THE DEPARTMENT OF STATE BULLETIN

Volume LXXV • No. 1953 • November 29, 1976

U.S. FOREIGN ECONOMIC RELATIONS: SOME FUTURE PROSPECTS
Address by Under Secretary Rogers 653

GOALS FOR UNESCO
Statement by Assistant Secretary Reinhardt 661

U.S. REVIEWS INTERNATIONAL COOPERATION IN SPACE ACTIVITIES AND WORK OF THE U.N. OUTER SPACE COMMITTEE IN 1976
Statement by Ambassador Bennett 668

THE OFFICIAL WEEKLY RECORD OF UNITED STATES FOREIGN POLICY

For index see inside back cover

THE DEPARTMENT OF STATE BULLETIN

VOL. LXXV, No. 1953
November 29, 1976

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

The BULLETIN includes selecte press releases on foreign policy, issue by the White House and the Depart ment, and statements, addresse and news conferences of the Presiden and the Secretary of State and othe officers of the Department, as well a special articles on various phases o international affairs and the function of the Department. Information i included concerning treaties and inter national agreements to which th United States is or may become party and on treaties of general inter national interest.

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

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

PRICE:

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

U.S. Foreign Economic Relations: Some Future Prospects

Address by William D. Rogers
Under Secretary for Economic Affairs [1]

This morning I would like to say a word or two about our foreign economic engagements from three perspectives.

First, I will try to locate the issues in the framework of our recent history. Second, I will describe where we stand now—our recent initiatives, our current policies, and the purposes which inform them. And third, I will look to some of the critical issues which will tax our wit and wisdom in the years immediately ahead.

Let me begin with a brief historical perspective. The seventies already are beginning to look like not one but two eras.

The first was 1970–73. During this time the international monetary system of fixed parities collapsed. The tradition of a trading system geared to deliberate reductions of trade barriers, nondiscrimination, and reciprocity began to show strains. And conflicts emerged in the area of private direct investment, for which there were few rules of the game and little consensus about what the rules, if any, should be. As the Vietnam era closed and an American President journeyed to Peking, there was an increasing awareness of the need to reform the international economic system.

But this was overtaken in the second period, from late 1973 to the present, by a series of unprecedented and unanticipated shocks in the global economy. First, inflation and recession managed to ravage the world's trade and financial centers at the same moment. Second, OPEC [Organization of Petroleum Exporting Countries] arranged a stunning increase in the price of oil, and this produced a massive shift of wealth to a handful of countries.

At the same time, through a combination of manmade policies and acts of God, global food reserves suddenly began to shrink, and serious students of the condition of man began to suspect that we were on the brink of massive food shortages and a massive shortage of energy and other raw materials as well. Finally, the shift in financial resources to the oil exporters produced a growing concern whether the world's existing financial institutions could in fact recycle OPEC's new funds and cope with the rising debt of both industrial and developing countries.

At bottom was a growing doubt about the viability of the international economic structure developed since the Second World War and a growing fear that inflation, recession, and the financial crises would drive nations in desperation to resolve their domestic economic difficulties at the expense of other countries.

So it was that the central objective of international economic policy of the industrialized democracies during this period had to be to keep themselves afloat, prevent backsliding, and avoid beggar-thy-neighbor policies.

[1] Made before the National Planning Association's Committee on the Changing International Realities at San Francisco, Calif., on Nov. 5.

Concrete Programs for Cooperation

In fact, I think it fair to say we came through the period of crisis in 1973–75 remarkably well.

Our achievements are several:

—Under the pressure of events, we have considerably strengthened the ties which bind us to the other industrialized democracies. We have established a tradition these last several years of working more closely together on economic issues than ever before. Rambouillet and the ministerial meeting last June of the OECD [Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development], at which both Secretary Simon and Secretary Kissinger spoke, and the summit meeting of heads of state at Puerto Rico in June established a commitment on the part of each of the major economic powers of the free world that their domestic economic policies cannot work effectively in disharmony, that there is a need for effective cooperation, and that we will work together. This newly emerged economic alliance is the very centerpiece of our international economic policy.

—Trade is the vital engine of international economic growth, and we are well started on the present round of reducing both tariff and nontariff barriers in Geneva. In this respect, the United States has tabled a generous tariff-cutting formula which would reduce existing tariffs on the average of 55 percent. At the same time, we have unilaterally instituted our own generalized scheme of preferences for the developing countries. These generalized preferences will give duty-free access to over $2½ billion of imports coming from over 100 developing countries. The beneficiaries will be not only the developing countries themselves but also our own consumers.

—We have not forgotten the lessons of 1973–75 for resources. We are alert now to the need to make a special effort to insure that the world has the resources it requires for future growth. In the area of energy and industrial raw materials, where both costs and risks are increasing, Secretary Kissinger has proposed the establishment of an International Resources Bank to facilitate a variety of cooperative arrangements between private enterprise and governments and spur the expansion of resource output, particularly in the developing countries.

—We are committed to a system of free movement of private capital, management, and technology in the interest of global growth. For this reason, we have made a major effort to improve the often uneasy environment in which international business can operate. The OECD investment declaration was a remarkable achievement, committing the major economic powers of the OECD to equal treatment for foreign investment and the avoidance of competitive incentives or disincentives to free investment flows. With this commitment, we can move forward to a system of capital movements that will enhance the prospect of efficient investment based upon comparative advantage. In addition, we are making a constructive contribution to the efforts of the U.N. Commission on Transnational Corporations, which will establish an information center for corporations and governments.

—Beginning with Secretary Kissinger's address at the United Nations General Assembly seventh special session, we have made a major effort to redesign our policies toward the developing countries, to address their special needs for growth and development. The United States has authored virtually all of the new accomplishments in this area, beginning with the expansion of the International Monetary Fund's compensatory financing facility, the expansion of the lending capabilities of the World Bank and other multilateral financial institutions, efforts to improve LDC [less developed country] access to our capital markets, and the forthcoming world conference on technology transfers, which is of such vital interest to the developing world.

In addition, we have also taken the lead in setting up financial facilities to help low-income countries weather severe balance-of-payments problems. Specifically, we proposed the establishment of the currently operating Trust Fund of the International Monetary Fund to subsidize loans to the developing countries with proceeds from the sale of IMF gold.

Over the last several years, we have refocused our concessional development assistance on the low-income countries and on the poorer sectors within those countries. Nearly all of our foreign development assistance now goes to promote health, education, food production, and population.

At the World Food Conference, and in its subsequent actions, the U.S. Government has focused on assistance to developing countries to increase food production. We are contributing $200 million to the newly established International Fund for Agricultural Development. This year we are also supplying 60 percent of the 10-million-ton food aid target established by the World Food Conference.

At the same time, we have not forgotten the lessons of the oil embargo. Under the International Energy Agency in Paris, we and 17 industrialized-country members have established an extensive framework for cooperation on emergency energy sharing as well as on the expansion of future production, conservation, research, and development. In addition, we have proposed the establishment of an International Energy Institute to assist developing countries in formulating their own national policies and to expand development and production of energy in energy-poor developing countries.

We have, in short, emerged from a period of severe difficulty with a comprehensive international economic policy and a series of specific and concrete programs to implement that policy. And it is well that this should be so—because some of the palpable lessons of the recent years of turmoil and struggle have been the increasing importance of international economic developments to our own domestic interests, the heightened sensitivity of our economy to impulses from abroad, and the absolute necessity for forging a comprehensive program that will enhance our own national interests through international economic cooperation.

The world is with us:

—This year we will import 44 percent of our total petroleum consumption. By 1980, this dependence may approach 50 percent, a question with serious policy implications to which I will return.

—We import 90 percent of our bauxite, 20 percent of chromium, 95 percent of platinum, 82 percent of manganese, 65 percent of our tin, nearly a third of our iron, all of our rubber.

—This year U.S. exports will be in the neighborhood of $113 billion. This amounts to nearly 14 percent of our total output of goods and is directly responsible for perhaps 3.5 million of the more highly paid and technologically advanced jobs in our own economy.

—American business has invested about a quarter of a trillion dollars abroad. The annual return on these investments is over $17 billion—an important share of total U.S. corporate profits.

Clearly then, a major concern of our foreign policy must be the enhancement of international economic cooperation.

Seven Challenges To Address

Let me now look ahead for a few minutes.

The future is never a simple extrapolation from the past. It would be captious to imply that we can rest content to do in the future what we have done in the past, no matter how well we may have done it. New challenges emerge. Indeed, new challenges are emerging even now, as I earlier suggested.

The Industrialized Democracies

First, and perhaps foremost, is the economic condition of the industrialized de-

mocracies of North America, Europe, and the Far East.

We speak constantly of interdependence. In fact, the synchronization of the economies of the major industrialized powers in recent months has been extraordinarily surprising. All began the process of recovery from the trough of the recession at about the same time. Most experienced a surge of quick growth; in our own case, annual growth rates for the first half of the year were 9 percent. Virtually all now, however, are in a pause.

The prospects for the world economy for 1977 are for slower rates of real growth than in 1976. This is largely because a number of industrial countries will be constrained, by difficulties in financing balance-of-payments deficits, to adjustment policies which slow the growth of aggregate demand in the short run. There clearly will be growth. But that growth will likely be below historic trends for the industrial world overall in the coming two years.

In addition, several structural factors may make it more difficult to recover higher growth rates.

Overall for the OECD countries, the share of national income going to wages and compensation has increased dramatically over the last decade and a half. Between 1960 and 1964 on the one hand, and mid-1974–75, the share of consumption in relation to total domestic product has risen; for example, in Italy, from 47 percent to 60 percent, and in the United Kingdom, from 64 percent to 71 percent.

In addition, the relative growth in fixed investment, as opposed to private consumption expenditures, has altered. Consumption in the OECD area has been growing more rapidly than investment. This is not a promising change from the standpoint of future growth prospects.

Finally, of course, inflation continues to be a serious problem, though more so in some countries than others, as does unemployment.

These structural shifts will make the process of adjustment for future growth in the industrialized democracies more difficult.

The United Kingdom and Italy, of course, are taking major action to promote needed adjustment. Both have indicated their intention to apply for additional IMF assistance, and the International Monetary Fund is now discussing with them the conditions for additional Fund help for the two countries. Although the U.S. Government is not a party to those discussions, we have made clear our deep and abiding interest in the success of the efforts of the United Kingdom and Italy to resolve their current economic difficulties.

President Ford said explicitly last week that we stand ready to support the further efforts of the United Kingdom under an IMF-arranged agreement.

Beyond that, however, let me emphasize that it is essential that we follow up on the 1974 proposal by Secretaries Kissinger and Simon to create a special new contingency financing mechanism among the OECD industrial democracies. The OECD Financial Support Fund, or so-called "safety net," has been ratified by most other industrial countries. U.S. participation is now imperative.

Possible Oil Price Increase

Second, OPEC will contemplate another increase in the price of its oil at its upcoming December meeting.

Some commentators in this country have ventured the opinion that a 10-percent increase, for example, is not likely to be significant. Not so. An increase in the price of oil—any increase—will decidedly not be a matter of indifference to the economies of the industrialized democracies, or to the developing countries, by any stretch of the imagination.

A few blunt facts:

—The world's import bill for OPEC oil this year is $125 billion. OPEC's balance-of-payments surplus, which is the mirror image of the balance-of-payments deficit of

the rest of the world, will be about $45 billion in 1976.

—A 10-percent price increase would add more than $12 billion annually to the global import bill.

—The effect will be to transfer additional resources to OPEC, reduce the import capacity of oil-importing countries, add to the cost of the energy component of all we consume, and thus add to pressures for inflation worldwide.

The weaker economies in the OECD area, and the developing countries, would be the most seriously affected. And these are the countries which can least cope with an additional shock now. Even without an oil price increase, a number will, as I have said, face difficulties in financing the payments deficits that would be implied by the maintenance of present growth policies. These countries will be required to undertake difficult adjustment policies to reduce those deficits in any event.

An oil price increase will have an adverse effect, which cannot be ignored, on the prospects for sustained, inflation-free recovery across a wide spectrum of countries and so on the global economic system as a whole.

Relations With the Developing World

Third, we also face an important challenge now in our relations with the developing world.

Americans are a generous and humane people. We have a long and impressive record of cooperation with poor countries. During the late 1960's and early 1970's, however, our relationships took a turn for the worse. Increasingly frustrated in their efforts for rapid economic growth and impressed with the results of the OPEC price increases, the developing countries were increasingly tempted to stridency, rhetoric, and the alluring slogans of automatic redistribution of wealth.

As I have indicated earlier, we have responded, beginning at the special session of the United Nations General Assembly last year, on the one hand, with a series of positive proposals to enhance the growth prospects of the developing world. We have, at the same time, tried to make clear that we think we are beyond the point where rhetoric serves to increase public understanding and sympathy for the developing countries among the citizens of the industrialized democracies. And, we have pointed out, it is to those nations—not to the Soviet Union and East Europe—which the LDC's must look for the official aid and market opportunities which they want and need.

These tensions of the dialogue between the rich and the poor of the world will be close to the surface in the meeting of the Conference on International Economic Cooperation (CIEC), which is due to hold its concluding ministerial meeting in Paris next month. A successful conclusion to this one-year analytical effort of 27 developed, developing, and oil-exporting members of the conference is by no means assured. Major issues divide the North and the South in the CIEC conference:

—The developing countries are proposing generalized relief or moratoria on the repayment of the heavy debts they have recently run up. The developed countries oppose this generalized approach to LDC debt. They favor a case-by-case examination of those countries experiencing financial difficulties and a principled effort to cope with overall balance-of-payments problems by tested aid and financing techniques.

—The developing countries are also asking for the indexation of the prices of their exports. We believe such an approach to international economic relations, even if it were technically feasible, would create major difficulties for the global economy and would be against the interests of most LDC's as well.

My own view is that the time has come to strike a new balance in the relationships between the North and the South. The new balance should emphasize development assistance and liberal market access—not

automatic resource-transfer devices—as the economic mechanisms most efficient for LDC development and most effective in shaping a global economy that serves our own objectives.

The industrialized democracies as a group are beginning to articulate their own affirmative proposals for action to that end. At the June ministerial meeting of the OECD, pointing out that the North had fallen into the habit of reacting to the claims of the South, Secretary Kissinger urged that a program be developed by that organization in a way which would permit the industrialized democracies to take the initiative and demonstrate at the same time our commitment to help the poor nations in their struggle for development.

The design of this program will be a major challenge for us and our allies of Europe and the Far East in the months and years ahead.

Food Supply

A fourth priority area for the future will be food.

As I have said, we have analyzed the problems we face in this area, and we have made proposals to address them. But the tough part remains—making these policies work.

This year, for example, good harvests were a temptation for complacency. Yet the underlying structural problems in the global agricultural system remain. Malnutrition is not decreasing, future production shortfalls are a certainty, and the incapacity of many countries to purchase grain when they most need it will continue to be a fundamental challenge to the international system and a tragedy in the poorest countries. Many analyses show that the food deficit in the developing world is actually growing larger, so that by 1985 the developing countries will have to import more than the 85 million tons projected at the Rome Food Conference.

Under these circumstances, the international community must move urgently to establish a system of food reserves, to coordinate food aid programs, and to encourage developing countries to take the difficult domestic measures to increase agricultural production. Unless we are able to make significantly more progress than we have to date, the world may, over the next quarter of a century, face a series of unmanageable food crises which could confront the United States, as the world's largest food producer and exporter, with agonizing choices between domestic and international priorities.

Challenge of Energy

Fifth is the challenge of energy.

We have made progress in the past year in managing the energy problems created by OPEC. But let me be frank—we have not done enough. This is critically the case with respect to our domestic policies.

In the years since the oil embargo the United States has increased its dependence on Persian Gulf oil. We are today more vulnerable to OPEC price and supply policies than we were in 1973. Within the OECD area, our domestic conservation efforts are so relatively ineffective that they constitute an embarrassment for us in our relations with Europe and Japan. The prospects are that demand for imported oil will level off in the other Western countries. Our consumption will increase—in fact, it will increase so substantially in the years ahead that we alone may insure the continued strength and viability of the OPEC cartel.

The plain fact is that we do not have a credible domestic energy policy. We sorely need one.

The longer term issues are systemic. They cut across all aspects of our international economic policy. The first is our dependence on a few, potentially unreliable suppliers. For the foreseeable future, U.S. energy independence may be an illusion. This adds urgency to our policies for diversifying sources of supply and for developing alternative energy sources. The second set of issues concern the adequacy of the

world's supply of oil and how we make the transition to the post-oil age. Extensive cooperation and policy coordination of all countries will be required if this transition is to be smoothly managed.

We are facing up to these key issues, ranging from the technology we need to the global capital requirements for energy development, in the Paris Conference on International Economic Cooperation. On the leadership which we and our allies provide, and on the choices we make in this area, hinge our economic welfare and our future security.

East-West Economic Relations

Sixth is the issue of East-West economic relations.

Trade between OECD members and the Soviet Union and East Europe has quadrupled in six years. We in the West have come to realize that in certain areas at least—agriculture being the clearest case —the Eastern economies can no longer be dealt with as afterthoughts but must be dealt with as integral factors in the world economic equation. And we are just beginning to come to grips with this new truth.

A number of issues have emerged as a result:

—How does one define effective reciprocity between market and nonmarket economies?

—What role will the Eastern economies play in the global energy and raw materials markets?

—How do we deal with the exploding debt of the Soviet Union and Eastern Europe?

For the near future we will probably proceed on two tracks.

The United States is tied down by the Jackson-Vanik amendment to the Trade Act, which bars normal trade relations with countries which do not move quickly enough to open up emigration. We should spare no reasonable effort to address the issue of human rights abroad. But the record is clear that the trade policy is too blunt and too public an instrument. Under Jackson-Vanik, we get neither trade nor human rights. We are forgoing important trade opportunities open to Europe and Japan. And emigration is not improving. Hopefully, we may see some way out of this in the months ahead.

In addition, we need to work more closely with our allies in examining the entire range of East-West economic issues which we all face. A first step is an analysis of the evolving East-West trade and investment patterns to get a better notion of the trends in such areas as energy development, agricultural trade, and technology transfer. We have never examined the facts with our allies before. Such an effort is also now getting underway in OECD in response to Secretary Kissinger's initiative last June. We expect this analysis to be a major contribution to East-West economic relations and opportunities.

Law of the Sea Negotiations

Seventh, we must make additional progress in the law of the sea negotiations.

The most recent session on the law of the sea treaty ended two months ago in New York. This was the most ambitious effort to create international law in this century. Much is at stake:

—One hundred and fifty nations are attempting to design an international regime for three-quarters of the earth's surface.

—A broad sweep of issues is involved: economic development, military security, freedom of navigation, crucial and dwindling living resources, the oceans' fragile ecology, marine and scientific research, and vast mineral wealth.

—The international community is attempting to reach agreement on entirely new international legal principles: the creation of an economic zone extending 200 miles and the designation of the deep seabed as the "common heritage of mankind," principles which never existed before.

Progress has been made in these negotiations. But much remains to be done, and it may be that the next session is our last chance, before nations begin to turn to unilateral action and the understandings which we have patiently woven so far begin to unravel. In the next several months, we must move decisively on the following issues:

—The balance between coastal state and international rights in the economic zone;
—Freedom of marine scientific research;
—Arrangements for dispute settlement; and
—Most difficult and important of all, the manner in which the mineral wealth in the deep seabeds will be exploited.

The deep seabeds issue is the key to the negotiations. Many of the developing countries are trying to impose a doctrine of total internationalization on the industrial countries, which alone have the technological and financial capacity for mining the seabeds in the foreseeable future. The United States has offered to find financing and to transfer the technology to make international mining a reality. But total internationalization is out of the question. We have made the most forthcoming proposal which we can, but there are limits beyond which we cannot and should not go.

In short, in this issue as well we face a major international economic challenge to our wit and wisdom.

I have attempted here to review our foreign economic policy from the early 1970's on into the future. Vital issues are at stake now—not only our economic well-being but the larger structure of international economic relationships as well. And the significance of all this for our political and security interests is unmistakable.

These challenges I have catalogued are also opportunities. We may be standing on the edge of a period of political and economic achievement unparalleled in our generation. It remains for us to summon the wisdom, the compassion, and the political will to face the critical choices before us.

U.S. Encouraged by U.K. Decision To Seek Standby Agreement With IMF

Statement by President Ford [1]

The United States has the highest confidence in the ability of the United Kingdom to overcome its present economic difficulties. The British Government has taken a number of positive steps.

We are further encouraged by Britain's decision to seek a standby agreement with the International Monetary Fund. As I have already stated publicly, the United States will fully support an agreement reached between Britain and the IMF.

As a matter of general policy, it is the abiding purpose of the United States to see the United Kingdom as a vigorous member of the European Community, the North Atlantic alliance, and other international institutions whose goal it is to build a better and safer world.

---

[1] Issued at Cincinnati, Ohio, on Oct. 28 (text from White House press release).

Goals for UNESCO

Statement by John E. Reinhardt [1]

President Kenyatta set the tone for this conference Tuesday morning [October 26] with his call for "harambee." Let us work together for the good of all, our distinguished host urged.

This 30th-anniversary conference of UNESCO must heed President Kenyatta's exhortation. For here in Kenya we must begin to develop a new working consensus if UNESCO is to play an effective part in a changing global system of social and economic relations.

Let us be clear about where we stand. The last General Conference ended in dissension. That dissension must be overcome. A new basis for consultation and cooperation must be adopted.

I recall a Swahili proverb which says: "One stone will not support a cooking pot." In a world where interdependence has become one of the basic elements of our existence, we must keep our foundation stones together—or our organization, too, may fall to the ground.

The United States is present at this conference to work with all nations to find a basis for consultation and cooperation.

A few months ago, in this same conference hall, Secretary Kissinger stressed this same point. Speaking at the U.N. Conference on Trade and Development, Dr. Kissinger noted that the accelerating forces of modernization—technological, social, and political—link the peoples of the world as never before. These forces can intensify conflict—or they can provide us with unprecedented possibilities for advancing our common aims. All nations are part of a global economic system. If this system is to flourish, it must rest on the firm foundation of security, fairness, and opportunity for all who wish to participate—rich and poor, North and South, East and West, consumer and producer. It must embrace the interests of all if it is to be supported by all.

How do we achieve this objective?

First, there must be commitment by all to bring about a constructive and cooperative relationship between the so-called developed and the so-called developing countries. I say "so-called" because all states, in a sense, are evolving—each continually advancing in accordance with its own cultural strengths, each with its own historical past, each according to its own potentialities, each using its own model or approaches to development.

No one model, no one ideology, should be unduly advocated. No one model should be unduly condemned. The United States bases its successful development on growth with equity and justice, on the benefits of a free market economy, and on stressing human rights, individual freedoms, a free press, freedom of choice, the abundance of educational opportunities, and the free exchange of ideas and information.

These are our beliefs. We share them with many other nations around the world.

[1] Made before the 19th General Conference of the United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization (UNESCO) at Nairobi on Nov. 1. Ambassador Reinhardt, who is Assistant Secretary of State for Public Affairs, was chairman of the U.S. delegation to the conference.

Other nations choose other roads, but there is no reason why this should lead to conflict. Nor should this impede the building of a more stable and just international order—an order resting not on power but on restraint of power, not on the strength of arms but on the strength of the human spirit.

UNESCO can take the lead in this challenge. The central issue is to reduce the continued disparities between the rich and the poor within countries and between developed and developing countries, to achieve growth with equity, and to pay special attention to the poorest of the poor within nations and among nations.

To accomplish these goals, we must build upon the constitutional foundation stones of UNESCO—the sharing and the encouraging of development in education, science, and culture.

We in the United States are wholeheartedly dedicated to these specific goals. And we recognize that UNESCO has already made significant contributions in each of these areas.

The First and Second Development Decades represent giant steps in concept. The Director General's [Amadou Mahtar M'Bow, of Senegal] mid-decade report details progress being made.

UNESCO's analytic work on this report is impressive. Especially important, for example, is the emphasis given by the report to the role of women, the improvement of education, and the increased consideration accorded to other social factors in the development process.

Much can be expected from long-range scientific and technological planning and sharing, and great credit here goes to UNESCO.

For example, the entire U.N. system, under the leadership of the Secretary General of the United Nations, is mobilizing to address the issue of science and technology applied for development.

A major conference has been proposed for 1979. The United States strongly supports its objectives and has offered to host this conference. Preparations for it will provide opportunities for the developed and developing countries and for organizations such as UNESCO to review their responsibilities for the sharing and use of technology. This presents an important opportunity for UNESCO—together with its companion U.N. agencies, each having major contributions to make in science and technology—to mount a concerted attack on this problem.

Mr. President, the U.S. delegation would like to congratulate the Director General for his work in the medium-term plan and in the program and budget documents he presented to this conference. We have read with interest the Director General's views on a possible new world order in his book, "Moving Toward Change." He has ably emphasized the special role that UNESCO plays in the U.N. system with its focus on man as the center of development.

We agree with Mr. M'Bow that UNESCO must be a forum from which broad philosophical perspectives can be formulated on the problems of our times.

Advancing the Common Aims of All Nations

We recognize that we are moving through a period of historic change as the world becomes an increasingly interrelated system and as the Western orientation that prevailed for several centuries comes to share in a more multicentered system of international relations.

But to return to my earlier question. I repeat, we have unprecedented possibilities for advancing the common aims of all nations—rich and poor, North and South, East and West, consumer and producer. How do we achieve our objective?

We feel that what is required to make UNESCO and other agencies effective as instruments of change is a political consensus that can support creative program initiatives and combine the best of the old and the new.

We feel that it is indeed important to address the social and cultural dimensions of our changing world and, as the Director

General has said, to move toward a new human order. But need we abandon those aspects of each nation's development which have been beneficial? Too drastic action may bring regrets. And a wise African proverb suggests that "Regrets are like a grandchild; they come some considerable time after the event."

We hold that many features of the Western experience are especially significant in development today:

1. It has become fashionable to decry economic growth in some countries. But I ask you to recall that the concept of "growth" and especially "growth with equity" is not only an economic phenomenon in Western development. The roots of this concept lie more deeply in the ideas of progress essential to the Scientific Revolution and to the Enlightenment's notion of man's dignity and his capacity to deal with physical forces.

2. Industrialization has not been noncultural. Great cultural traditions have persisted and, indeed, become enriched under the pressures of rapid scientific and technological change. The will for cultural identity is no less intense in developed than it is in developing countries.

3. It is the industrialized countries which first became increasingly responsive to the ecological risks of uncontrolled material growth. Since 1969 the United States—with the passage of the National Environmental Planning Act—has begun a continuing study of the impact of technological changes and taken steps to guard the public interest. Pollution is not limited to the developed countries.

4. The ideas of freedom and the protection of human rights—enunciated in the West—are essential to progress and change. They are values that need to permeate any new system of international relations. Nowhere are they more important, for that matter, than in those fields that are the special concern of UNESCO: in human rights and fundamental freedoms, in the freedom of scientific research and scholarly inquiry, in the freedom and rights of the creative artist, in the free access of all people to educational and cultural opportunities, and in a free flow of information.

We in the United States are fully committed to cooperative enterprises for bettering relations among peoples and for reducing disparities and dependencies. We are not for abandoning the great fundamental goals which have been widely shared guideposts in man's development.

It is the hope of the United States that during the course of our deliberations in this UNESCO meeting we can work with the Director General, with his staff, and all member nations to develop guidelines for future planning. In developing this new framework for UNESCO planning, two central objectives should stand out as UNESCO's contribution to reducing disparities and dependencies in the movement toward new international relations:

1. The worldwide dissemination and growth of knowledge, skills, and technology must not be slowed.

2. The right of all peoples to preserve their own cultural heritages and the freedom of all peoples to develop their own ways of living must be protected and encouraged.

To these objectives, we need to add the assurance that UNESCO will carry out its programs to serve the needs of all peoples, whatever their cultural patterns and socioeconomic systems. UNESCO programs must embrace the working philosophy that honors and gives full value to the dignity of man as an individual with equality in rights and freedoms.

Freedom of Information and Expression

In the working out of these goals there is certain to be some disagreement over means.

From the beginning of the United Nations, we have found basic agreement at the international level on commitment to the free and open exchange of ideas. This

commitment is expressed most clearly in the Universal Declaration of Human Rights and in the Constitution of UNESCO.

Nevertheless, wide differences exist among nations regarding the underlying issues of communications in the light of particular social and political systems. This is true especially in the role of the mass media in the interrelationships among individuals as well as among peoples.

The United States, from the start of its life as an independent nation, has had a strong commitment to the maintenance of the right of free speech, however exercised, a right which we have insisted be relatively unfettered by government. How did this commitment come about? Why have we adhered to it with what some would call almost religious fervor? Because we believe that free speech is our chief weapon against tyranny—that only through the unfettered exchange of ideas is it possible even to come close to "truth."

This approach, we realize, is not universally shared. Other governments have at times adopted different domestic standards, which in turn affect their attitudes toward standards for free flow of information and ideas in the international sphere.

Accordingly, the United States wishes to use this occasion to articulate once more in the strongest possible way its commitment to freedom of information and expression and to the fundamental human right of every individual to seek, receive, and impart information and ideas through any medium and regardless of frontiers. We are eternally vigilant to prevent any infringement on this freedom.

In affirmation of this fundamental belief, we make the following statement: The United States, recognizing the vital importance of communications in the development of peoples and nations and of the friendly relations between them, is concerned that all peoples should have the opportunity to share in the potential benefits of modern mass communications. It reaffirms its belief in full and equal opportunities for the education of all, in unrestricted pursuit of objectivity, and in the free exchange of ideas and knowledge, and it asserts that the wide diffusion of culture and the education of humanity for justice and liberty and peace are indispensable to the dignity and fulfillment of man and constitute an obligation which all nations must fulfill in a spirit of mutual assistance and concern.

The United States is determined to help develop and to increase the means of communication among peoples, while yet preserving the independence, integrity, and fruitful diversity of sources of information.

Insuring Two-Way Flow of Information

It is appropriate that the international community look very hard at how we can insure that the flow of information and ideas is truly two-way. It is our conviction that the most effective way to reduce the current imbalance is not by inhibiting the communications capacity of some but by increasing the communications capacity of all.

In furtherance of this approach, the United States has consistently offered to share its knowledge and expertise regarding communication facilities available for experimental undertakings. For example, the United States offered its ATS–6 [Applications Technology Satellite] communications satellite to India for a yearlong educational experiment.

Through the ATS–6 satellite, the Indian Government was able to transmit programs on agricultural techniques, family planning and hygiene, school instructions, teacher education, and occupational skills. The telecasts were broadcast in different languages to Indians in 5,000 villages in seven Indian states. Schoolchildren gathered around television sets outdoors and in

schoolhouses, receiving daily lessons from the "blackboard in the sky," as Indian journalists labeled the ATS–6.

Following this successful joint project with the Government of India, the United States has been making available for several months, to interested developing states, opportunities to participate in the use of the ATS–6 satellite to demonstrate various applications for national development that communications satellites make possible. Some 30 countries are taking advantage of this opportunity.

Concern for effective two-way communications between the various societies of this world and its people is an appropriate interest of UNESCO. Restricting the use of satellites—or of special competencies in the mass media—will not help.

We believe that the United States and other nations in which are found highly developed mass media facilities and capabilities should endeavor to make available, through bilateral and multilateral channels, both private and governmental, assistance to other states in helping to develop their mass media. Furthermore, it is the strong conviction of the United States that UNESCO itself, in its future planning, must accord a high priority to expanding and strengthening, through its regular program and budget, assistance to member states in helping them further develop their communications capacities.

These positive approaches would encourage the greatest possible international exchange of information and ideas. These approaches would facilitate a more balanced flow of communications. These approaches would foster greater understanding among peoples, respect for the value of diversity among cultures, and speed the sharing of knowledge and ideas that are essential to the cause of peace and achievement of political, social, cultural, and economic progress.

Structure and Operations of UNESCO

Mr. President, we cannot pay so much attention to the goals of UNESCO without looking also at its structure.

The Director General in his first address in 1974 spoke to us of improvements he wished to make in the methods of programing and in the means of implementing UNESCO activities. We have seen with interest the many changes he has made during the last two years. We welcome more discussions of the dynamics of restructuring of the Secretariat, recognizing that the real test can only come from working experience.

A more focused framework for planning is one prerequisite for making UNESCO an effective mechanism for international cooperation. Another is the strength and structure of the organization itself, and the strategies and procedures it adopts to carry out its work.

Means are needed to assess the performance of UNESCO undertakings. A process is necessary by which the managers of the Secretariat and the members of the governing bodies can know what progress is being made and why and what problems are being encountered and why.

The Director General has already undertaken certain steps to change the structure and methods of operation and has informed the General Conference of his actions in document 19 C/46. He has taken on this task of reorganization with unusual vigor, and we applaud this initiative.

We agree with the new emphasis that has been given to the operational activities of UNESCO. However, care must be taken to see that UNESCO's intellectual resources and its operational programs are closely linked and that neither one overshadows the other. For there is danger that operations without strong intellectual content will lose their relevancy and quality. Likewise, intellectual activities without a strong operational content can become sterile and

unrelated to pragmatic needs of the member states. Close, effective relations with UNESCO's networks of NGO's [nongovernmental organizations] will contribute much to avoiding this.

Realities of World Situation

Mr. President, we now want to end by returning to the point we raised earlier: the need for a new consensus among member states. I trust that I have made clear the spirit and the will that the United States brings to this General Conference.

We agree with the Director General that UNESCO's activities over the next decade must be carried out within the context of changing international relationships. The dimensions and shape of a different world order will emerge from our debates, our consultations, our actions—here and elsewhere. What we agree upon is that, in bringing about change, we must confront:

1. The disparities between developed and developing countries as a central issue of changing international relations;
2. The links between national development and international structures;
3. The need to bring disadvantaged groups into the mainstream of development actions and development benefits; and
4. Dependencies that exist in an increasingly interdependent world.

These are realities that the United States recognizes as the essential characteristics of the world situation within which UNESCO works. They are characteristics, moreover, which underscore the importance of education, natural and social sciences, and culture in enhancing national development and in reducing dependencies in a new era of international relations. They stress the need to pay special attention to the role and participation of women, to the poor and marginal populations within countries, and especially to the rural poor. They also, more deeply, emphasize the intense desire of all peoples to preserve their cultural identities under the pressure of scientific and technological change. They establish, in turn, the central contributions of UNESCO to a changing pattern of relations among the peoples of the world.

Our task at this General Conference is to make UNESCO an effective organization through which we can cooperate. The requirements are fourfold:

1. A framework for planning, assessment, and operations that sharply focuses on UNESCO's direct responsibilities and its achievements and shortfalls in the fields of education, the sciences, and culture;
2. A well-organized and well-staffed administrative structure leading to maximum effectiveness and efficiency;
3. A close link within intellectual operational activities which stress renewal and innovation to meet the real needs of member states; and
4. A common determination to focus upon the objectives in the Constitution of UNESCO, to which all of us, as members, have subscribed—political consensus among member states that reflects a sense of community and rejects confrontation over narrow and disrupting interests.

If I have spoken at great length and candidly, I have done so only because I recognize the seriousness and urgency of the problems confronting this 30th-anniversary conference of UNESCO. I believe my apprehension is shared by others.

I cannot speak for the Director General, but I recall the words of Mr. M'Bow at the close of the UNESCO Conference in 1974. As that conference ended, Mr. M'Bow called on the UNESCO member states to resolve their disputes through dialogue, tolerance, and understanding, rather than through confrontation. Specifically, Mr. M'Bow said:

> We must avoid those conflicts that take on the character of systematic confrontations. We should perhaps avoid even the adoption of resolutions, no matter how strong the majority behind them, that

leave profound bitterness among some of us. I want to launch an urgent appeal for tolerance and understanding and seek consensus through patient dialogue.

I look forward to a closing statement this year that will show how UNESCO member states met and debated and tugged and perhaps even fought vocally—but ended with a sense of "harambee."

Maritime Boundaries Between the U.S. and Canada

Press release 543 dated November 4

On November 1, Canada published an order giving the 60-day advance notice required by Canadian law of the 200-mile fisheries zones it intends to implement on January 1, 1977. The order sets out the lateral limits of the zones asserted by Canada in the Atlantic and Pacific Oceans, including areas off the coasts of the United States.

The United States and Canada have had maritime boundary and related resource questions under active discussion for a number of months, but we have not yet reached agreement on our continental shelf or fisheries zone boundaries. Thus the United States does not accept all of the limits published by Canada.

In view of the Canadian publication, the Department of State has today [November 4] had published in the Federal Register the coordinates of the boundaries of the continental shelf and fisheries jurisdiction asserted by the United States in the areas off the coasts of the United States and Canada.[1] In a number of areas, the coordinates are different.

The two governments are thus taking steps to insure that their assertions of jurisdiction will not prejudice the claims or interests of either party or adversely affect our ongoing negotiations. To this end, the Canadian order and the U.S. Federal Register notice each make clear that these assertions of jurisdiction are without prejudice to the negotiation of any maritime boundary between the two countries.

The two governments recognize the need to continue serious and active negotiations toward a mutually acceptable boundary settlement, mindful that the two governments will need to consider third-party procedures if the negotiations do not make progress. The two governments are also continuing negotiation of mutually acceptable long-term arrangements in respect of living and nonliving resources. In the meantime, they are also negotiating mutually acceptable interim fisheries arrangements. Both countries will also avoid steps for the time being relating to the development of nonliving resources in the boundary areas concerned which could prejudice negotiation of a boundary settlement.

The United States will continue negotiation of these offshore issues in confidence that the important national interest of each country in the cooperative development of our offshore resources will lead the United States and Canada to a mutually agreeable and beneficial resolution of these questions.

---

[1] Public Notice 506, 41 *Fed. Reg.* 48619, Nov. 4, 1976.

U.S. Reviews International Cooperation in Space Activities and Work of the U.N. Outer Space Committee in 1976

Following is a statement made in Committee I (Political and Security) of the U.N. General Assembly by U.S. Representative W. Tapley Bennett, Jr., on October 18.

USUN press release 117 dated October 18

The year 1976 has been an active and successful year both in outer space and in the U.N. Committee on the Peaceful Uses of Outer Space. We would like to take this opportunity to call to your attention several developments which we regard as particularly interesting and significant.

During the past year, the United States has continued to participate cooperatively with other nations in the exploration of outer space. We have, for example, launched Helios-2, built by the Federal Republic of Germany, the second scientific satellite to investigate the properties of interplanetary space close to the Sun. In January we launched the CTS [Communications Technology Satellite], an experimental high-powered communications satellite developed jointly with Canada.

In cooperation with the Agency for International Development, using the ATS–6 satellite [Applications Technology Satellite], NASA is currently conducting demonstrations of the applications of space-age technology for the benefit of developing countries. These demonstrations will be seen in 27 countries in Asia, the Middle East, Africa, and Latin America.

In addition, consistent with our pledge to provide nondiscriminatory reimbursable launch assistance for foreign satellite projects for peaceful purposes, we launched the first Indonesian communications satellite (Palapa) and another in a series of INTELSAT [International Telecommunications Satellite Organization] launches.

During July the United States, as one event in the Bicentennial of American independence, made the first successful soft landing on the planet Mars with a Viking lander; this feat was repeated in September. Dissemination of early results of this historic program has already begun, adding further to our understanding of the universe. Later this afternoon we will be presenting a slide showing together with a commentary by the distinguished scientist and researcher Professor Carl Sagan of Cornell University dealing with the Mars landing.

With a new Space Transportation System based on the reusable shuttle rapidly becoming a reality, increasing emphasis has been given in 1976 to planning for its international use. Four announcements of opportunity have been issued worldwide to solicit proposals for experiments to be carried on the shuttle during its orbital flight test program, on the first two missions which will use the shuttle's Spacelab, and on a free-flying Long Duration Exposure Facility. The development of Spacelab, which is an unprecedented European contribution to the Space Transportation System, is being managed by the European Space Agency. It passed the midway point in 1976. Development was begun this year on a Canadian contribution to the Space Transportation System, a remote manipulator system for use with the Space Shuttle orbiter vehicle.

On July 31, 1976, India completed the one-year broadcast phase of the Indian Satellite Instructional Television Experiment using the NASA Applications Technology Satellite ATS–6 to transmit educational programs directly to some 2,400 villages in rural India. The TV programs, ground transmitting station, and village receiver sets were all funded and built by India. The social impact of the programs in the villages is still being analyzed, but the experiment has demonstrated the practicality of satellite-based instructional broadcasting for developing countries and has aroused interest throughout the world. Programs containing clear do-it-yourself instructions —in agriculture and animal husbandry, for instance—were particularly popular. I am sure our distinguished colleague the Representative of India will say more on this point.

Our intensified upper atmospheric research program has focused on the possible threat to the Earth's stratospheric ozone shield from manmade fluorocarbon compounds, widely used as refrigerants and aerosol propellants. Because of the global nature of this problem, we made special efforts in 1976 to undertake cooperative international stratospheric research activities and to inform as broad a segment of the world scientific community as possible about research underway in the United States. To foster improved international coordination of stratospheric research and policy planning, an international conference on the stratosphere and related problems was held at Utah State University, Logan, Utah, September 15–17, 1976. The conference included sessions on recent scientific research findings and discussions of the policy implications of stratospheric pollution.

We share what appears now to be the general belief that all states, regardless of their stage of economic and technical development, can realize substantial benefits from an open system of Earth observation from satellites such as the Landsat system with which we are experimenting. The United States has already shared and continues to make available to all interested parties at least one-time coverage of over 90 percent of the Earth's land surface. Researchers and scientists in over 125 countries are obtaining Landsat data for a wide variety of uses.

This ever-growing international interest stems primarily from the many benefits that can be derived from use of Landsat data. Let me briefly cite just a few of the many significant results that have been reported.

Geologists in Bolivia have recently discovered deposits of lithium and potassium as a result of computer-aided interpretation of Landsat data. A new iron ore deposit was discovered in Egypt using Landsat data as well. In Bangladesh, Landsat investigators discovered that eight new islands with an area of 100 square miles had developed in the Bay of Bengal as a result of the buildup of sediment washed down from the Himalayas. A forest inventory in Thailand using Landsat revealed to forestry managers that there had been a significant previously unobserved decline in the amount of forested area in that country.

The World Bank has also been using Landsat information extensively in some of its projects. For example, Landsat imagery taken before and at the height of flooding in Pakistan was used by the Government of Pakistan and the Bank to assess the extent of damage and to direct timely aid to farmers attempting to reclaim their cropland.

Mexican investigators have compiled land use maps of the entire country and have been using Landsat to study potential land use as well, including potential agricultural productivity, carrying capacity for cattle, and erosion risk.

We look forward to an ever-broadening circle of benefits from this highly valuable program.

Mr. Chairman, the Outer Space Committee will be holding its 15th annual session next year. The anticipation of this occasion suggests a moment's reflection on the work of this unique institution.

I would cite but a few examples of the invaluable work undertaken and accomplished by member states in the Outer Space Committee forum.

Although the first three years of the committee's activities, the period 1963 through 1965, were marked by political and ideological controversy, its 28 members during 1966 proved able to negotiate the Outer Space Treaty, the basic and much-applauded treaty instrument establishing rules to encourage international cooperation in the conduct of peaceful space activities.

A principal adornment of the treaty is the prohibition in article IV against orbiting or otherwise placing nuclear or other weapons of mass destruction in outer space. The treaty negotiators had the foresight to take action to prevent developments which no one wanted but which otherwise might have become inevitable. They gave proof to what a former Permanent Representative of the United States, Governor Adlai Stevenson, once described as the call to action in the truism that it is far easier to agree not to arm an arms-free environment than to disarm an environment bristling with military hardware.

The Outer Space Treaty's insistence on international cooperation in space-related programs as the fundamental objective of the community of nations remains as bright a beacon for the next decade as it has been in the past 10 years.

Its establishment of a regime characterized by openness and nonappropriation, the guarantee of freedom for every nation and group of nations to explore and use space without discrimination, the requirement of continuing and substantial exchanges of scientific information, and the expressed goal that space activities should be carried on for the benefit of all mankind rather than for narrowly or selfishly conceived purposes represent an encouragement for the future as well as an achievement of the past.

Television Broadcasting by Satellite

A second example of the high achievement of the Outer Space Committee, now comprising 37 members, is its work in the field of television broadcasting by satellite.

The full application of this technology is still largely prospective; broadcasting by satellite directly into unmodified conventional individual television sets is not yet a possibility. But the technology is already being widely tested in Canada and India and has just been demonstrated further through a series of broadcasts in Latin America, Africa, and the Middle East. The Outer Space Committee has made a fundamental contribution through its educational work in acquainting governments with the likely benefits and costs involved in these future activities.

We are looking forward to the evaluation being made by the Government of India of the Satellite Instructional Television Experiment, which I have already mentioned. An appreciation and realistic appraisal of this U.S.-India experiment and of possible patterns of international cooperation have been greatly stimulated by the Outer Space Committee. Its Scientific and Technical Subcommittee undertook the first international analysis on a governmental level of this new technology, and a special Working Group on Direct Broadcast Satellites held five sessions which demonstrated that its benefits can be realized only if the subject is approached on an interdisciplinary basis.

Direct broadcast by satellite provides an illustration of the indispensable need of bringing together diplomats and experts from the scientific, technical, economic, institutional, and legal disciplines in order to understand what can flow from prospective technologies.

It is against this background of multidisciplinary analysis that the Legal Subcommittee this year intensified its work of trying to draft principles that can be accepted by states and broadcasting entities for the conduct of satellite television broadcasting once this becomes technically feasible. The subcommittee has drawn up statements of nine proposed principles.[1] These deal with such matters as broadcasting purposes, international legal parameters, rights and benefits for states, international cooperation, state responsibility, consultation procedures and peaceful settlement, copyright and neighboring rights, and provision of information to the United Nations.

This work has been undertaken on the basis of mutual benefit and conciliation. Extremely difficult issues remain for examination and negotiation. They involve such matters as participation by interested states and broadcasters and practical assistance to that end.

Direct broadcast satellite technology can make a great contribution to the values proclaimed by the Conference on Security and Cooperation in Europe. In the Final Act of the Helsinki Conference, participating states stated that they consider "the development of contacts to be an important element in the strengthening of relations and trust among peoples" and that they "make it their aim to facilitate the freer and wider dissemination of information of all kinds, to encourage co-operation in the field of information and the exchange of information with other countries . . . ." The participants further pledged "to develop the mutual exchange of information with a view to a better knowledge of respective cultural achievements" and "to seek new fields and forms of cultural cooperation." It is in this light that the United States will participate in the difficult but absorbing work of the Legal Subcommittee in 1977.

The character of international institutions and their procedures is of considerable interest to contemporary diplomats. Wisely conceived procedures can greatly stimulate mutual understanding and mutual appreciation of the problems of other nations. On the other hand, lack of attention to enlightened traditions and practice can make cooperation impossible, as can rigid rules applied without reference to the political and social purposes for which they were originally established.

The history of the Outer Space Committee and its various subsidiary bodies bears witness to the fact that significant results can flow from processes of discussion and mutual conciliation. No vote has ever been taken in the committee. In all these years the committee has always operated under the guiding statement made by its chairman at its first session, on March 19, 1962, that its work would be accomplished by consensus with every effort being made to avoid voting. We recognize that, under a consensus procedure, action may for a time become impossible if one or more members engage in obstruction. But over the long run, objective needs for progress and the desire of participants to be seen as constructive and mutually sympathetic can achieve far more than results brought about by conventional voting procedures with all their confrontational characteristics and consequences.

Remote Sensing by Satellite

Mr. Chairman, I have already touched upon current U.S. experience with our Landsat remote sensing activities. This year the Scientific and Technical Subcommittee has again noted that the Landsat system continues to provide the international community with data and experience in the new field of remote sensing by satellite of the natural resources and the environment of the Earth. Landsat 1 has been operating

[1] For texts, see annex II to U.N. doc. A/AC.105/171, report of the Legal Subcommittee on the work of its 15th session.

for four years, Landsat 2 for more than a year, and an improved Landsat C has been scheduled for launching in the 1977–78 timeframe. Consideration is now being given to a fourth Landsat, among whose characteristics could be improved spectral and spacial resolution.

Turning to the ground segment of our Landsat system, I would like to point out that, in addition to the United States itself, reception facilities in Canada, Brazil, and Italy receive data directly from these satellites in accordance with the terms of bilateral agreements they have negotiated with our National Aeronautics and Space Administration. Argentina, Chile, Iran, and Zaire have also concluded agreements with us, and the construction of facilities in these four countries is underway or expected. A temporary station is operating in Pakistan. The Economic Commission for Africa has just endorsed a comprehensive training and station development program for Africa, and the European Space Agency has formulated a plan for rationalizing Landsat data acquisition and use in Europe.

A number of other nations are considering the possibility of establishing stations in 1977 and 1978. As we told the Outer Space Committee, the United States intends to continue to be responsive to the growing interest in the Landsat network.

What are the main fields in which remote sensing technology holds promise for development? As the Scientific and Technical Subcommittee report identifies them, they include mapping areas of the world and changes in the conditions and use of the Earth's surface; agricultural forecasting as an aid to production and distribution; geologic mapping to facilitate mineral resource exploration and development; hydrological surveys for water resource identification, planning, and pollution monitoring; and land use surveys for development and transmigration planning.

These various uses have interest for developed and developing countries alike. Every country in this hall is concerned with these matters, whatever its particular stage of development and the history and character of its most pressing economic and social needs.

A working system will be practicable only if data dissemination policies are marked by the same openness and nondiscriminatory access that is a hallmark of the Outer Space Treaty. While complete global coverage could be achieved with satellites of the Landsat type with approximately 15 Earth stations, the entire system is dependent upon the availability of data without condition or discrimination. The facilities in Argentina, Brazil, Canada, Chile, Iran, Italy, and Zaire will be acquiring data on a regional basis. The bilateral agreements under which they are established oblige the station operators to provide data on reasonable terms without discrimination to all interested neighboring and other states.

A certain caution as to the development of this technology is desirable. The costs involved in the space segment are large, and ground segment requirements for adequately trained personnel are considerable. An analysis made by the Scientific and Technical Subcommittee helps to understand the system elements and flow of data involved in remote sensing. It observes that a first element is data acquisition involving the use of satellites and control stations. There follows data reception, utilizing ground-based antennas and receivers. Formatting and recording are then involved in what may be called data pre-processing. There is also data storage and dissemination, involving archiving and reproduction. Resulting data must then be analyzed by means of interpretation or user processing. And the objective of these elements is information utilization; that is, practical applications by users.

A further note of circumspection is appropriate. Even with our extensive experience with Landsat 1 and 2, we are still in a pre-operational/experimental phase. A fully operational phase remains some years away. What is clear, and we want to underscore this point, is that neither in the current phase nor in an operational framework

can this technology develop unless there is ongoing regional cooperation. Observation from space can only be accomplished as a practical matter without regard to boundaries; indeed, much of the valuable information on geology and hydrology, to give but two examples, requires regional observation and would be seriously impaired even if it were practical to observe on a national basis. Moreover, the costs involved, both human and financial, are of such a magnitude that few would be able to expect benefits except through open programs of regional and global cooperation.

The United States looks forward to continuing our active participation in the invaluable work of the Scientific and Technical Subcommittee in widening understanding of remote sensing. We commend to all delegations a reading of the remote sensing section of the report of the subcommittee in document A/AC. 105/170. We hope others will join in disclosing their plans in this fascinating field so as to maximize its contributions to economic and social development around the globe.

We also look forward to participating in the work of the Legal Subcommittee in drafting principles that states may wish to adopt for the planning, establishment, and operation of remote sensing activities. The underlying themes of international cooperation and mutually agreed sharing of benefits will be as relevant to remote sensing as they are to the Legal Subcommittee's work in the field of television direct broadcasting.

There will be a new matter before the Outer Space Committee in 1977, which has been put on its agenda through an initiative of the committee's distinguished chairman, Ambassador Jankowitsch of Austria, and of the delegation of Argentina. This summer the committee agreed that member states should be asked to provide the Scientific and Technical Subcommittee with information on programs in the field of generation and transmission of solar energy by means of space technology. Of course the Outer Space Committee is not competent to consider energy questions generally, and it will not be getting into the energy business. But we agree that its mandate can properly include a consideration of the use of space technology for possible programs involving solar energy generation and transmission and that a review of the technology by the competent scientists of the Scientific and Technical Subcommittee will be desirable.

Mr. Chairman, my delegation's discussion this afternoon of some focal points of space activities has necessarily been impressionistic. But even while recognizing the limitations imposed by scarce human, scientific, technical, and financial limitations, we have great enthusiasm for the future. Bilateral and regional cooperation in space programs is growing mightily. The Outer Space Committee is enhancing international understanding of the potential benefits and costs of space technologies. This is exactly what the United Nations should be doing. We applaud its activities in this field and the benefits which they may help bring to people everywhere.

U.S. Announces $20 Million Pledge to UNICEF for 1977

Following is a statement by Michael N. Scelsi, U.S. Representative on the Executive Board of the United Nations Children's Fund (UNICEF), made at the annual United Nations Pledging Conference on the United Nations Children's Fund on November 4.

USUN press release 141 dated November 4

Another momentous year has passed since we last gathered here to indicate our support for UNICEF. UNICEF has made a tremendous effort in the past year on behalf of children the world over. Nonetheless, their lot is still a critical one. Our best efforts barely stem the tide. Children everywhere deserve a better life than they are getting; and nations, as well as UNICEF, should give renewed special attention to the needs of children, who are,

after all, the human resources upon whom the future of the world will depend.

May I take this occasion to express appreciation by all of us for the hard-working and dedicated headquarters and field staff of UNICEF and its distinguished leader, Harry Labouisse. We provide the financial resources; but without their devoted resources, nothing could be accomplished. Under their guidance, the principle of basic services for children in developing countries has made considerable progress during the past year, and a paper on the subject drafted by the Executive Board will be under consideration by the General Assembly at the current session.

In past years the timing of our legislative process has not permitted me to indicate at this meeting the extent of U.S. support for UNICEF, other than in glowing terms of praise. This year I am happy to announce that the President and Congress of the United States have appropriated for UNICEF for 1977 the sum of $20 million, which shows our continued high regard and support for the objectives and ideals of UNICEF.

Congressional Documents Relating to Foreign Policy

94th Congress, 2d Session

Amending Sections 2734a(a) and 2734b(a) of Title 10, United States Code, To Provide for Settlement, Under International Agreements, of Certain Claims Incident to the Noncombat Activities of the Armed Forces. Report of the Senate Committee on the Judiciary to accompany H.R. 7896. S. Rept. 94–1121. August 5, 1976. 10 pp.

Protocols for the Third Extension of the International Wheat Agreement, 1971. Report of the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations to accompany Ex. I, 94–2. S. Ex. Rept. 94–31. August 20, 1976. 3 pp.

Designation of Portugal as a Beneficiary Developing Country. Communication from the President of the United States transmitting notice of his intention to designate Portugal as a beneficiary developing country for purposes of the generalized system of preferences, pursuant to section 502(a)(1) of the Trade Act of 1974. H. Doc. 94–587. August 23, 1976. 1 p.

TREATY INFORMATION

Current Actions

MULTILATERAL

Biological Weapons

Convention on the prohibition of the development, production and stockpiling of bacteriological (biological) and toxin weapons and on their destruction. Done at Washington, London, and Moscow April 10, 1972. Entered into force March 26, 1975. TIAS 8062.

Ratification deposited: Togo, November 10, 1976.

Energy

Agreement on an international energy program. Done at Paris November 18, 1974. Entered into force January 19, 1976. TIAS 8278.

Provisional accession deposited: Greece, September 15, 1976.

Health

Amendments to articles 34 and 55 of the constitution of the World Health Organization of July 22, 1946, as amended (TIAS 1808, 4643, 8086). Adopted at Geneva May 21, 1973.[1]

Acceptance deposited: Chad, November 3, 1976.

Maritime Matters

Amendments to the convention of March 6, 1948, as amended, on the Intergovernmental Maritime Consultative Organization (TIAS 4044, 6285, 6490). Adopted at London October 17, 1974.[1]

Acceptance deposited: Cameroon, November 1, 1976.

Narcotic Drugs

Convention on psychotropic substances. Done at Vienna February 21, 1971.[2]

Ratification deposited: Federal Republic of Germany, November 8, 1976.

Ocean Dumping

Convention on the prevention of marine pollution by dumping of wastes and other matter, with annexes. Done at London, Mexico City, Moscow, and Washington December 29, 1972. Entered into force August 30, 1975. TIAS 8165.

Extended by Denmark to Faroe Islands: November 15, 1976.

Racial Discrimination

International convention on the elimination of all forms of racial discrimination. Done at New York

[1] Not in force.

[2] Not in force for the United States.

December 21, 1965. Entered into force January 4, 1969.[2]
Accession deposited: Liberia, November 5, 1976.

Tin

Fifth international tin agreement, with annexes. Done at Geneva June 21, 1975. Entered into force provisionally July 1, 1976.
Ratification deposited: Australia, November 8, 1976.
Acceptance deposited: Federal Republic of Germany, September 29, 1976.[3]

Women—Political Rights

Convention on the political rights of women. Done at New York March 31, 1953. Entered into force July 7, 1954; for the United States July 7, 1976.
Ratification deposited: Luxembourg, November 1, 1976.

BILATERAL

Chile

Agreement for sales of agricultural commodities, relating to the agreement of October 25, 1974 (TIAS 7993). Effected by exchange of notes at Santiago October 29, 1976. Entered into force October 29, 1976.

Egypt

Agreement for sales of agricultural commodities, relating to the agreement of June 7, 1974 (TIAS 7855). Signed at Cairo October 26, 1976. Entered into force October 26, 1976.

Indonesia

Agreement amending the agreement for sales of agricultural commodities of April 19, 1976 (TIAS 8308). Effected by exchange of notes at Jakarta October 15, 1976. Entered into force October 15, 1976.

Agreement amending the agreement for sales of agricultural commodities of April 19, 1976 (TIAS 8308). Effected by exchange of notes at Jakarta October 18 and 19, 1976. Entered into force October 19, 1976.

Poland

Agreement concerning the reciprocal acceptance of certificates of airworthiness for imported civil glider aircraft. Effected by exchange of notes at Washington September 16 and 27, 1965. Entered into force September 27, 1965. TIAS 5868.
Terminated: November 8, 1976.

Agreement relating to the reciprocal acceptance of airworthiness certifications, with annex. Effected by exchange of notes at Washington November 8, 1976. Entered into force November 8, 1976.

Spain

Agreement providing for consultations should exports of textiles or textile products from Spain cause market disruption in the United States. Effected by exchange of notes at Madrid September 23, 1976. Entered into force September 23, 1976.

Sri Lanka

Agreement for sales of agricultural commodities, relating to the agreement of March 25, 1975 (TIAS 8107). Signed at Colombo October 29, 1976. Entered into force October 29, 1976.

Syria

Loan agreement relating to economic development programs of Syria. Signed at Damascus September 30, 1976. Entered into force September 30, 1976.

PUBLICATIONS

1975 Digest of U.S. Practice in International Law Released

Press release 523 dated October 22

The Department of State released on October 22 the "Digest of United States Practice in International Law, 1975," edited by Eleanor C. McDowell of the Office of the Legal Adviser.

This third annual "Digest" covers all significant developments in U.S. practice in international law during the calendar year 1975. It includes chapters on international economic law, aviation and space law, treaty law, legal regulation of the use of force, the position of the individual in international law, state territory and jurisdiction, and many other subjects.

Of special interest in the 1975 volume are legal matters related to the winding down of the Vietnam war, including the evacuation of U.S. citizens and foreign nationals from areas of hostilities; the U.S. response to the Cambodian seizure of the SS *Mayaguez*; the role of Secretary of State Kissinger as a mediator in the Middle East conflict and the U.S. undertaking to maintain an early-warning system in the Sinai; U.S. activity in the United Nations and the Organization of American States; U.S. efforts to deal with corrupt practices involving multinational corporations and to establish international guidelines recognizing the rights and duties of both host governments and such corporations; Federal regulations responding to the discriminatory effect of foreign boycotts; U.S. participation in the Inter-

[2] Not in force for the United States.
[3] Applicable to Berlin (West).

national Energy Program; legislative proposals regarding executive agreements and Department of State criteria for determining what constitutes an "international agreement"; the role of U.S. courts in litigation involving foreign states, including the executive branch view of certain limitations on the act-of-state doctrine; and proposed U.S. legislation to codify the restrictive theory of sovereign immunity under international law.

Orders for the "Digest of United States Practice in International Law, 1975," accompanied by checks or money orders, should be sent to the Superintendent of Documents, U.S. Government Printing Office, Washington, D.C. 20402. The price of the 1975 volume (Department of State publication 8865; GPO catalog no. S7.13:975; GPO stock no. 044-000-01605-2) is $11.00.

GPO Sales Publications

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

Background Notes: Short, factual summaries which describe the people, history, government, economy, and foreign relations of each country. Each contains a map, a list of principal government officials and U.S. diplomatic and consular officers, and a reading list. (A complete set of all Background Notes currently in stock—at least 140—$21.80; 1-year subscription service for approximately 77 updated or new Notes—$23.10; plastic binder—$1.50.) Single copies of those listed below are available at 35¢ each.

Burundi	Cat. No.	S1.123:B95
	Pub. 8084	6 pp.
Congo, Brazzaville	Cat. No.	S1.123:C76/2
	Pub. 7896	4 pp.
Guinea	Cat. No.	S1.123:G94
	Pub. 8057	4 pp.
Ivory Coast	Cat. No.	S1.123:IV7
	Pub. 8119	6 pp.
Sao Tome and Principe	Cat. No.	S1.123:SA6
	Pub. 8871	4 pp.

Foreign Policy and the Department of State. This illustrated pamphlet traces the history of U.S. foreign policy and diplomacy from its unofficial beginnings in the colonial period and the establishment of the Department of State in 1781 to the present day. It also describes the administrative structure of today's State Department, its building in Washington, and its overseas posts. Pub. 8869. Department and Foreign Service Series 154. 30 pp. 90¢. (Cat. No. S1.69:8869).

Military Mission to Iran. Agreement with Iran extending the agreement of October 6, 1947, as amended and extended. TIAS 8279. 4 pp. 35¢. (Cat. No. S9.10:8279).

Atomic Energy—Cooperation in Regulatory and Safety Matters. Arrangement with the Republic of Korea. TIAS 8283. 12 pp. 35¢. (Cat. No. S9.10:8283).

Cooperation in Technology, Research and Development. Agreement with Egypt. TIAS 8284. 7 pp. 35¢. (Cat. No. S9.10:8284).

Weather Stations—Continuation of Cooperative Meteorological Program in the Cayman Islands. Agreement with the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland. TIAS 8285. 18 pp. 35¢. (Cat. No. S9.10:8285).

Whaling—Amendments to the Schedule to the International Whaling Convention of 1946. Adopted at the twenty-seventh meeting of the International Whaling Commission. TIAS 8286. 6 pp. 35¢. (Cat. No. S9.10:8286).

Atomic Energy—Application of Safeguards to Uranium from Canada. Interim arrangement with Canada. TIAS 8287. 3 pp. 35¢. (Cat. No. S9.10:8287).

Trade in Cotton, Wool and Man-Made Fiber Textiles and Textile Products. Agreement with Thailand. TIAS 8288. 14 pp. 35¢. (Cat. No. S9.10:8288).

Political Rights of Women. Convention with other governments. TIAS 8289. 34 pp. 45¢. (Cat. No. S9.10:8289).

Mapping, Charting and Geodesy. Agreement with Ecuador. TIAS 8290. 13 pp. 35¢. (Cat. No. S9.10:8290).

Criminal Investigations. Agreement with Belgium. TIAS 8292. 5 pp. 35¢. (Cat. No. S9.10:8292).

Defense—Establishment of Communications Circuit. Agreement with Canada. TIAS 8293. 2 pp. 25¢. (Cat. No. S9.10:8293).

Narcotic Drugs—Additional Cooperative Arrangements to Curb Illegal Production and Traffic. Agreement with Mexico. TIAS 8294. 4 pp. 35¢. (Cat. No. S9.10:8294).

Narcotic Drugs—Cooperative Arrangements to Curb Illegal Production and Traffic. Agreement with Mexico amending the agreements of December 11, 1974, as amended, and February 4, 1976. TIAS 8295. 8 pp. 35¢. (Cat. No. S9.10:8295).

Narcotic Drugs—Indemnification for Liability from Flight Operations. Agreement with Mexico. TIAS 8296. 5 pp. 35¢. (Cat. No. S9.10:8296).

Frequency Modulation Broadcasting. Agreement with Mexico amending the agreement of November 9, 1972, as amended. TIAS 8301. 6 pp. 35¢. (Cat. No. S9.10:8301).

Canada. Maritime Boundaries Between the U.S. and Canada 667

Congress. Congressional Documents Relating to Foreign Policy 674

Developing Countries. U.S. Foreign Economic Relations: Some Future Prospects (Rogers) . 653

Economic Affairs
U.S. Encouraged by U.K. Decision To Seek Standby Agreement With IMF (Ford) . . . 660
U.S. Foreign Economic Relations: Some Future Prospects (Rogers) 653

Educational and Cultural Affairs. Goals for UNESCO (Reinhardt) 661

Energy. U.S. Foreign Economic Relations: Some Future Prospects (Rogers) 653

Food. U.S. Foreign Economic Relations: Some Future Prospects (Rogers) 653

Industrialized Democracies. U.S. Foreign Economic Relations: Some Future Prospects (Rogers) 653

Law of the Sea. U.S. Foreign Economic Relations: Some Future Prospects (Rogers) . . 653

Presidential Documents. U.S. Encouraged by U.K. Decision To Seek Standby Agreement With IMF 660

Publications
GPO Sales Publications 676
1975 Digest of U.S. Practice in International Law Released 675

Space. U.S. Reviews International Cooperation in Space Activities and Work of the U.N. Outer Space Committee in 1976 (Bennett) . 668

Treaty Information. Current Actions 674

United Kingdom. U.S. Encouraged by U.K. Decision To Seek Standby Agreement With IMF (Ford) 660

United Nations
Goals for UNESCO (Reinhardt) 661
U.S. Announces $20 Million Pledge to UNICEF for 1977 (Scelsi) 673
U.S. Reviews International Cooperation in Space Activities and Work of the U.N. Outer Space Committee in 1976 (Bennett) 668

Name Index

Bennett, W. Tapley, Jr 668
Ford, President 660
Reinhardt, John E 661
Rogers, William D 653
Scelsi, Michael N 673

Checklist of Department of State Press Releases: November 8–14

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

No.	Date	Subject
*548	11/8	Robert P. Smith sworn in as Ambassador to Ghana (biographic data).
*549	11/9	National Meeting on Science, Technology, and Development, Nov. 17.
*550	11/10	Shipping Coordinating Committee (SCC), Committee on Ocean Dumping, Dec. 13.
*551	11/10	SCC, Subcommittee on Safety of Life at Sea, working group on container transport, Dec. 15.
*552	11/10	Study Group 5, U.S. National Committee for the International Radio Consultative Committee, Dec. 17.
*553	11/10	Study Group 1, U.S. National Committee for the International Telegraph and Telephone Consultative Committee (CCITT), Dec. 9.
*554	11/10	Study Group 5, CCITT, Dec. 8.
*555	11/10	Fine Arts Committee, Dec. 6–7.
556	11/11	"Foreign Relations," 1948, volume V, "The Near East, South Asia, and Africa," part 2, released.

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