

The original documents are located in Box 42, folder “10/26/74 - Reasoner Interview (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 Ron Nessen donated to the United States of America his copyrights in all of his unpublished writings in National Archives collections.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.

MARIJUANA

Question:

Do you think marijuana use should be legalized, or decriminalized as the Marijuana Commission recommended?

Answer:

I am opposed to the legalization of marijuana, especially since medical evidence on its effects is still being explored. I do think that penalties for simple possession have been far too harsh in the past and am pleased that over 35 states have now adopted our Model Statute on Drugs which makes these penalties more realistic.

I am also opposed to the decriminalization of marijuana because I believe this Nation learned during prohibition that such an answer is really no answer at all.

Background:

Advocates of legalizing marijuana claim it is no worse than alcohol or tobacco, but that is hardly sufficient reason for the government to encourage its use through legalization. Marijuana may well be a passing fad of the 60's, but legalization would assure it being a problem far into the future.

The Marijuana Commission recommended, near the end of its report, that simple possession of small amounts of marijuana be decriminalized. Under the Model Drug Statute such possession remains a misdemeanor. Measures permitting the possession of small amounts of marijuana to be legal without decriminalizing the production or sale of it would create an ostrich effect in the law in this area. Lawful possession would necessarily entail unlawful trafficking.

GCS
10/23/74

ANTITRUST

Question:

What is your attitude toward antitrust enforcement?

Answer:

I believe that the antitrust laws should be enforced vigorously and, equally important, in an evenhanded manner. Whenever violations are uncovered they should be prosecuted. I regard vigorous enforcement as especially important in a time of inflation since anticompetitive practices -- such as private agreements among competitors fixing the prices consumers will pay -- and anticompetitive structures in various industries all serve to insulate businesses from the rigors of competition.

Background:

The antitrust laws reflect the nation's commitment to preserving a competitive marketplace and to the belief that such a marketplace will produce the best possible products at the lowest possible prices. I share that commitment and that belief.

GCS
10/23/74

BUSING

Question

What is your position on busing?

Answer:

Americans of all races have felt great concern in recent years over the busing issue. This has been an emotional, divisive issue in many communities. It is an issue that has confused parents, educators, courts, and government officials.

The basic goal should be quality education for all Americans. Like most Americans, I believe in the neighborhood school. I am against busing to achieve racial balance, and I am against excessive busing under any circumstances. I believe that what has been most lacking on both sides of the issue has been a spirit of compromise -- what the Supreme Court, in deciding Brown v. Board of Education, called "adjusting and reconciling public and private needs."

Background:

In the Equal Educational Opportunities Act of 1974, which I have signed recently, I agree with the Congressional declaration that it is the policy of the United States that "all children enrolled in public schools are entitled to equal educational opportunity without regard to race, color, sex, or national origin; and (that) the neighborhood is the appropriate basis for determining public school assignments." (Sec. 202(a))

I am also encouraged by the Chief Justice's statement in the Supreme Court's Detroit decision, which limits busing across school district lines, that "without an inter-district violation and inter-district effect, there is no constitutional wrong calling for an inter-district remedy."

The policy of this Administration will continue to be to avoid whenever possible federally imposed busing requirements in cases under the jurisdiction of federal executive agencies. Second, it will continue to be our policy to seek fair and workable remedies for unlawful denials of equal educational opportunity, and to work with school authorities and civil rights advocates in a cooperative, non-adversary spirit. Finally, it need hardly be stated that the law, as determined by the courts, must and will be obeyed. I believe that within this framework, we can begin to come to grips with the busing issue in a constructive way.

GCS
10/23/74

CAPITAL PUNISHMENT

Question:

What is your stand on the issue of capital punishment?

Answer:

I believe that capital punishment can be a deterrent to crime. Many states are revising their laws to reflect the decision of the Supreme Court in Furman v. Georgia. Earlier this term the Senate passed legislation which would restore the death penalty for certain heinous Federal crimes. I support that legislation and hope for passage in the House.

Background:

This legislation would impose the death penalty in Federal cases involving murder, treason, and war-time espionage after a post-final hearing determined that there were certain aggravating factors and no mitigating factors.

GCS
10/23/74

DRUG ABUSE

Question:

Are we failing in our efforts to control drug abuse in America?

Answer:

When I proclaimed October 20-26 Drug Abuse Prevention Week, I met with the government experts in this area. They tell me that although we have clearly turned the corner from the spiraling rise of drug abuse in the 60's, there is still a long way to go. Constantly reviewing and improving efforts at all levels in our society is an ongoing priority of my Administration.

Background:

On October 18, you met with: Ambassador Sheldon Vance, Executive Director of the Cabinet Committee on International Narcotics Control; Dr. Robert DuPont, Director of the Special Action Office for Drug Abuse Prevention; and Mr. John Bartels, Administrator of the Drug Enforcement Administration. You pledged full Administration support of efforts to halt drug abuse.

Recent developments indicate that some slippage may be occurring which, if unchecked, could lead to a resurgence of the drug abuse problem. There has been a very recent upsurge in treatment demand, particularly in the West and in medium and small cities across the country. Mexican brown heroin has spread far beyond its traditional Southwestern area and now is estimated to supply over 60 percent of all the heroin available in the country. And the prospect of renewed Turkish opium production could significantly worsen the supply situation, depending on the effectiveness of the controls implemented.

GCS
10/23/74

GUN CONTROL

Question:

Recently, a Washington attorney was shot to death near his car by a 15-year old child. What do you think should be done on the issue of gun control?

Answer:

I am sure everyone in this room joins me in condemning the illegal use of firearms, as well as all other crimes of violence. But the question on gun control is whether further Federal legislation is appropriate. I think it is in the area of Saturday night specials - those cheap junk handguns which are flooding our country - but I think it more appropriate for State and local governments to decide for themselves whether even more stringent gun control statutes are necessary for their individual locality.

Background:

The issue of gun control is a violent emotional one. Gun enthusiasts are "one issue voters" who many claim have totally lost touch with reality on this issue. They are generally conservative and have supported the Administration on the other really big issues.

Saturday night special legislation, although easy in concept, proved impossible to draft in the last Congress: Conservatives wanted objective standards which no one could draft, and Liberals wanted "concealability" to be the standard which would be the first step in banning handguns.

The basic statutory framework is that the Federal government sets certain nationwide minimums: Federal licensing of dealers, no mailorder purchases, stringent Federal restrictions on machine guns, sawed off shotguns, and other automatic weapons, and restrictions on ownership by convicted felons, addicts and mental incompetents. Within this framework, state and local governments are able to tailor individual restrictions to suit local conditions.

GCS
10/23/74

JUSTICE DEFENSE OF FORMER GOVERNMENT EMPLOYEES

Question:

Could you explain the theory behind the Department of Justice's offer to defend former government employees in civil suits?

Answer:

That policy is a Justice Department policy and your questions on that explanation are better referred to the Department. I understand the Department is prepared to explain that policy to you.

Question:

Did the White House approve of this policy?

Answer:

The range of problems in representing ex-government officials who are sued in civil suits has been discussed in general terms with the Counsel's office, but Justice's policy in this regard was not formulated by the White House or cleared in advance by the White House.

Question:

Why did the head of the Criminal Division, Henry Petersen, sign the letter offering continued representation in civil suits?

Answer:

These are all wiretaps cases, and the Criminal Division has traditionally handled all civil suits arising out of wiretaps cases.

Question:

Why wasn't Special Prosecutor Jaworski informed of the letter beforehand, and doesn't it represent a conflict?

Answer:

That question is better directed to the Department of Justice, but these five specific cases are ones in which Justice had already been representing former President Nixon, and so Jaworski may be presumed to have known about all of them.

GCS

10/23/74

BICENTENNIAL

Question:

What's happening on the Bicentennial?

Answer:

A great deal of groundwork has been laid by the American Revolution Bicentennial Administration (ARBA), whose function is to coordinate and facilitate the Bicentennial commemoration. The national focus of the Bicentennial continues to be on the participation of every citizen and every community, with restricted Federal expenditures. International participation is invited and the response from abroad indicates fast-growing interest. Many programs are in the planning stage, with the results to show in the months ahead as we draw closer to the official celebration period -- March 1975 through the end of 1976. Currently, there are more than 1,500 recognized Bicentennial communities and over 3,000 Bicentennial projects underway. Many more are being added daily.

Background:

In 1966, PL 89-491 established the American Revolution Bicentennial Commission (ARBC) to plan and develop the Bicentennial. The Commission recommended a disbursed, grass roots (as opposed to centralized) commemoration and the ARBA, established under PL 93-179 on December 11, 1973, is implementing the original plans. John Warner, former Secretary of the Navy, was sworn in as Administrator on April 11, 1974. ARBA Presidential appointments remaining to be announced are the twenty-five member Advisory Council.

Federal Agency participation and Administration policies are administered by Counsellor Anne Armstrong, who chairs the Domestic Council Committee on the Bicentennial, a Cabinet-level committee. There are two Federal Task Forces: one, coordinating Federal participation in Philadelphia and the District of Columbia and the other, planning the logistics and transportation for visitors to the National Capital area.

Through ARBA, \$200,000 matching grants of equal amounts are available to each state and territory, though none have yet been given since policy for the grants is currently being approved. Policy guidelines for the grants are presently being cleared in accordance with OMB procedures.

October 23, 1974

SUBJECT:

SIMON CONCEDES WE MAY BE IN
A RECESSION

What is the President's reaction to Bill Simon stating that
we may be in a recession?

GUIDANCE: The important point is that almost everybody agrees that economic activity is sluggish. Whether or not this period will qualify as a recession is a question of semantics which will be determined by the National Bureau of Economic Research.

Whatever you want to call this period, there is no question it has many characteristics that are not typical of a recession. Certainly the rate of inflation is extraordinarily high. Also, while the declines in housing and stock prices have been particularly severe and the physical volume of retail sales has been weak, there has been no decline at all in employment, which climbed to an all-time peak in September. Similarly, investment spending is still booming, which is most unrecessionlike. Thus, our economy is sluggish in a rather peculiar way.

Nevertheless, the basic facts are that we have a combination of declining economic activity, and double-digit inflation--what has been appropriately called "stagflation"--and it looks like those conditions will continue into next year.

JGC

October 23, 1974

SUBJECT:

EPA OFFICIAL ADVISES
GAS RATIONING AND INCREASE
IN TAXES

John Quarles, the Deputy Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency, yesterday called for the Government to consider gasoline rationing, abolishing the Highway Trust Fund, imposing a surcharge by weight on luxury cars, and an increase in the gasoline tax.

What's your reaction to the statement by John Quarles?

GUIDANCE: ~~It is my understanding that~~ The comments by Mr. Quarles were his own personal views and do not represent the views of EPA, Administrator Russ Train, or this Administration.

JGC

October 23, 1974

SUBJECT:

WISCONSIN BEEF TO HONDURAS

What did the White House finally do with the Wisconsin farmers who were threatening to kill their cattle and bury it if the Administration would not assist in shipping the cattle to Honduras?

GUIDANCE: ~~As I mentioned last week, the White House~~² asked the U.S. Department of Agriculture to check into the situation. They did, and recommended that the American Red Cross, along with assistance from A.I.D. handle the situation. ~~If you have any questions on what has happened, you could call the American Red Cross.~~

FYI: It is my understanding that the American Red Cross, with assistance from A.I.D., will be shipping the beef to Honduras. END FYI.

JGC

QUESTION - If balancing the federal budget is one of the long-term inflation-fighting tools, how does the Administration view the built-in escalators in Social Security and other similar programs over which we have no control? In this regard, does the Administration believe that those programs should be constrained in any way?

ANSWER - Not only balancing the federal budget but even a long-run surplus may be desirable as a long-term goal in view of the heavy investment needs we face in the future. Anything built into the budget that drives federal spending successively higher needs to be re-examined. In a general way, the Administration believes that all federal spending programs should be constrained. I would not single out social security and similar programs for special scrutiny. We need to take a careful look across the full range of federal spending activities,

QUESTION: Will you advance the date on which Americans can own gold? Will the Government sell its own gold stocks to Americans?

ANSWER: Recent legislation provides that Americans may freely own gold after December 31, 1974. While the legislation permits the President to advance the date, I have no present plans to do so.

We have the option at any time of selling gold from Treasury stores. Obviously such sales would reduce or eliminate the need to import more gold if demand increased when the prohibition on ownership was ended. We are considering whether to exercise the option to sell but have made no decision.

10/1/74

QUESTION:

Is the President seriously considering new energy-related taxes or tariffs to help reduce demand for foreign oil, or is this a Treasury proposal?

ANSWER:

Of course, the White House and a number of agencies have considered energy-related taxes or tariffs. However, a definite proposal for such a tax or tariff, other than the Excess Profits Tax, has not been made by the White House, Treasury, or any other agency. As you know, the FEA is now preparing a Project Independence Blueprint. By the first of next year, we expect to develop, through the Committee on Energy, a National Energy Policy to achieve the goals of Project Independence. The specific form of energy-related taxes and tariffs will be determined by our energy problems as analyzed in the Project Independence Blueprint and the actions of OPEC nations.

Prior to the time our National Energy Policy is announced, I may decide to propose certain energy-related taxes or tariffs designed to promote conservation and moderate the impact of high world oil prices on the U.S. economy. Such measures, if proposed, would at the same time protect the poor from having to bear an inequitable share of the burden.

10/1/74

October 18, 1974

Q & A - GNP REPORT

Q. In the light of the 2.9% annual rate of decrease in real GNP, does the President believe we are in a recession? Arthur Burns has said that we are. Whom should we believe?

A. The important point here is that almost everybody agrees economic activity is sluggish. Whether or not this period will qualify as a recession is a question of semantics which we can leave to the recognized experts.

Whatever you want to call this period, there is no question it has many characteristics that are not typical of recession. Certainly the rate of inflation is extraordinarily high. Also, while the declines in housing and stock prices have been particularly severe and the physical volume of retail sales has been weak, there has been no decline at all in employment, which climbed to an all-time peak in September. Similarly, investment spending is still booming, which is most un-recessionlike. Thus, our economy is sluggish in a rather peculiar way.

Nevertheless, the basic facts are that we have a combination of declining economic activity and double-digit inflation -- what has been appropriately called "stagflation" -- and it looks like those conditions will continue into next year. It is this problem to which my economic policy is addressed.

— *Y. Brown* —

Q - How does your proposed program meet the problem of stagflation?

- (a) Curb inflation by maintaining budget restraint in 1975 and beyond, by cutting expenditures and by instituting a temporary surtax to pay for the new programs, so that we can
 - ease the pressure of Federal borrowing in the credit markets, which will reduce interest rates and make more funds available for housing
 - enlist public support for voluntary restraint on energy use and waste and inflationary actions.

- (b) Avoid a new round of shortages and the inflationary pressures they generate by
 - eliminate restrictions which raise prices
 - maximizing food production
 - economizing on our use of energy
 - increasing our productive capacity by liberalizing the investment tax credit.

- (c) Cushion the impact of our economic difficulties where they have hit disproportionately hard through
 - direct aid housing
 - increased unemployment benefits
 - temporary employment for those whose unemployment insurance has expired
 - tax relief for low-income taxpayers.

October 10, 1974

SUBJECT:

ECONOMIC GUIDANCE

Why does the President feel that we are not in a recession?

GUIDANCE: I realize that according to the popular shorthand method, two quarters of decline in real GNP constitute a recession, and GNP declined at an annual rate of 7% in the first quarter and about 1-1/2% in the second quarter. However, the prestigious National Bureau of Economic Research considers a number of indicators and to date it has been their position that the slowdown has not been "wide enough" and "deep enough" to call it a recession.

Several additional factors must be considered, such as unemployment rate and its duration, industrial output, etc. The overall economy is strong. Factors that should be considered are:

- Although GNP declined slightly in the first two quarters, demand in general is still at a high level
- There is less speculation in the stock market on borrowed money.
- Business investment in plant and equipment remains strong.
- Our financial institutions remain healthy, and are carefully regulated through state, the national banking system and the Federal Reserve.
- There are built-in safeguards for individuals, such as federal insurance of bank deposits.
- Individuals have much greater wealth, and they have greater useable assets, such as savings accounts, insurance policies, etc.
- There are built-in stabilizers that work automatically in time of trouble - numerous income supports we have cranked into our economy, such as unemployment benefits, Social Security, Pension programs, Welfare programs, Food Stamp programs and Manpower Training programs.

The President yesterday never really set any goals or made any predictions on what the rate of inflation you expected or would consider satisfactory. What rate of inflation would be acceptable?

GUIDANCE: The Administration feels it is wrong to have a specific numeric goal. The basic goal is to reduce the rate of inflation to a point where it becomes of no significant influence in the economic decisions of consumers and business and industry in making future economic plans. The Price indices by themselves are not the sole determination and can be deceptive. Other factors must be considered--such as monetary growth, interest rates and financial markets.

We will not know that we have succeeded until we find the economy in a stable growth pattern over a period of several months.

Does the President really expect to have some meaningful reductions in the rate of inflation by early in 1975?

GUIDANCE: As the President said yesterday, he feels if the Congress responds to his 31 specific recommendations, and if the American people respond in a voluntary way, that we can have, hopefully early in 1975, some meaningful reduction in the rate of inflation (President's words).

The Administration continues to blame the higher costs of food and fuel for this inflation. Is anyone ever going to start recognizing the industrial commodities component as the major problem?

GUIDANCE: In the first 12 month period concluding in August, the problem had been concentrated in food and fuel. Both of these are due to special circumstances and are likely to be less troublesome next year. Food, gasoline, fuel oil, coal, and other energy-related items directly accounted for about 36% of the increase in the Consumer Index. However, in the past three months, these items accounted for about 8% of the increase.

The most disturbing aspect right now, in our opinion, is the large, consistent increases in prices of a great many industrial commodities. These increases may have been caused primarily by the fact that they

controls. Some of the increases may represent secondary effects of a huge rise in petroleum costs, and some of them are directly related to petroleum. For example, many chemicals are made from petroleum.



INDEX

- A. Near Eastern and South Asian Affairs
- B. European Affairs
- C. East Asian and Pacific Affairs
- D. Latin American Affairs
- E. African Affairs
- F. International Economic Affairs
- G. General Questions

MIDDLE EAST NEGOTIATIONS

Q: How do you see the United States role in a Middle East settlement process? Are you optimistic about further movement on a settlement?

A: I am fully committed to continue the efforts which the United States has undertaken to help the nations and the peoples of the Middle East achieve a just and durable peace. The meetings which Secretary Kissinger and I had in August and September in Washington and New York with Israeli Prime Minister Rabin, King Hussein and Prime Minister Rifai of Jordan, and the Israeli and Arab Foreign Minister were for the purpose of maintaining the momentum for peace which began with the Geneva Conference and the disengagement agreements between Egypt, Syria and Israel. It was clear from these talks that the governments of the area very much want and need our assistance in moving ahead toward a settlement through negotiations within the Geneva Conference framework. As a result of these talks, and at the invitation of the governments concerned, Secretary Kissinger visited the area earlier this month to clarify the prospects and procedures for another round of negotiations. He will return to the area in the near future to try to work out the specific modalities to be followed.

Some may ask why the United States is playing such an active role in an area far removed from our shores. The consequences

of another conflict in the area are potentially more dangerous than ever before for the peoples of the area and the world as a whole. It would be totally irresponsible were the United States not to make every effort to help the parties themselves find a permanent solution to their differences and to help work out a new cooperative relationship among the countries and peoples of the Middle East and between them and the rest of the world.

Our efforts have taken a number of different forms. The most visible has been the determined, skillful diplomacy of Secretary Kissinger. Also, we have continued our past policy of seeking to maintain that strategic military balance in the area which is essential for the preservation of peace and movement toward a settlement. Less visible but equally important are our efforts to assist and encourage the development of a new economic and social climate conducive to continued peace rather than renewed conflict.

I am encouraged by the progress made so far. The important thing now is that movement continues in a process of step-by-step agreements to maintain the momentum toward a just and lasting peace in the Middle East.

MIDDLE EAST - ISRAELI AID

Q: During Prime Minister Rabin's recent visit to the U.S., he reportedly asked for \$1.5 billion a year in military assistance for the next several years. How did you respond? Was your response tied to Israeli concessions in the negotiations?

A: I discussed all aspects of our relations with the Prime Minister. Military assistance is only one aspect of the long-standing close U.S.-Israeli relationship and is an expression of our commitment to the security and well-being of the State of Israel. We have affirmed that commitment many times. Israel's ability to defend itself is essential to stability and to achieving a just and lasting peace in the Middle East and I assured the Prime Minister that our military supply relationship will continue and that we will not bargain with the security of our friends. As for the precise financial implications, they remain under continuing review.

MIDDLE EAST - AID TO THE ARABS

Q: Do you support the proposed economic aid to the Middle East -- \$250 million for Egypt and \$100 million Special Requirement Fund (Syria) -- presently under Congressional consideration? What would happen if no aid Bill passed this year?

A: I strongly support the proposed legislation authorizing the extension of economic assistance to several countries in the Middle East, including Israel and Egypt. The Middle East assistance package is of the greatest importance to the success of our efforts to help bring peace to that part of the world and to further develop the cooperative bilateral ties between the United States and nations of that area. We should be in a position to do all we can to assist the countries in that area turn their efforts toward reconstruction and economic development as part of their movement toward a durable peace settlement. Given the obvious interest for the United States as well as the countries of the area in peace and mutual good relations at this critical period, I intend to continue to work with the Congress in an effort to achieve an acceptable Foreign Assistance Bill including Middle East assistance by the end of this year.

PALESTINIAN ROLE IN A MIDDLE EAST PEACE SETTLEMENT

Q: Where do the Palestinians fit into any Middle East peace settlement you foresee?

A: The question of the future of the Palestinian people is another important aspect of the Middle East problem, one which becomes increasingly important as progress is made on other issues. There can be no question but that full consideration must be given the legitimate interests of the Palestinian people if there is to be a just and durable settlement. The United States recognizes this vital fact and we are determined to do our best to assist the parties to find an equitable solution for the Palestinians who have for so long been displaced, as well as for Israel and the other states and peoples in the areas.

MIDDLE EAST - NUCLEAR ASSISTANCE

Q: In light of concern about nuclear non-proliferation and Arab oil supplies, how do you explain our willingness to supply nuclear technology and materials to a volatile area such as the Middle East, including Egypt and Israel?

A: It is our belief that nuclear power, no less than conventional technologies, can make an important contribution to economic progress in the area and thereby contribute to stability. As Secretary Kissinger indicated in his UN speech, we are involved in an intensive review of our non-proliferation objectives with a view to assuring that a threat to international peace will not arise because of the spread of nuclear technology. Our proposals to cooperate with Egypt and Israel in the field of nuclear power include strict safeguards designed to prevent the misuse of U. S. -supplied assistance.

I can assure you that the United States opposes nuclear proliferation and is determined that our cooperation in the supply of nuclear power should not be diverted to any unintended uses. We must also keep in mind that the United States is not the only country in a position to supply nuclear technology and that other countries may not insist on equally vigorous safeguards.

ARMS AID TO PAKISTAN

Q: How about our arms supply policy? Pakistan is pressing for a change. Are we going to go along with that?

A: Our objective in South Asia is to see that area move towards long-term peace and stability. We will determine our particular policies within this framework, so that our policies will contribute to, rather than upset, South Asian stability and contribute to meaningful progress towards long-term regional relationships resting on the independence and integrity of each state in the area. No decision has been made to revise our current policy, but that policy remains under continuing review.

US-SOVIET SUMMIT IN VLADIVOSTOK

(FYI: Your meeting with General Secretary Brezhnev in Vladivostok will be announced on Saturday, October 26 at 11:00 a.m. Your interview with Mr. Reasoner will precede the announcement. Mr. Reasoner will be aware of a possible Vladivostok meeting and presumably will question you about it. To make the interview as current as possible, you will want to respond as if the announcement had been made.)

Q: What do you hope to accomplish during your meeting with General Secretary Brezhnev in November? What will be the focus of your discussions?

A: From the outset of my Administration, I have stressed my commitment to working for improved relations with the Soviet Union in the interests of world peace. It is in this spirit that I will meet General Secretary Brezhnev in November. I look forward to the working meeting in Vladivostok as an opportunity to become acquainted with the General Secretary and to exchange views with him on matters of mutual interest. Inasmuch as this will be our first meeting, I expect our discussions to cover a broad range of issues in US-Soviet relations, including the several negotiations in which our two countries are now engaged. We also will be looking ahead in our talks to the General Secretary's visit to the United States next year.

US-EUROPEAN RELATIONS

Q: How do you assess the current state of US-European relations?

A: Since I entered the Congress in 1949, I have believed that it is important for the United States to have a strong alliance with NATO and Western Europe. This policy has paid -- and continues to pay -- sizable dividends to all members of the Alliance.

The Atlantic Declaration signed in Brussels this summer provides a fresh affirmation of the NATO Alliance by its members and marks a renewed spirit of unity and common purpose in the West. I intend to continue efforts to broaden and strengthen the partnership the Declaration symbolizes.

In recent weeks, I have met with a number of Allied leaders -- the Foreign Ministers of Britain, France and West Germany, and the Presidents of Italy and Portugal. In the near future, as part of these continuing meetings, I will meet with the President of France, the West German Chancellor and the Canadian Prime Minister.

In all of these meetings, I have stressed and will continue to stress the importance of close consultations on matters of mutual interest. I have emphasized that the nations of the West face major challenges -- financial, energy, security -- that will require our best common efforts if we are to meet them successfully.

US-European relations currently are very good. Based on my meetings with Allied leaders and the will to cooperate expressed in the Atlantic Declaration, I am optimistic that jointly we can meet and overcome the problems that confront us.

U. S-SOVIET RELATIONS

Q: Detente with the Soviet Union has become a controversial issue, both in the press and on the Hill. Could you comment on the general state of US-Soviet relations and on the proposition that the Soviets have made real gains under detente while we have gotten little in return?

A: The effort to achieve a more constructive relationship with the Soviet Union expresses the continuing desire of the vast majority of the American people for an easing of international tensions while safeguarding our security. I am committed to continuing to work for better relations with the Soviets in the belief that it is in our real interests and in the interests of a more peaceful world.

Now, there is no question that the Soviet Union obtains benefits from detente. How else could Soviet leaders justify it? But the essential point surely is that detente serves American interests as well. On the global scale, in terms of the conventional measures of security, our interests, far from suffering, have generally prospered. In many areas of the world, the influence and the respect we enjoy are greater than was the case for many years. Real detente -- the course I am committed to -- does not involve gains at US expense.

Continued effort to engage the Soviets in a relationship characterized by mutual restraint and accommodation is an absolute imperative in the present world situation. Equally

imperative, of course, are the needs to maintain a strong defense posture and close ties with our traditional friends. The task before us is to conduct US-Soviet relations in a way that will protect our own security and other interests, benefit other nations of the world, and progressively deepen the commitment of the USSR to mutual restraint, accommodation and increasing cooperation as the governing principles of our relations.

In this context, I believe the prospects for major progress are good insofar as they depend on our actions. I have informed the Soviet leaders that it is my intention to continue the course of Soviet-American relations charted in summit meetings in Moscow and Washington, in agreements reached by our two governments, and in the general spirit of cooperation that has been established. I am firmly committed to that course. My Administration will approach the negotiations with the USSR already in progress or projected in coming weeks with utmost seriousness and determination to achieve concrete and lasting results -- results in the best interests of the United States and in the interests of improved international stability. Personally, I am hopeful that the Soviet Union shares these objectives and will continue to work in earnest with us in this approach.

SALT

Q: Reports say you have assured the Soviet leaders of extensive efforts to further arms limitation negotiations. Other reports say the US has no agreed SALT position. Where do you plan to go next on SALT?

A: Shortly after I took office, I sent a message to General Secretary Brezhnev reaffirming our commitment to further substantive negotiations on the limitation of strategic arms. I personally gave this same message to Soviet Foreign Minister Gromyko during our discussions in Washington last month.

The SALT negotiations resumed in Geneva in mid-September and have now been in continuous session for almost six weeks. As agreed at the recent Moscow Summit, this round of negotiations is focusing on an agreement covering the period until 1985. The US Delegation in Geneva has been putting forth the US position on the framework for the 1985 agreement. The Soviets have similarly been putting forth their position. Obviously, at this stage of the negotiations we have not resolved all the differences in the positions of the two sides. We believe, however, there is common ground which can form the basis for an agreement.

Secretary Kissinger is in Moscow this week discussing a number of topics of mutual interest with the Soviets. SALT will be a major topic of discussion as we attempt to narrow our differences with the Soviets and move toward an agreement.

GREECE-TURKEY-CYPRUS

Q: Your Administration is being accused of "tilting" toward Turkey, being unfair to Greece, and thus seriously damaging our relations with that country. Could you comment on this and the U.S. role in the Cyprus crisis?

A: We have not "tilted" toward Turkey. The diplomatic efforts of the United States have focussed on three essential objectives:

- to stop the fighting on Cyprus;
- to assist in relieving the human suffering of the people of Cyprus;
- to assist the parties toward productive negotiations for the restoration of peace and stability in the Eastern Mediterranean.

We have made progress in each area. A ceasefire has been achieved and is holding. The United States has urged military restraint and we have supported every UN Security Council resolution on Cyprus, including the most recent resolution disapproving unilateral military actions taken against the Republic of Cyprus and urging that negotiations be resumed among the parties.

The United States has been a major contributor to international efforts aimed at relieving suffering on the island. I have directed that money and supplies be provided to the International Red Cross and the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees. By December 31, we will have contributed more than \$7.6 million to this Cyprus relief effort.

In seeking to bring the parties into productive negotiations, the United States has maintained direct and frequent contact with the leaders of the Greek, Turkish and Cypriot Governments. We have been encouraged by the talks which have begun on Cyprus between Acting President Clerides and Vice President Denktash.

The United States is prepared to play a more active role, if that is what the parties desire, in helping to find a solution to the difficult Cyprus problem. Such a role would be in the context of the continuing overall goals I have set; to preserve the sovereignty, territorial integrity and independence of Cyprus and to restore stability and peace to the Eastern Mediterranean. I want to emphasize that the U.S. greatly values the friendship of Greece, Cyprus and Turkey, and it is in this context that we will continue to offer our assistance.

I believe that our ability to pursue these goals depends on being able to maintain a constructive relationship with the parties involved. I concluded that the cut-off of assistance to Turkey imposed by the restrictive provisions of the Continuing Resolution would be destructive of that relationship and might, in fact, destroy any hope for the success of initiatives the U.S. has already taken or may take to contribute to a just settlement of the Cyprus problem. These restrictions threaten our relations with Turkey, a crucial member

of an alliance vital to the strategic interests of the U.S., and instead of encouraging the parties to return to the negotiating table, an arms cutoff to Turkey could mean the postponement of meaningful negotiations. As a result of my vetoes of two earlier versions of this Continuing Resolution, Congress eased the most troublesome of the earlier restrictions and after a three-week delay in providing necessary funds for the operation of several departments and agencies, I signed, with serious reservations, the Continuing Resolution.

The problems created by these legislative restrictions with respect to our relations with Turkey are not compensated for in any way by benefits to Greece or the Greek Cypriots. Contrary to the intentions of the supporters of these restrictions, this bill can only hinder progress toward a settlement which is so much in the interest of both Greece and the people of Cyprus.

Nevertheless, I will do my best to accomplish the goals which we had set.

US-JAPAN RELATIONS

Q: Why are you going to Japan? How would you describe our relationship with Japan as you prepare for your trip?

A: I told Prime Minister Tanaka that I consider our close relationship with Japan of vital importance to the United States. I am happy to say that it is probably closer now than it has ever been. Japan's economic well-being as well as her security are closely linked with our own.

We shall continue to work closely with Japan which is one of the most important countries in the world and one of our strongest allies. My forthcoming visit to Japan -- the first by any American President -- best symbolizes this new era in our relations and I look forward to discussing additional areas of US - Japanese cooperation in the common challenges we face.

JAPAN - NUCLEAR WEAPONS PROTESTS

Q: Are you concerned that the recent protests in Japan may offset your plans to visit there? Have you assured Prime Minister Tanaka that American ships do not carry nuclear weapons when they visit Japanese ports?

A: All of the information that has come to me indicates that the vast majority of Japanese people want me to come to Japan just as the American people will welcome the Japanese Emperor's visit to the United States.

It has long been U.S. policy not to confirm or deny the presence or absence of nuclear weapons deployed anywhere. This is something we do not discuss for valid security reasons. Let me simply assure you that the United States Government has no intention of acting in a manner contrary to the wishes of the Japanese Government.

PEOPLE'S REPUBLIC OF CHINA

Q: The opening to China was one of the most distinctive aspects of former President Nixon's foreign policy. Do you intend to sustain his efforts to normalize relations with the People's Republic of China? Why has there been no apparent movement in U. S. -PRC relations in the past year? When do you foresee full normalization and establishment of diplomatic relations with the PRC?

A: In many ways Mr. Nixon's successful efforts to open an official dialogue with the People's Republic of China marked the breakthrough in his policy of moving from an era of confrontations to one of negotiations. I fully subscribe to those past efforts, and intend to pursue the policy of further normalizing U. S. -PRC relations outlined in the Shanghai Communique.

I disagree with the view there has been no movement in U. S. - PRC relations. The United States has made very rapid progress since 1971 in establishing contact with a country from which we had been completely isolated for two decades. We have set up Liaison Offices in Peking and Washington. Our trade with the PRC has grown from about 5 million dollars in 1971 to what is expected to be a billion dollars this year. We continue to have an active cultural and scientific exchange program with the Chinese. A Congressional delegation, headed by Senator Fulbright, recently returned from a two-week tour of China. I expect that Secretary Kissinger will be visiting Peking later this year.

As I indicated in my address to Congress on August 12, I remain committed to the course of improved relations charted in the Shanghai Communique. We look forward to continuing progress in strengthening those relations in the months and years ahead.

PRESIDENTIAL TRIP AND US AID TO KOREA

Q: How do you justify your visit to Korea in light of the repressive regime governing that country? Do you favor continuing US military and economic aid to the Park regime in Korea, which uses US support to strengthen its repression of human rights?

A: In planning my trip to Japan, I gave careful consideration to an invitation from the Korean Government. You will recall that Presidents Eisenhower and Johnson visited Korea. Korea is one of our long-standing allies, and we have important security interests in the Korean peninsula. We still maintain a sizeable military presence there. I took all of these factors, including criticism of recent Korean internal political policies, into careful account and decided that, on balance, it was in our national interest to accept the Korean invitation.

We have made clear to the Korean Government our views on the question of human rights, and shall continue to do so. But whatever may be our disagreements, Korea is, some twenty years after a devastating communist invasion and war, a strong and independent country. The US has lessened its overall assistance substantially, and grant aid is continuing to decline. But the existence of an independent, self-reliant Republic of Korea is a key element of our efforts to maintain the stability and security of Northeast Asia. We consider these interests of paramount importance. I believe the prevention of war on the Korean

Peninsula is the first and most important step toward making possible conditions in which free political and social institutions can develop. Withholding essential economic and military assistance could well have the opposite effect.

OUR OVERALL POLICY IN VIETNAM

Q: After all we have been through with Vietnam over the past ten years, it is still a major issue in the country. What is your policy in regard to Vietnam, what obligations do we still have there and what actions do you plan to take over the next two years?

A: Our basic objective in Vietnam is to make the peace agreements work and thus give the Vietnamese people a reasonable chance to decide their future for themselves. Those agreements were reached after considerable effort. They represented, and they still represent, a major contribution to world stability. We want to see them carried out.

In pursuit of this objective, our policy follows two lines:

-- First, we encourage observance of the specific provisions of the Agreement. For example, we have supported the International Control Commission and we are urging all parties to contribute their share of the funds needed to permit it to continue its work. We are also doing all we can to get a full accounting for our men missing in action. We are encouraging the Vietnamese parties to talk to each other. Most important, we have kept our obligation to withdraw all American troops and to provide war materials to South Vietnam only on a replacement basis.

-- At the same time, while trying to make the agreements work, we must help our friends as long as the fighting continues.

The North Vietnamese have sent over a hundred and sixty thousand

men into South Vietnam since the cease-fire along with large quantities of new supplies. It is quite proper for us to provide enough economic and military assistance to help our friends defend themselves and reconstruct their economy. We are no longer doing the fighting, but our aid is essential for those who are. It is also essential in demonstrating to the Vietnamese and the rest of the world that we are reliable and responsible allies.

We believe that the combination of these policies will work. We have been encouraged by the efforts of the South Vietnamese Government to implement the agreement and by its attempts to reach a peaceful settlement with the other side. We regret that the Communists have rejected out of hand Saigon's proposals for direct talks with Hanoi and for free general elections. We continue to hope that a momentum can be started toward a political settlement.

Some Americans are discouraged about Vietnam. But we should not forget the positive developments that show the progress made:

-- Americans are no longer fighting in Vietnam, and the South Vietnamese are able to defend themselves without our troops.

-- Even though the cease-fire is not completely effective, the level of fighting is lower than it was before the cease-fire.

We are not yet at the end of the road. There may even be an upsurge in the fighting. Our continued economic and military assistance is still essential. But I do not believe that Americans should be discouraged or speak of walking away from a part of the world where so much has already been accomplished.

VIETNAM

Why do We Continue to Support President Thieu?

Q: There have been a number of recent reports from South Vietnam indicating that several popular demonstrations against President Thieu have taken place. Other reports outline the corruption and undemocratic repressive measures which pervade his administration. Still others state that it is Thieu who refuses to make the necessary accommodations with the Communists to bring about a genuine peace. In the face of all of this, why do we continue to support President Thieu? Would it not be more in our interest now to endorse a more moderate man who can really bring peace?

A: President Thieu is the elected head of the constitutional government in South Vietnam seeking to maintain the independence of this country. That is why we support him and his administration.

Under the circumstances -- a continued high level of infiltration from the North and heavy attacks by enemy forces in many areas -- I believe that the achievements made in the past year toward rebuilding the economy and getting on with the process of nation building have been truly remarkable.

Let me give you a couple of examples:

-- One of the largest and most successful land reform programs in history has been carried out.

-- Hundreds of thousands of war victims and refugees have been resettled.

I believe the record clearly shows that the Communist side, not President Thieu, is mainly to blame for the absence of a

peaceful settlement. The Thieu Government has gone far in implementing the Agreement and in attempting to reach a peaceful settlement with the other side.

On March 29, 1974 the Government of South Vietnam proposed in Paris a specific date for free general elections to be preceded by the formation of the National Council of reconciliation and Concord and by negotiated agreements on other democratic internal problems. The South Vietnamese Government has also proposed direct talks with Hanoi on improving relations between North and South Vietnam. All of these South Vietnamese proposals were rejected out of hand by the Communist side.

US AID TO VIETNAM

Q: Why do we continue to provide so much aid to South Vietnam? Does not this just allow the war to go on and the destruction continue? Specifically in Vietnam by cutting aid won't we be able to force President Thieu to make a political settlement? It has also been charged that the United States is violating the Paris Agreements by continuing to provide military assistance to the Thieu Government. With inflation so rampant at home, shouldn't we now drastically cut aid to Vietnam?

A: First of all, it is the Communist side, not the GVN, that is continuing the war by refusing to implement the ceasefire:

-- The Viet Cong and the North Vietnamese have refused to contribute to the International Commission on Control and Supervision (ICCS) budget and have never assisted the ICCS in implementing the ceasefire.

-- They have walked out of the talks in Paris and they have boycotted the talks in Saigon.

-- They have refused to let us search for any of our MIAs. South Vietnam has repeatedly called for a complete implementation of all political provisions of the Agreement with a fixed date for elections. The Communist side has refused even to discuss these proposals.

If by cutting off aid and political support we force the GVN to accommodate the Communists while the Communists are blatantly violating the Agreement, it will undermine the political stability of the GVN side and could lead to a Communist takeover.

If we leave the South Vietnamese without sufficient means to defend themselves, this may convince Hanoi that it can win a military victory and lead to a renewed offensive.

I am very disappointed with the moves in Congress to cut military assistance drastically. In my meetings with the bipartisan leadership, I have asked the Congress to reconsider its actions. On the military side, we have asked for minimum amounts to assure adequate replacement of equipment on a one-for-one basis, as provided in the Paris Agreement, and to cope with increased levels of fighting. The amount of assistance recently approved by both Houses is inadequate to provide for all of their critical needs, if South Vietnam's enemies continue to press their attacks. I intend to discuss with the leaders of the Congress how we can provide the assistance necessary.

Our request for economic aid has thus far been cut about in half by Congressional action. Such an amount would fail even to maintain the status quo. We would hope to be able to help in the vital reconstruction process and to give South Vietnam an opportunity to build a viable, self-sufficient economy. Over the long run, that would mean less American aid.

CAMBODIA - US MAJOR POLICY AIMS

Q: What are our policy aims in Cambodia? Why are we still actively involved there? When do you see this involvement ending?

A: Our major goal now is to see a negotiated settlement in Cambodia. The war there has gone on far too long. The other side has failed in its efforts to take Cambodia by military means. We believe negotiations should take place now. The Cambodian Government has recently called for unconditional talks. We fully support this move. Until there is a settlement, we will continue to support and assist our friends. We believe that only when the other side firmly believes it cannot win, will they be willing to talk.

U. S. POLICY TOWARD LATIN AMERICA

Q: Mr. President, you have just returned from a meeting with the President of Mexico at which you discussed a range of subjects, including hemispheric affairs. What is your view of U. S. policy toward Latin American and what can we expect in the coming year in this area of foreign policy?

A: Over the past year, the U. S. has been giving renewed attention to its relations with the countries of Latin America and the Caribbean. Together we have been working to broaden and deepen our relations, and important progress has been made toward establishing a frank, open dialogue and regular consultations on a broad range of subjects. Periodic conferences of the Foreign Ministers have been established to facilitate this development. Also, I have met in recent months with a number of leaders from the Hemisphere, and most recently with the President of Mexico, to discuss regional matters and to hear the views of these leaders on subjects of interest or concern to them. I expect this process to continue.

We have also made significant progress toward resolving some longstanding bilateral problems in the region over the last year and we will be continuing our efforts to resolve remaining problems. I am sure that with a continuing spirit of mutual understanding and cooperation, our efforts to resolve such issues through negotiation and mutual compromise and to strengthen further Hemispheric relations will be productive. I assure you the efforts of my Administration over the coming years will be directed toward this end.

CUBA POLICY

- Q: The Organization of American States (OAS) has begun consideration on possible lifting of the sanctions against Cuba: Senators Javits and Pell visited Cuba and reported that Prime Minister Castro is interested in better relations with the U. S. and that his release of four U. S. -citizen prisoners is evidence of this desire; and Prime Minister Castro in a CBS interview indicated he thought an improvement in U. S. -Cuban relations would be possible under your Administration. What is your position on U. S. policy toward Cuba and do you regard these as signals from Cuba indicated its desire for improved U. S. -Cuban relations.
- A: As you know, the Organization of American States, which voted against the Castro Government because of charges brought by member governments that Cuba was intervening in their internal affairs, has approved a resolution calling for reconsideration of the Cuba sanctions question. There will be a meeting of the Rio Treaty parties in Quito in November to discuss the issue. During this OAS process, we will be consulting with other governments in the Hemisphere regarding their views. Should the members of that forum decide that the conditions which gave rise to the Cuba resolutions no longer obtain, then that would certainly be one element we would weigh in any considerations of our own policies.

Now, it has long been our position that we would be prepared to consider a change in our policy toward Cuba if and when Cuba demonstrates that it has changed its policies. Of course we always look for consistent indications of a desire on Cuba's part to establish a peaceful and constructive relationship with the U. S.

Looking at recent speeches and public statements by Cuban officials, I have seen no real evidence of such an interest on the part of the Cubans in beginning to work toward establishing such a relationship.

CHILE - COVERT OPERATIONS - 40 COMMITTEE

Q: You have expressed your support for CIA and covert operations such as those in Chile. Do you intend to "destabilize" other governments in the future? Will the 40 Committee continue to operate?

A: The U.S. had no role in the coup in Chile; we did not encourage or support the coup. Our efforts were designed to support the democratic process in Chile and to preserve media outlets. So while I reject your characterization of what the government did in Chile, there may be occasions in the future, as there have been in the past, where the national interest may require that some action be taken in support of our foreign policy which it would not be appropriate to announce publicly.

The 40 Committee is a component of the NSC system. It provides a forum to review and evaluate sensitive operations. I can assure you -- and I have discussed this with the leaders of Congress and CIA Director Colby -- that all such actions are subject to critical review and careful control through the NSC system and approved by me. They are taken under laws approved by the Congress, using funds provided by the Congress, and are reported to the committees designated by the Congress to review these operations.

Future covert operations, if required, will be authorized only to protect our national security and only then when other means will

not accomplish that necessary objective. I am satisfied that our current procedures will ensure that this will be done.

AFRICA

Q: There continues to be criticism that your Administration is ignoring Africa. What is your Administration's policy towards Africa?

A: African interests will be taken seriously in the foreign policy of my Administration. Our goal is to increase our understanding of the problems and aspirations of Africa and to find new ways in which we can be helpful. Recently, I met with President Siad [See-AHD] of Somalia, who is the current President of the Organization of African Unity, and had an opportunity to pursue with him matters of common interest. I look forward to continued contacts of this sort with Africa's leaders.

Recently there have been some heartening developments in Africa, particularly with regard to the Portuguese territories. We have recognized the new state of Guinea-Bissau and supported its membership in the United Nations. We follow with keen interest the developments in Mozambique and Angola and have expressed our appreciation to the Portuguese for their efforts to provide self-determination to these peoples, a step we have urged all along.

Lastly, I think we should keep in mind the basic humanitarian concern the American people have always felt for the peoples

of Africa. The United States response to the disastrous drought in Africa which began in 1972 is a clear example of that concern. The United States Government has been the largest donor throughout the emergency period, providing approximately 40 percent of the total in foodstuffs and other relief supplies. Through the end of fiscal 1974 we had committed over 600,000 tons of foodstuffs worth approximately \$120 million, and have given another \$29 million in non-foodstuffs. This type of assistance will continue. We are also joining with others to assist the affected states in medium and long-term development projects which will permit them to provide for their own needs.

SOUTH AFRICA

Q: There have recently been news reports that your predecessor's Administration adopted a "secret tilt toward the white supremacist states."

A: Our policy toward Africa is not secret, and U.S. actions toward Africa make quite clear the unfairness of such characterization. The United States Government's views about South Africa's dehumanizing system of apartheid have been expressed repeatedly in the United Nations, other international forums, and in public statements. We also continue to enforce an embargo on the sale of arms to South Africa. We have a ban on naval visits and a neutral stance on U.S. investment. On the other hand, we do not believe that isolating South Africa from the influence of the rest of the world is an effective way of encouraging them to follow a course of moderation and to accommodate change. Nor can we associate ourselves with violent solutions to the problems of southern Africa.

FOREIGN AID IN GENERAL

Q: Mr. President, in the post-Vietnam era foreign assistance has come under increasing attack as a cause and symptom on unnecessary involvement overseas and a source of support for undemocratic regimes. Congress has cut funding levels and restricted your powers. You have vetoed two temporary bills and accepted a third only very reluctantly. Do you think you can get the mutually acceptable foreign aid legislation you have called for when Congress returns?

A: Yes, I do. I know from my own experience in Congress that foreign assistance is not a popular issue. It grows more unpopular just before an election, when the foreign aid dollar to protect our interests abroad seems to compete with the need for dollars for domestic projects. When Congress returns I will do what every President has always had to do: try to find the common ground on issues, try to forge agreement, and to articulate the interests of all the people rather than of various areas and constituencies.

In the past whenever we have had to take in our belts at home there has been a rush to cut back on our programs abroad -- to isolate ourselves. This is understandable, but in today's world it is dangerous.

Nothing has demonstrated our interdependence with other countries and their reliance on American leadership and cooperation than the shortages we are facing in food and energy. For many countries, without the help made available by our foreign aid, there would be starvation, and sickness. We cannot ignore these needs

for if they go untended they will only worsen and spread. There can be no doubt that America's interests lie in helping countries in need to help themselves.

We spend less than 1/2 of 1% of our Gross National Product on foreign aid. Surely this is a small price to pay for the difference between life and death to many people.

Apart from our food programs our assistance goes to enable friendly countries to defend themselves so that we will not have to do it for them.

I am going to continue the process of reducing our direct involvement in the defense of friends around the world without jeopardizing either their security or our own. I believe there is broad support in Congress for this policy.

OIL PRICES

Q: You and Secretary Kissinger have both called oil prices a world peril and sounded threatening. What actions does the U.S. plan to take?

A: The very serious problems caused by high oil prices are receiving the priority attention of this Administration. Most immediately, we must intensify our efforts to conserve energy and move ahead rapidly under Project Independence to develop alternative sources of energy to reduce our dependence on imported oil. We and the other oil importing countries simply cannot afford to permit our oil import bill to continue to rise, and we must all limit our use of oil. In order to be most effective, these conservation policies must be carried out in close cooperation with other consuming countries. We are now working with a number of other countries to develop a framework for this cooperation.

At the same time, we seek to improve our cooperative dialogue with the oil producing countries. It is a misreading of our intentions to say the United States is seeking a confrontation: we are calling for a recognition of the interdependence of the modern world and the need for cooperation. I am confident that the oil producers will realize that their own economic well-being is intimately linked to the economic health of the rest of the world and that they will conduct their oil price and production policies accordingly. We are

also working within the international financial system to provide a means to make the oil income surpluses available to nations whose balance of payments are seriously threatened. We also expect the trade reform act to provide opportunities for expanded world trade by enabling the U.S. to work with others to improve the international trading system and lower artificial barriers to trade.

There is still another measure which is essential. That is the avoidance of nationalistic policies whereby each nation attempts to protect itself at the expense of others. The international economy can be strengthened only through international cooperation, with each nation accepting its share of the burden in meeting our common difficulties.

HUMAN RIGHTS AND FOREIGN POLICY

Q: For the past several years US foreign policy has been attacked for being insensitive to human rights issues in Greece, Korea, Chile and elsewhere. Do you contemplate any change in this approach to policy?

A: As Americans, we can never acquiesce in the suppression of human liberties. Many Americans have fought and died to preserve freedom in foreign lands. We will continue to adhere firmly to the human principles and rights stated in the United Nations Declaration on Human Rights -- not only in international forums, but also in our exchanges with other governments.

We want people everywhere to be free and we will use our influence to encourage respect for human rights, but we cannot refuse to deal with other states on grounds that they do not meet our standards.

I assure you we will continue to work for human rights in the manner that will be most effective in enhancing those rights.

NUCLEAR WEAPONS PROLIFERATION

Q: What is the U.S. doing and what actions are open to us to prevent the spread of nuclear weapons throughout the world, with its obvious threat to peace and security?

A: Our desire to prevent the spread of nuclear weapons is a key factor in our foreign policy. That this desire is shared strongly by most other nations is reflected by the fact that over 80 countries have ratified the Non-Proliferation Treaty. This Treaty constitutes a pledge by non-weapon states not to develop nuclear explosives and, equally important, requires comprehensive safeguards so that international nuclear sharing in the peaceful use of nuclear energy can be carried out without contributing to the problem of proliferation.

We must realize, however, that there are a number of countries who have shown little interest in associating themselves with the Treaty. Moreover, the effect of any treaty is not immutable. Thus, the potential for proliferation continues to exist. We must work to strengthen the Non-Proliferation Treaty, but we also recognize the necessity of taking additional steps outside the framework of the Treaty to prevent proliferation as effectively as possible.

It is our objective to establish conditions and to take actions so that countries do not develop nuclear explosives either for weapons or so-called peaceful purposes. Of course, the most important condition to achieve is that of stability and interdependence

so that no country feels that it is in its security interest to acquire nuclear weapons. Beyond that, our specific actions are aimed at easing nuclear tension through arms control, which we are pursuing now with the USSR, and strictly controlling the export of technology and materials intended for civil nuclear energy programs, but which could be used to assist the independent development of nuclear explosives. In effecting such controls, it is vital to have the close cooperation of those other countries in the world who are nuclear exporters, since the network of controls will be only as strong as its weakest link. Without these controls, we will not be able freely to share nuclear technology. With them, the world can safely derive the benefits of this important energy source.

Secretary Kissinger has dwelt on the issue of proliferation in his recent UN speech, and we will make it the subject of diplomatic and technical discussions in every appropriate forum where we can hope to influence nations toward prudent policies in this area.

NATIONAL DEFENSE

Q: What are your views on national defense?

A: Our interests are best served by maintaining a strong national defense. Peace can only be built upon the clear ability and will of the American people to protect our interests whenever they may be threatened.

There are several critical facets to the need for a strong military posture. A strong defense is our principal deterrent against aggression. This is crucial not only to us, but to our allies as well, since we bear the main burden of maintaining the security and survival of the Free World. Our Defense posture is a fundamental underpinning of our alliances, and reinforces the will of our allies to make our common defense work. Moreover, our military strength underwrites our diplomatic strength. It insures that negotiation is the only rational course, and thus lays the groundwork for achieving, through negotiation, a relaxation of tensions with our adversaries, and an enduring framework for peace.

I recently signed into law the Defense Appropriations Bill for FY 1975 which Congress had approved. Although the Congress

did not accept all Administration recommendations, I fully recognize and appreciate the bipartisan efforts made by the House-Senate conference committee to produce a Defense Appropriations Bill acceptable to both Houses and sufficient for our national security needs.

In any event, from my experience in Congress I know all too well the conflicts that defense bills can produce in the name of economy and other national interests. Thus, as I mentioned when I signed the FY 1975 defense bill, I want to renew my pledge to build a new partnership between the Executive and Legislative branches of our Government, a partnership based on close consultation, compromise of differences and a high regard for the constitutional duties and powers of both branches to work for the common good and security of our nation.

Each Administration and Congress since the Second World War has supported -- on a bipartisan basis -- the maintenance of our military strength. I intend to continue to support a strong defense posture, and I believe the Congress will continue to do so also.

FOREIGN POLICY COMMISSION

Question

What is the status of the Commission on the Organization of Government for the Conduct of Foreign Policy? (Murphy Commission)

Answer

It is finishing up its briefings here in Washington and has begun public hearings in 4 major cities to insure broad input. Following those hearings, the Commission will draft a report of its findings and recommendations for formulating and implementing U.S. foreign policy. The report will be submitted to the Congress and the President by June 30, 1975.

Background

The Foreign Policy Commission was created by the Foreign Relations Authorization Act of 1972.

The Commission is composed of 12 members. Four members are appointed by the President; four members are appointed by the President of the Senate; and four members are appointed by the Speaker of the House.

The Commission has the mandate to examine all aspects of the formulation and implementation of our foreign policy. Its recommendations may take the form of proposed constitutional amendments, legislation, or administrative actions.

The Chairman of the Commission is the Honorable Robert D. Murphy; the Executive Director is Francis O. Wilcox.