today:

"Ford's announcement that he will participate in the NATO summit meeting stresses the importance of this event. Whether we like it

or not, America today is still the main pole of world foreign policy. Its choices therefore are important for all either directly or indirectly. Ford showed in his speech that he wants to take the only road by which the U.S. can recover its flawed credibility, and that is a selective revision of U.S. commitments on the international level..."

"Effect on Credibility Can Be Overestimated"

A writer in center-left La Stampa of Turin said on Saturday:

"The last American dilemma in Vietnam is whether it should passively witness the end of Saigon--as was done in Phnom Penh--or try to encourage its dying ally with some final military aid. Ford favors the second way but Congress is against it..."

"The impact of the Indochinese debacle on American credibility in the world is not insignificant but it must not be overestimated. The weight of the American superpower survives, as did that of the Soviet superpower after the Cuban humiliation in 1962 and again after the Egyptian defeat ten years ago. On the other hand, one must pay for one's mistakes and it is a good policy to put them aside as soon as possible.... The problem is to select one's commitments carefully and honor them."

Belgian Radio-TV: "No New Solution"

Belgian radio and television said of the Ford speech, "One must admit that President Ford was disappointing...he did not propose any new solution for Indochina."

Brussels' independent Le Soir declared, "The least one can say is that President Ford did not meet expectations and that his speech on the state of the world will have satisfied no one. One thing is sure--Mr. Ford has lost South Vietnam in Congress."

"Last Speech of the Old Era"

Conservative La Libre Belgique said, "This is not the first speech of a new era. It is the last speech of the Vietnam era."

Conservative Gazet van Antwerpen wrote, "Ford is opposed with all his power to the pitiful image of a paralyzed Gulliver, just as he opposes isolationism and non-observance of commitments. But he cannot impose his will. The major responsibility lies with Congress."

Rotterdam: "Old Thought Patterns"

Independent liberal NRC Handelsblad of Rotterdam stated Friday, "With the best will in the world one cannot describe President Ford's speech as either inspiring or as a proof of vision. Worn-out rhetoric, old patterns of thought and out-of-date policy proposals are the dominant ingredients of this 'cocktail' mixed by Ford and Kissinger..."

Vienna: "Merely a Symbolic Gesture"

Independent Die Presse on Saturday carried the report of a Washington correspondent that Mr. Ford, "discussing the 'state of the world' in a speech which was both sober and sobering...tried before Congress to glue together the disintegrating parts of the foreign policy shaped by Nixon and Kissinger. He virtually asked the Congress to bless the rather dubious and certainly not honorable tactics of a world power which is withdrawing and ailing....Since the Congress absolutely does not intend to allocate the enormous funds the President has requested for South Vietnam... his initiative is merely a symbolic gesture of the support of the Thieu regime in Saigon."

Conservative Party Suedost-Tagespost of Graz predicted Saturday, "The Congress will reject most of Ford's demands.... Any U. S. aid still in the planning stage will come too late. If we compare Ford's plans with...Nixon's far-reaching promises of military and economic aid for the Saigon Government, Washington's credibility appears severely shaken."

Helsinki: "Maneuver Directed at Allies"

Swedish-language Hufvudstadsbladet of Helsinki remarked Saturday, "President Ford can hardly have any illusions about his possibilities to influence the developments in Southeast Asia by force. The effects of an eventual political initiative in the direction of North Vietnam and the Soviet Union cannot be counted on too much, either....In this situation, it is not perhaps unreasonable to see Ford's appeal partly as an opening in the maneuver mainly directed to the U. S. allies--particularly in Asia....Gerald Ford's honorable intentions are not usually questioned. But today it is the Congress, not the President, who has the power, also in foreign policy."

Tokyo: "Speech Lacked Consistency"

Publicly financed NHK television, asserting today that two-thirds of President Ford's speech was devoted to the Indochina problem because of the deterioration of the situation in Cambodia and South Vietnam, contended that it "lacked logical consistency and showed impatience in America's foreign policy." The network added that the U.S. "does not want to admit the defeat of its Indochina policy."

"Intended to Show U.S. Resolve"

Liberal Asahi forecast today that "future U.S. diplomacy will shift to an emphasis on strengthening cooperation with America's allies." Today's moderate Yomiuri wrote, "The President's foreign policy address was intended to show the indomitable resolve of the U.S. to retain the trust of its allies rather than to explain America's overall policy.... The President showed an aggressive attitude as regards the Indochina problem by seeking standby rights to use the military but Congress reacted coolly to this request."

"Far Cry From Public and Congressional Opinion"

Moderate Mainichi held today that "the basic concept of President Ford's speech was a far cry from the general conviction of the American people and Congress that the U.S. policy toward Vietnam has failed completely and that the only thing left for the U.S. to do is to leave that part of the world."

It continued, "People in some quarters are wondering whether the U.S. has learned anything from the past bitter lessons about its involvement in the Vietnam conflict.... If there is any error on the part of the U.S., it was the failure to recognize that big powers no longer hold sway over smaller countries in their efforts to settle regional disputes."

"Reaffirmed Defense Pledge"

Moderately conservative Sankei stated today, "We highly approve of President Ford's saying 'the U.S. -Japan security treaty is the cornerstone of stability in the Asian and Pacific area,' because he stressed the importance of U.S. -Japan relations and reconfirmed America's defense pledge."

Seoul: "Aimed at Strengthening Credibility"

Independent Hankuk Ilbo of Seoul said Saturday, "Although the U.S. Administration came up with a hard-line policy to save Vietnam, this policy is aimed at strengthening credibility and belief in commitments. President Ford is trying to demonstrate that **security commitments** to the ROK and Japan are still strong despite the Indochina situation...

"The U.S. Government's attitude is encouraging...but we are worried about the future attitude of the U.S. Congress and public opinion. Congress, led by the Democrats, is driving the Ford Administration into a corner, giving the impression that U.S. foreign policy is almost paralyzed.... We hope the U.S. Congress will understand the lesson of Vietnam--an armistice agreement which became a 'paper tiger'...America should know that its credibility and dignity depend on the ROK defense."

Saturday's conservative Chosun Ilbo declared, "Vietnam should be defended for the cause of peace in Northeast Asia as well as Vietnam.... It is obvious that the U.S. will lose credibility and dignity if Vietnam falls..."

Independent conservative Donga Ilbo, stating Saturday that "Eastern Europe, the Middle East, the ROK and Japan are closely connected with the national interest of the U.S.," asserted that "most of these nations worry that the U.S. may neglect them because of excessive involvement in Indochina.... The U.S. Administration and Congress are urged to demonstrate supra-partisan cooperation in establishing foreign policy directly linked to the long-term national interest and credibility of the U.S...."

"Echoed Schlesinger on ROK Defense"

Middle-of-the-road Joongang Ilbo termed the Ford speech "a repeat of Secretary of Defense Schlesinger's Congressional report which said defense of the ROK is essential for the defense of the U.S.... U.S. policy toward Northeast and Southeast Asia has not changed.... We should not be skeptical about the ROK-U.S. defense treaty, since President Ford has now reaffirmed U.S. commitments."

Manila: "America's Problem Is Integrity"

A Bulletin Today columnist wrote after the Ford address, "If the President of the U. S. has plans to meet with Asian leaders, he can only be taken seriously if he carried the weight of the American Congress too. Asians are all too familiar with the American game of 'passing the buck.' The U. S. President is all for you but the U. S. Congress is not or vice versa. Then the American press is for whichever of the two forces will make America look great. America's problem is credibility and integrity of the word. Both are way, way down."

Malaysia: "Nobody Believes Aid Requested Can Save Situation"

Today's Penang Star stated, "Nobody, not even President Ford himself, believes that the \$722 million aid he sought for South Vietnam can reverse the hopeless situation in that country. The aid would not even have the psychological effect of making negotiations with the Communists easier...." It continued, "The protracted American effort to set up and sustain anti-Communist Governments in those countries is obviously near its end."

"It is a bitter blow to the pride of the U. S.... There has been some loss to its prestige, some loss of influence and a heavy drain on weapons supplied to the South Vietnamese that are now filling the arsenals of the Communists."

"The U. S. should be more careful in the future about judging other peoples and their problems; it should act with more restraint and wisdom in carrying out its foreign policies."

"Substantial Military Aid Could Help Get Political Solution"

Penang's Straits Echo judged today that "Mr. Ford was not projecting the impossible.. The shrunken perimeter (in South Vietnam) can be held, provided that military aid is forthcoming on an urgent basis. If substantial military aid is provided and the Communist offensive is blunted, Congress could feel justified in pushing for a political solution--even though this would mean settling for less than the Paris agreement."

Singapore: "Face-Saving Sentimentalism"

The New Nation of Singapore remarked Saturday, "One can see only face-saving diplomacy or at best mere sentimentalism in President Ford's state of the world address to a Congress unyielding in its denial of further military aid to Vietnam and Cambodia..."

"Asian leaders will be wise to note that the era of U. S. troops and air power always **being** on short call is coming to an end. In the current U. S. reassessment of its foreign policy vis-a-vis the Far East, little likelihood is foreseen of the sort of decisive commitment that characterized the Dulles 'Communist containment' decade."

Canberra: "No Intent to Jettison Allies"

The independent Canberra Times stated today that "President Ford's foreign policy address to Congress gives no comfort to those who believe the U. S. is preparing to jettison embarrassing allies so that it may better look after its domestic problems."

"It is reassuring to hear the President say that the U. S. has proposed to play in the world a role proportionate to its status of a superpower and to the expectations of its friends.... That expectation no longer includes American troops fighting land wars on foreign soil.... It will be based on strong and continuing diplomatic initiatives; it will consist in maintaining America's military strength and in honoring commitments given."

"Did Not Sound Confident About Congress"

A Melbourne Age correspondent reported today that "President Ford sounded like a man who knew he was beaten before he started, and not like a President confident that he could... pull Congress into following his lead." He added that "the future credibility of U. S. policy and the future reliability of American support will depend less on one series of tragic mistakes in Indochina than on the ability of American political leaders to make their own political system work in a predictable way."

New Zealand Report Stresses Congressional Reaction

Papers carried a New Zealand Press Association report that "Washington commentators today take the view that President Ford's foreign policy speech to Congress emphasized the gap between Administration and Congressional thinking. Mr. Ford won applause in Congress when he said, 'Let us start afresh,' but in the view of many Congressmen and commentators, his speech--asking \$1 billion assistance to South Vietnam--made it clear that Southeast Asia is not the issue on which a fresh start could be made."

The report added that Washington commentators "noted that the last two Congressional elections showed the American public wants out of Indochina and, to that extent, Congress could be considered to reflect the national will better than the White House."

Bangkok: "From Policeman to Ostrich"

The British-owned Bangkok Post declared yesterday that there was no hope for Mr. Ford's Indochina aid request and that "the President is being unrealistic if he thinks that Congress will pay attention to what he said. With Watergate, the U. S. has almost destroyed its Executive branch of Government and placed itself at the mercy of an isolationist and myopic Congress. It added:

"No wonder America's commitments in the Middle East have little meaning and the credibility gap that the Americans are building for themselves will adversely affect their influence on global events. The pendulum has swung from one extreme to another... from America being the policeman of the world to America being the ostrich with its head in the sand."

"New Hope to Millions"

The pro-U. S. Bangkok World said Friday, "The latest move on the part of President Ford will definitely hearten those countries which are on friendly terms with the U. S. His announcement that the U. S. will stand by its friends, will honor its commitments and will uphold its principles has given new hope to millions in distress in war-torn Vietnam."

Madras: "Kissinger Imprint"

A correspondent observed in today's conservative Hindu of Madras: "The Ford speech still bore a heavy imprint of Dr. Kissinger's thinking, making it clear that he has not lost favor in the White House, at least for the time being."

"Evacuation Proposal Most Controversial"

A New York correspondent wrote in the Deccan Herald of Mysore that the "most controversial part of President Ford's message" was the proposal to send troops to Vietnam to protect the evacuation. He said: "Although put in this way the President's appeal may be hard to reject, the question is now being asked why one should not start the evacuation process now instead of waiting for the last moment to justify the use of U.S. troops. The irony is that these troops may be needed to protect the Americans from their South Vietnamese friends for alleged betrayal."

"Should Let Events Take Their Course"

Many leading newspapers suggested that the U.S. should let Vietnamese events take their own course.

The Congress Party's National Herald of New Delhi and Lucknow judged "the best course for the U.S. would be literally to leave South Vietnam to its fate."

The independent Times of India of New Delhi, Bombay, and Ahmedabad, while praising the President for his stand on Cambodia, asked: "Why can't he see that the odds against saving the Thieu regime are equally hopeless and the best the U.S. can now do is to leave events to take their own course in South Vietnam?"

Tehran: "New U.S. Involvement?"

The Tehran Journal wrote on Saturday, "Ford's plea for troops to be rushed to South Vietnam if it is necessary to help in the evacuation of South Vietnamese refugees and Americans, while it no doubt prolongs the disastrous war, also raises the possibility of another attempted U.S. involvement in Indochina."

Amman: "Significance Given to Middle East"

Independent ad-Dustur of Amman stated Saturday that "the problem of the Middle East occupied a significant portion of the President's speech... indicating that Washington considers the Middle East to be one of its most important problems..."

Athens News Play

Saturday's conservative Kathimerini of Athens, citing President Ford's speech, carried the headline, "Proposal of Ford for Aid to Greece Is Deceptive Maneuver." Moderate To Vima headlined Saturday, "Aid to Greece a Cover of Mr. Ford For Arms to Turkey."

Tel Aviv: "Continuity of Middle East Peace Efforts"

Semiofficial Davar of Tel Aviv remarked yesterday that "the Middle East did not command a central place in the President's speech" and that Mr. Ford "did not point an accusing finger at Israel..."

The paper said: "The continuation of the U.S. effort to promote peace in the Middle East should be received with satisfaction... Despite the collapse in Vietnam, the President's speech reflects the clear intention of the U.S. Administration to continue the policy of detente with Moscow..."

Independent Haaretz of Tel Aviv commented yesterday, "Two and one half out of 75 minutes were devoted to the Middle East... Many interpretations have been made of the few sentences on the Middle East... However, Vietnam is now the major item on the U.S. calendar..."

Sao Paulo: "No Dramatic Re-examination"

Today's independent O Estado de Sao Paulo expressed disappointment with President Ford's speech because it "did not reformulate" the situation "nor did it propose any renewal or dramatic re-examination of the national conscience."

View of "Media Campaign" Against War

On Friday the paper said American public opinion had been divided on the Vietnam war by "the media campaign against it" rather than by the pros and cons of the war itself. It said:

"We believe that a newspaper like ours, which supported the mission of the U. S. in Southeast Asia... has the right to raise the question of responsibility for Indochina's tragedy.... The fact is that we appreciate the mission entrusted to the U. S. more than American newsmen and more than pressure groups. Our criticism is in effect an appeal to the conscience of the American public... Americans and their allies--particularly the Europeans--must admit and recognize their responsibility for the tragedy of Indochina. "

Moderate Jornal do Brasil of Rio de Janeiro said on Saturday that the speech "impressed the Congressmen as little as if it had been made by Nixon..."

Caracas: Emphasis on OPEC Reference

President Ford's state-of-the-world address received heavy newsplay in Caracas, emphasizing his reference to the U. S. trade law.

Independent El Nacional headlined on Friday: "Ford Asks Congress to Eliminate Anti-OPEC Clause Against Venezuela and Ecuador." The story said: "Latin America, Asia and Africa should know that the U. S. is a true and interested friend, a friend whose actions can be trusted..."

Moderate El Universal, carrying a similar headline, noted: "This discrimination has disrupted the new dialogue in the Hemisphere."

Independent Ultimas Noticias headlined: "Ford Asks Congress Not to Apply Discriminatory Law Against Venezuela."

Buenos Aires News Play

Clarín, Cronista Comercial and Opinion of Buenos Aires on Friday carried news accounts of the President's references to Latin America. Nationalistic Clarín remarked on the "scant mention of inter-American relations" in the speech.

On Saturday, left-intellectual Opinion commented that "although there is little chance of its being fulfilled, Saigon is encouraged by the promises contained in Ford's message to Congress."

Bogota: "We Acknowledge Ford's Good Will"

Liberal El Tiempo of Bogota commented Saturday: "As far as Latin America is concerned, it is only fair to praise the President's firm statement on the U. S. trade bill...favoring elimination of the discriminatory clauses against Venezuela and Ecuador....According to President Ford, friendship with Latin America is vital and therefore these obstacles must be overcome...so we must acknowledge President Ford's good will toward his neighbors to the south..."

Mexico City: Warnings Against Further "Intervention"

Centrist El Sol de Mexico stated Saturday that "President Ford's request for Congressional approval of possible U. S. military intervention to help in the evacuation of U. S. citizens who might be attacked while leaving Vietnam could be a move to justify new U. S. aggression... The U. S. Congress and the U. S. people should eliminate this new threat against peace."

Nationalist El Universal commented: "It seems that President Ford has not learned the historical lesson given by Vietnam to the U. S.... Military intervention has already been proved a failure and economic assistance brought about greater inflation in the U. S., promoted the deterioration of the economy and undermined U. S. prestige."

Moscow Radio: "Maneuvers to Justify U.S. Intervention"

Soviet media carried news reports and commentary on the President's speech in propagandistic tones. Radio Moscow's domestic service on Friday evening asserted that Mr. Ford's aid requests were intended "to maintain the rotten Thieu regime in power" and that "the President's demand is proof of U.S. intentions to continue its policy of further interference in Vietnam's internal affairs.... In his address the President spoke of the need for the Paris agreement to be observed. However, his demand for increased support for the Thieu regime clearly runs counter to the terms of that agreement.... In an effort to justify his actions in the eyes of the world, the President emphasized the refugee problem... (but) the creation of the refugee problem is in actual fact a new maneuver aimed at justifying U.S. interference in the affairs of South Vietnam."

In other broadcasts, the radio hailed the advances of the Communist forces in Indochina and reported the U.S. pullout from Cambodia, where "the American military command was forced to stop the airlift--this time, it seems, for good."

Moscow TASS circulated a dispatch in its English service reporting "The Views Of American Legislators" (TASS headline) on the President's aid requests--but citing only Senators and Representatives strongly opposed to them."

Eastern Europe: Less Severe Treatment

East European media carried extensive comment and coverage of the President's address.. They reported that the Administration was "holding on like grim death to the old policy of supporting Thieu to the last" (Warsaw Radio domestic service April 11), but the tone of condemnation of U.S. policy and motives was generally somewhat less severe than that adopted by Moscow media.

Prague Radio's domestic service Friday evening carried its U.S. correspondent's report of the speech and his conclusion: "Now the issue is whether the U.S. will succeed in coming to terms in a rational way ~~with~~ the real situation in the world."

Radio Budapest said the President's "extraordinary message... showed above all that America has still not emerged from the Indochinese whirlpool... (and) it furnished no evidence on any essential policy reappraisal." Nevertheless, the radio concluded, "Ford's remarks about the fundamental identity of interest involved in America's vital security, the averting of war and the future of Soviet-American relations indicate that the American Government in its global policy will opt for the path of common sense."

The Bulgarian Party paper, Rabotnichesko Delo of Sofia, on Saturday carried a commentary by its Washington correspondent who found in the speech no evidence of changes in basic U.S. foreign policy. He said the President, "wishing to restore the trembling authority of the U.S. as defender of the 'free world,' tried to calm allies in Asia and Europe Western... stating that the process of detente with its reduction of tensions did not mean any weakening of the country's military potential." The correspondent judged that "the sole area in which continuing the present policy lines can be evaluated as positive was that portion of the speech dealing with Soviet-American relations."

Peking: "U.S. Intervention Will Not End"

Peking media were strongly critical of U.S. policies and intentions as deduced from the President's speech and recent Administration actions. The New China News Agency reports in both Chinese and English asserted that President Ford's address showed "that the United States has no intention of discontinuing its interventionist policy toward South Vietnam." The agency said Mr. Ford's request for "revision of the Congressional ban" on using U.S. troops in Indochina "is obviously aimed at obtaining a legal basis for future intervention in South Vietnam...and armed blackmail against the Vietnamese people."

THE WHITE HOUSE

WASHINGTON

May 5, 1975

MEMORANDUM FOR: DICK CHENEY
RON NESSEN ✓
TERRY O'DONNELL

FROM: BOB MEAD B

SUBJECT: President Ford's Foreign Polixy Speech

The television ratings for President Ford's Foreign Policy Speech, delivered 9:04-10:05 p.m. on April 10, 1975, are as follows:

- Viewed by an estimated 31.2 million households
- Viewed by an estimated 58.5 million people
- Overall rating of 45.5 percent

This was the fourth highest rating the President has received on Presidential television appearances.

Television appearances:

1. Library Speech on Energy and Economics 81.4 million people
2. News Conference on December 2, 1974 62.9 million people
3. Future Farmers of America Speech in Kansas on
October 15, 1974 59.7 million people