

SG

[SG's Press RELEASES]

27 JAN - 27 DEC 1958

CLEAR

AS July 04

CLEAR

D.C. Sept. 70

S-0928

Box 1

file 6

UNITED NATIONS
Office of Public Information
Press and Publications Division
United Nations, N.Y.

(For use of information media -- not an official record)

CAUTION -- ADVANCE TEXT

Not to be published before
delivery at approximately
1200 GMT, 7:00 AM (EST),
Monday 29 December 1958

Press Release SG/758
27 December 1958

TEXT OF SPEECH BY SECRETARY-GENERAL DAG HAMMARSKJÖLD
AT THE OPENING OF THE FIRST SESSION OF THE ECONOMIC
COMMISSION FOR AFRICA, ADDIS ABABA, 29 DECEMBER

The first session of the Economic Commission for Africa is a great occasion both for the peoples of Africa and for the United Nations itself. Its opening today will be particularly memorable because we are honoured by the presence of His Imperial Majesty. In the days when international cooperation was not so well founded as it is today, His Imperial Majesty, in the adversity then experienced, was a symbol to the whole world of the principles of international order. It is certainly a vindication of his faith that now, in happier times, we are gathered here for the first session of the Commission and that the United Nations is to make its African home in Addis Ababa. It is, I am sure, a source of deep satisfaction to all of us to read in his speech delivered from the Throne in November that His Imperial Majesty had directed that a Conference Hall, to be called "Africa Hall", is to be erected and is to be made available to the Commission for its work.

Ethiopia is an ancient kingdom with its culture deeply rooted in a great religious tradition. Its ancestral modes of gracious hospitality are personified by His Imperial Majesty. Those same traditions of hospitality which welcomed the followers of Mohammed in their exile, today welcome peoples of many origins who throng the streets of this city. In the coming months, members of the United Nations Secretariat, who are to form the staff of the Commission will also, I know, find the same welcome.

One day we may look back to the establishment of the Commission as marking the moment when Africa began to assume its full role in the world community. Only two African States were Signatories of the Covenant of the League of Nations, although two were subsequently admitted to the League. These four States were original Members of the United Nations. Since its inception, six African States on becoming independent have been admitted to membership. The most recent is Guinea which earlier this month became the eighty-second Member of the United Nations. I would

(more) *

like to take this opportunity to echo those sentiments which were expressed in the United Nations General Assembly on that occasion and to welcome this new country into our midst. This increase in membership not only ensures a fuller representation of Africa in the United Nations, introducing a greater sense of balance to our deliberations and decisions, but it also represents a further step towards the fulfillment of the United Nations Charter.

Africa has had, nevertheless, a special presence in the modern history of international organizations. The mandates system of the League of Nations emerged in 1919 as a part of the settlement of World War I. It matters little that it may have been conceived originally merely as a convenient device for the treatment of a difficult problem. For the fact is that it did evolve rapidly into something more constructive: an instrument of peaceful change. When the time came to fashion the more advanced Trusteeship System, the United Nations found the ground prepared and the provisions of its Charter were deliberately designed to provide a framework for orderly evolution in the process of emancipation. It was clear, I believe, to many drafters of the Charter that the United Nations interest in Africa would not be limited to the implementation of the trusteeship provisions and of those relating to the non-self governing territories. Because the Charter so clearly recognized the multiple aspects of the United Nations responsibilities and, in particular, those pertaining to progress in the economic and social field, it was inevitable that their gradual implementation would lead to new forms of international action. In the very spirit of these provisions, it appears both natural and timely that an instrument for economic cooperation for the whole of the continent of Africa should now be established.

While its future work is not and cannot be directly concerned with factors pertaining to political evolution, the Commission, if it is to be successful, could not disregard the fact that the very elements of the political and constitutional changes which are rapidly taking place in Africa have a direct bearing on the problems of economic development.

It is precisely because of these changes that the concept of "international organization" appears to be so uniquely fitted to the problems of economic development in Africa.

New States are emerging in the historical process with geographic boundaries which, in most cases, are not best suited to the requirements of rapid economic growth. If such growth is to take place, concerted action and joint endeavors will be needed among countries and territories, each with its own complex economic

(more)

and social patterns and with its own particular political status. New economic links are to be forged among entities belonging to different monetary areas. And all of this should be achieved without losing the present advantages deriving from existing relationships with the rest of the world. These complicated processes can be greatly enhanced and facilitated by the existence of some flexible institutional arrangement such as the Commission can provide. That is to say, an arrangement which will retain its value and usefulness through changes in political and constitutional patterns, and which will make available to countries and territories and to regional and sub-regional groupings, a body of technical services for the study and exploration of common problems, as well as a centre for consultations where Governments can freely define and elaborate the form of their cooperation.

In another sense, also, international organization can assist in meeting some of the fundamental needs of the African peoples. I have alluded earlier to political and constitutional change. In fact, change is taking place in all aspects of African life at a pace previously unknown. Governments which now take their rightful place in our international deliberations represent peoples who, in some instances, had until recent years little or no contact with the outside world beyond the association afforded by the colonial status. It is already apparent that in some parts of Africa the colonial phase will prove to be of much shorter duration than in other continents. In other parts, colonialism is becoming so markedly altered from its original form that it is hardly the same phenomenon which used to be identified under that word. Indeed, Pliny's remark that "there is always something new out of Africa" is nowadays acquiring a fuller meaning, if in a somewhat different context. In such circumstances, the systematic confrontation of experience and of solutions can be of great mutual advantage. Governments which have to come to grips with similar economic problems naturally want to know how the others do it. The existence of a well organized clearing house for exchange of information and experience, supplemented by some measure of analysis and critical appraisal, can have a direct practical impact by shortening the process of trial and error and can help to create a body of collective knowledge and wisdom on problems of development and administration.

In its short history, the United Nations has done much to assist and stimulate this relatively new form of cooperation, which, in addition to its practical effect, may have a far-reaching influence in building a new type of human solidarity. I am sure that this Commission will find this kind of activity to be an indispensable part of its programme of work.

(more)

There are bright prospects for concrete action open to this Commission, which can add significantly to the United Nations record of solid achievement. It is true, however, that at times we may not make the best and fullest use of our machinery, and that energies may be dissipated in measures and actions of slight consequence. Africa could ill afford any such wasted effort. Officials of Governments - still for the most part insufficiently staffed - cannot afford to spare their time on international meetings if they are not convened for clearly useful purposes. It is my hope that this Commission will be vigorous; that it will not hesitate to deal with challenging problems, and that it will avoid what, in the light of scarce resources, would appear superfluous or secondary. For this, self-discipline will be necessary from the outset. Habits once formed are not easily corrected, whether in the life of international organizations or elsewhere. It is essential, therefore, that at all times, we assign their proper place to the various means of our action, public debate, consultation and technical advice, so that the Commission may be enabled to discharge all of its functions in a well conceived and always flexible programme of action.

It is also important that we think of this Commission not as an isolated endeavour or a self-contained entity, but rather as a focal point where the economic needs of the African people will be expressed and where action designed to meet those needs will be initiated and stimulated. The Commission will have its own staff and resources to undertake specific projects. But its very existence should be recognized also as an opportunity for a general intensification of all programmes of economic cooperation in Africa. Backing up its work will be other activities of the United Nations and of the specialized agencies.

The United Nations system can now place at the disposal of Governments a quite diversified machinery. If we are not as yet endowed with the means to finance capital investment, we can, at least, act in multiple ways to create those conditions which will lead to investments either private or public, domestic or foreign. Most Governments are already familiar with our programmes of research and technical assistance. Under the new Special Fund which, by a happy coincidence, is being established at the same time as the Commission, we will be able to enlarge and intensify our activities by undertaking comprehensive surveys of resources and by providing equipment for pilot plants or technological institutes. Close relationship of the Commission with all of these programmes and with the substantial work of the specialized agencies is essential. Our institutional system is

(more)

complicated and sometimes, no doubt, its intricacies are puzzling to Governments. It has not been easy to create for the first time in our complex world a comprehensive system of voluntary cooperation over wide areas of activity. But whatever its imperfections, this system, on the whole, has been successful, and through the Commission Governments will become increasingly familiar with it.

The first bid for an economic commission was made in 1950 and thus it has taken almost a decade for this project to come to fruition. The delay may be deplored, but in more than one way the time has not been entirely lost. During these years we have acquired experience in working on a regional basis and we now find ourselves in a better position to chart a profitable course. Also, it seems to me that in those ten years a very favourable change has taken place in the climate attending international discussions on Africa. As the future of this continent is seen in clearer and, indeed, more promising perspective, it becomes possible to develop that pragmatic and rational approach, unhampered by emotionalism, which is indispensable to economic cooperation.

The General Assembly made its decision last year, inspired by an earnest desire to assist the peoples of Africa. But, in turn all peoples of the United Nations ... will recognize that they too have no little to gain through increased partnership with the African peoples. Our sense of progress and of democracy is richer and broader than that inherited from the nineteenth century. We have acquired an increased understanding for various forms of social consciousness and patterns of social organization. We have learned to see and appreciate the role which they can play in certain important phases of development programmes. At the same time we now rejoice in witnessing the acute desire-- even the impatience - of African leaders for rapid modernization. A new synthesis of tradition and aspiration is emerging in this continent, with distinctive features, which is bound to be a significant addition to the common fund of human experience.

While we retain that sense of proportion becoming to a young organization, and while we are fully conscious of our limitations and of the difficulties which lie ahead, we cannot fail to see the broader implications of the event we are celebrating today. Thanking once again His Imperial Majesty for the welcome he has extended to us, I can only now express my sincere hope that the Commission, through the active participation of all of its members and associate members, and through the efficient work of its Secretariat under the able guidance of Mr. Mekki Abbas, will begin to fulfill those expectations which at this very moment are in the minds and hearts of all of us.

* *** *

U N I T E D N A T I O N S
Office of Public Information
Press and Publications Division
United Nations, N. Y.

(For use of information media -- not an official record)

Press Release SG/722
13 September 1958

TRANSCRIPT OF REMARKS BY SECRETARY-GENERAL DAG HAMMARSKJOLD
AT THE AIRPORT ON HIS RETURN FROM THE MIDDLE EAST, 13 SEPTEMBER

Well, you remember that just three weeks ago the General Assembly passed a resolution which was based on proposals from the ten Arab states. In that resolution, the Arab states first of all reconfirmed their will to establish what I might perhaps call a good neighbor policy, and second, asked the Secretary-General, in consultation with the governments concerned, to arrange for measures which might help in upholding the purposes of the Charter, and they mentioned there especially Lebanon and Jordan.

Now, the center of it all is of course this pledge to establish peaceful relations, and what follows, the request of the Secretary-General, is subordinated to that major purpose. The fact that the ten states requested the Secretary-General to consult may be taken as a kind of invitation to look at matters -- look at these various practical arrangements in the field. That is the basis on which I have visited a number of the countries in the region.

It has not been, as people seem to have felt sometimes, for negotiations; it has not been for mediation; it has not been in order to argue this or that kind of line of policy ... withdrawal of troops or whatnot; it has been to get first hand from the governments in the region their view on matters as a background for the practical arrangements that we might make from the UN side, in order to assist as it is said in the resolution.

I followed that line, and the governments have likewise taken that as their basis in the contacts. I must say that the contacts, without exception, have been highly useful for the intended purpose, giving me much better background for the decisions which will have to be taken here.

I have only to add that what comes out of it all, from these consultations and our studies here, will be in the report which comes before the General Assembly at the end of the month. I think that is all I need to say by way of summation. I wish to use this opportunity to add that I am deeply grateful for the way in which governments in the area have arranged for these talks.

* *** *

U N I T E D N A T I O N S
Office of Public Information
Press and Publications Division
United Nations, N.Y.

(For use of information media--not an official record)

CAUTION--ADVANCE RELEASE

Not to be published
before 6:00 p.m. (EST), 2300 (GMT)
Tuesday, 9 December 1958

Press Release SG/752
8 December 1958

STATEMENT BY SECRETARY-GENERAL DAG HAMMARSKJOLD

FOR HUMAN RIGHTS DAY -- 10 DECEMBER 1958

In the written history of man there are some pages that stand out by their lasting power to evoke a sense of human kinship, and to inspire new efforts for great ideals.

The United Nations contributed such a page to history when, ten years ago, it proclaimed the Universal Declaration of Human Rights.

It is right to list among the finest achievements of the United Nations the drafting and adoption of this first world charter of human rights. It is more important still that the Declaration should remind us of the distance between its aspirations and the practice of our lives.

May this tenth anniversary help to inspire us to uphold and defend the dignity of man in a manner worthy of the "reason and conscience" with which the Declaration affirms that all human beings are endowed. May it help us to act with greater respect for the rights of others and thus to build a firmer basis for world understanding and world peace.

* * *

U N I T E D N A T I O N S
Office of Public Information
Press and Publications Division
United Nations, N. Y.

(For use of information media -- not an official record)

Press Release SG/754
5 December 1958

STATEMENT BY SECRETARY-GENERAL DAG HAMMARSKJOLD
ON PROFESSOR AHMED S. BOKHARI

Professor Ahmed S. Bokhari has been one of the senior officials of the Secretariat of the United Nations for four years. Before joining the Secretariat, as Under-Secretary in charge of Public Information, he was Head of the Delegation of Pakistan to the United Nations. In both capacities his rich and perceptive mind has left its strong mark in the Organization.

Professor Bokhari carried the dual heritage of Eastern and Western civilization. This gave him an unusual width of approach to those problems of our time with which the United Nations had to deal. He reflected in his personality the possibility of a synthesis of great traditions on which it is the task of our generation to build one world. He also knew in a deep personal sense the difficulties and tensions which must accompany such a process.

His influence will long be felt and his unique personality will long be remembered by his friends and colleagues.

* *** *

UNITED NATIONS
Department of Public Information
Press and Publications Division
United Nations, N.Y.

(For use of information media -- not an official record)

Press Release SG/684
5 June 1958

ADDRESS BY SECRETARY-GENERAL DAG HAMMARSKJOLD
AT A LUNCHEON AT CAMBRIDGE UNIVERSITY,
ONE P.M., THURSDAY, 5 JUNE 1958

Mr. Chancellor, Mr. Vice-Chancellor, My Lords,
Ladies and Gentlemen,

To return to Cambridge is to experience again the quiet strength of tradition and the vitality of spirit which have borne this University through the ages. We, whom you have honoured in the beautiful ceremony this morning, will remember this day with pride and joy. We express to you our deep gratitude for the privilege which you have had us share.

You will, I hope, permit me to add a personal note. I came over, as a student, to this University. What I learned from my friends here and from teachers like Lord Keynes has meant very much for me and makes me cherish the honorary degree you have given me also as a symbol of a reunion with a school of learning which has always held a special place of honour in my heart.

The name of Cambridge stands for one of the proudest traditions of the Western world, a tradition and an ideal of the search for truth and the maintaining of spiritual freedom. Its task as a seat of learning and a center of research is more important than ever.

We are glad that there is a Cambridge, as a fact and as a symbol. We are proud and grateful, indeed, now to be counted among its alumni.

--
We meet in a time of peace which is no peace, in a time of technical achievement which threatens its own masters with destruction.

We meet in a time when the ideas evoked in our minds by the term "humanity" have switched to a turbulent political reality from the hopeful dreams of our predecessors.

The widening of our political horizons to embrace in a new sense the whole of the world, should have meant an approach to the ideal sung in

(more)

Schiller's "Ode to Joy", but it has, paradoxically, led to new conflicts and to new difficulties to establish even simple human contact and communication.

Korea, China, Indonesia, Kashmir, Palestine, Hungary, North Africa. There are fires all around the horizon, and they are not fires announcing peace. More perturbing than all these smoldering or barely controlled conflicts are the main underlying tendencies, which we all know only too well and which preoccupy our minds and darken our hopes.

We may well rejoice in having taken the first steps towards the establishment of an international democracy of peoples, bringing all nations - irrespective of history, size or wealth - together on an equal basis as partners in the vast venture of creating a true world community. But we have taken only the first steps, and they have often proved painful. There is a maturity of mind required of those who give up rights. There is a maturity of mind required of those who acquire new rights. Let us hope that, to an increasing extent, the necessary spiritual qualities will be shown on all sides.

Today we are in the middle of this development and, naturally, we tend to judge it from the viewpoint of our own past and our own immediate interests. This may explain why many now show reactions which seem to reflect a kind of despair of Western civilization. But, where is the reason for such defeatism? Is it not possible to establish and maintain a spiritual leadership, whatever the changes in other respects?

Our lives today are coloured, first of all, by the long and bitter strife between the Western world with its traditional ideals, and a new power bloc, grown out of the great revolutions after the First World War and representing views of society and of man's place in society, different from ours although partly inspired by thinkers of the West. However, this is not the place to comment on that strife and the harassing political problems to which it gives rise.

The conflict between different approaches to the liberty of man and mind or between different views of human dignity and the right of the individual is continuous. The dividing line goes within ourselves, within our own peoples and also within other nations. It does not coincide with any political or geographical boundaries. The ultimate fight is one between the human and the sub-human. We are on dangerous ground if we believe that any individual, any nation or any ideology has a monopoly on rightness, liberty and human dignity.

When we fully recognize this and translate our insight into words and action, we may also be able to re-establish full human contact and communications across geographical and political boundaries, and to get out of a public debate which often seems to be inspired more by a wish to impress than by a will to understand and to be understood.

This generation can boast of scientific achievements, the scope of which goes beyond the sum of what had come out of scientific research up to our days. In laboratories here in Cambridge and many of its sister institutions Rutherford and Diracs - may the names of these two Cambridge men of different generations be permitted to represent them all - have laid the basis on which the potentialities hidden in matter have now been explored up to a point where the use of nuclear energy has become a practical reality.

Parallel with this development - and also in this case, ironically enough, partly as a by-product of war efforts - we see the beginning of a penetration into outer space, with all the possibilities for new progress and new difficulties which this entails.

May it be enough to recall here how, through these achievements, doors that were locked have been broken open to new prosperity or to new holocausts. Warning words about how the development of social organization, and how the growth of moral maturity in the emerging mass civilizations, has lagged behind the technical and scientific progress, have been repeated so often as to sound hackneyed - and to make us forget that they are true.

What, then, is wrong? Why is it that a situation with so many achievements both in the political and in the technical fields should lend itself to comments of this kind? The reasons, of course, are many and complicated. I guess that we, all of us, may have developed our own views on what has led up to the present situation.

It is easy to turn the responsibility over to others or, perhaps, to seek explanations in some kind of laws of history. It is less easy to look for the reasons within ourselves or in a field where we, all of us, carry a major responsibility. However, such a search is necessary, because finally it is only within ourselves and in such fields that we can hope, by our own actions, to make a valid contribution to a turn of the trend of events.

/...

With your permission, I would in this context like to quote one of the influential thinkers of our time, whose personal history and national experience have given him a vantage point of significance.

In an address in Carnegie Hall in New York, in 1952, Martin Buber had the following to say:

"There have always been countless situations in which a man believes his life-interest demands that he suspect the other of making it his object to appear otherwise than he is In our time something basically different has been added One no longer merely fears that the other will voluntarily dissemble, but one takes it for granted that he cannot do otherwise The other communicates to me the perspective that he has acquired on a certain subject, but I do not really take cognizance of his communication as knowledge. I do not take it seriously as a contribution to the information about this subject, but rather I listen for what drives the other to say what he says for an unconscious motive Since it is the idea of the other, it is for me an "ideology". My main task in my intercourse with my fellow-man becomes more and more to see through and unmask him With this changed basic attitude the mistrust between man and man has become existential. This is so indeed in a double sense : It is first of all, no longer the uprightness, the honesty of the other which is in question, but the inner integrity of his existence itself Nietzsche knew what he was doing when he praised the 'art of mistrust', and yet he did not know. For this game naturally only becomes complete as it becomes reciprocal Hence one may foresee in the future a degree of reciprocity in existential mistrust where speech will turn into dumbness and sense into madness".

I excuse myself for having quoted at such length from this speech. I have done so because out of the depth of his feelings Martin Buber has found expressions which it would be vain for me to try to improve.

If I have wanted, on this occasion, to draw attention to the aspect of the troubles of our time to which the quoted words have given such an impelling expression, this is because it is in a basic way related to the tasks and the spirit of an institution like this University.

/...

Scientists of genius, working here and in other research centers around the world, have made a unique contribution to progress, prosperity and peace. If their achievements have been turned to uses sometimes very far from their original intentions, it is not their fault. Nor is it the fault of their colleagues in the fields of theology, law, medicine, history and philosophy, or other branches of humane letters, if their contributions have not sufficed to create such psychological and political safeguards as would guarantee that the achievements of science be turned to man's benefit and not to his destruction.

But all of us, in whatever field of intellectual activity we work, influence to some degree the spiritual trend of our time. All of us may contribute to the breakdown of the walls of distrust and toward checking fatal tendencies in the direction of stale conformism and propaganda. How can this be done better or more effectively than by simple faithfulness to the independence of the spirit and to the right of the free man to free thinking and free expression of his thoughts. So, attitudes in line with the liberal traditions of this University emerge as a deeply significant element also in our efforts to master the political difficulties.

I have used strong words, but they reflect deep concern. For someone active primarily in the field of international politics it is today natural to appeal to the spirit for which Cambridge may be taken as a symbol. Deeprooted conflicts which have run their course all through history and seemed to reach a new culmination before and during the Second World War, continue. And destructive forces which have always been with us make themselves felt in new forms. They represent, now as before, the greatest challenge man has to face.

* * * *

UNITED NATIONS
Department of Public Information
Press and Publications Division
United Nations, N.Y.

(For use of information media -- not an official record)

CAUTION -- ADVANCE RELEASE
Not to be made public before
2:00 PM EDT (1800 GMT)
Tuesday, 3 June 1958

Press Release SG/683
2 June 1958

ADDRESS BY SECRETARY-GENERAL DAG HAMMARSKJOLD TO A MEETING
OF THE NORWEGIAN ASSOCIATION FOR THE UNITED NATIONS AT THE
FESTIVAL HALL, UNIVERSITY OF OSLO

OSLO, 3 JUNE 1958 AT 7 P.M.

(Unofficial translation)

Why the United Nations? That such a question can be posed, and deserves to be answered, demonstrates how short a distance we have traveled in developing organized forms of international co-existence. Who asks today why we have parliaments, or why we have an organized diplomatic representation? There was a time, however, and not too long ago, when those questions could also be posed.

The answer I should like to elaborate further can be summarized as follows: The United Nations is necessary because the classical forms of bilateral diplomacy are no longer sufficient in the world that has become ours. The Organization is necessary, moreover, because regional organizations alone cannot satisfactorily make up for these shortcomings of bilateral diplomacy. The Organization is necessary, finally, as a phase in the evolution towards those more definitive forms of international cooperation of universal scope which I, for one, am convinced must come, but which cannot be brought into being without many experiments and long preliminaries.

It often happens, both among friends of the United Nations and among its critics, that its co-called successes or failures are discussed as though the Organization were independent from the governments and dis-associated from them in its efforts. This, for instance, appears to be in the background when it is said that it was - or that it was not - the United Nations that brought the Suez crisis under control. This is also the sense in which appeals are made for "support of the United Nations".

To yield to the temptation of regarding the United Nations in this manner, is to overlook the basic character of the Organization. It is in no way a kind of independent, state-like entity, least of all a "super-government". It is a

(more)

platform, or more accurately a constitutional framework for specific negotiations between governments in forms which have been added to those offered by traditional diplomacy and, with similar methods but with geographical delimitations, in various regional associations of states. A technique of diplomatic negotiation is obviously not something that can be "supported" - except, if you like, by making use of it when it appears to offer the chance of achieving a result that would otherwise not be within reach. Thus, when the United Nations is said to have scored a success, this obviously means only that intended results have been reached in making use of the forms of negotiation the Organization offers. And when it is said that the United Nations has failed, this means, conversely, that it turned out that what was desired could not be reached through these forms of negotiation. A success, by the way, would then probably have been equally impossible in the classical forms, or on a regional basis. In other words, the technique of negotiation characteristic of the United Nations, even though it may have advanced further than other, older forms, has turned out not sufficiently advanced to make it possible for us to cope with these cases.

What I have already said explains in part the first portion of my answer to the question: Why the United Nations? The Organization has offered the opportunity of developing new forms of negotiation, advancing further than bilateral or regional contacts. In this, it has responded to a need which has made itself increasingly felt as the international system of states has been transformed. New nations in Africa and Asia have come into being and have had to be integrated into world politics. At the same time, the ties between various parts of the world have become so strong as to entail worldwide consequences for almost any international conflict, no matter how limited it may seem at the outset.

(more)

In this brief survey of the position of the United Nations I shall have to content myself with naming, without elaborate examples, the various new forms of diplomatic activity which the Organization permits. In part, they have had precedents in the League of Nations. In part, they are innovations or have at least progressed further than used to be possible.

The technique which has primarily attracted attention is, of course, the public debate in the Assembly or the various Councils. It represents a public diplomacy added to the private diplomacy that used to be the rule. The transition to public diplomacy allows public opinion to follow the unfolding of diplomatic operations and, conversely, it offers an opportunity for public opinion to influence the positions taken in the course of the negotiations.

Next, I should like to mention the introduction of voting as a form of resolving diplomatic conflicts. In inter-state politics, we are still only at the beginning of an evolution towards a system where a minority is presumed to bow to a majority. The normal thing in international deliberations remains, of course, agreement. The influence of this older attitude has prevented the voting technique within the United Nations from reaching full efficiency. On the one hand, agreement between the five permanent members of the Security Council remains a condition for achieving a decision of the Council in questions of substance. On the other, as is well known, all the decisions in the General Assembly, and most decisions of the Councils, are only recommendations, the effect of which may depend mainly on how well they are believed to reflect world opinion.

A third innovation within the United Nations, as far as diplomatic techniques are concerned, stems from the fact that all member states maintain

(more)

permanent representation in New York and accredit ambassadors to the Organization. This has created what actually amounts to a standing diplomatic conference at United Nations Headquarters. The new and broader opportunities of negotiation which have thus been opened, are being used increasingly. Aside from those debates and votes which figure in the press, there is thus a continuous, intense and fruitful diplomatic activity of the multilateral type, which has led to a coordination of positions, to reconciliations and to planning which would have been far more time-consuming and complicated if conducted in traditional forms - if they had then been possible at all. It is dangerous to overestimate the importance of personal contacts, but on the other hand it is unrealistic to underestimate the importance of the fact that qualified representatives of opposing camps live together, sharing their problems, and at the same time are in continuous touch with representatives of "uncommitted" governments. In these respects, as far as I am able to judge, things have developed further in New York than in any international center in the past.

(more)

Finally, and as a fourth new technique added to the arsenal of classical diplomacy, I should like to mention the utilization of the diplomatic functions of the Secretariat. Over the years, the weight of the work of the Secretary-General has increasingly moved from what are conventionally regarded as political and administrative tasks to the diplomatic ones. This has not stemmed from any directed or planned development; it has happened under the pressure of practical needs which have increasingly made themselves felt. The diplomatic activity of the Secretary-General and his assistants is exercised in forms and for purposes which in many ways resemble those typical of the activity of an ambassador on behalf of his government, whether he is exercising "good offices" or operates as a negotiating party in relation to some other country. In this connexion, the position of the Secretariat is unique in that, of course, it does not represent any country. Nor has it, as has the representative of a government, the means of putting force behind its words. When diplomatic efforts by the Secretary-General are increasingly demanded by member governments, this must be taken as evidence that they have found it useful, in their relations with other states, to have available an outside party representing what might be called the common denominator. Often the Secretary-General has had to go into action where formerly a third government would have functioned, but where in this day and age, with present complex relations between governments, it has appeared simpler and more effective to turn to the Secretariat of the United Nations.

It is difficult for those on the outside to evaluate the evolution of diplomacy within the United Nations which I have just described. The touchstone of its importance should not be the superficial classifications of "success" or "failure". At the present stage, it must rather be whether the governments cooperating within the United Nations have felt the need

(more)

of such new techniques - and use them. That has governed their attitude in this respect is probably, not least, their view of how things would have gone if they had not had access to these new possibilities. In this connexion, it is enough to recall that so far no state has even considered leaving the United Nations, and that the Great Powers have found reason, not only in words but also in action, to support in their foreign policy the new diplomatic techniques which the United Nations has made available.

Much of what I have said, naturally, applies also to regional associations such as NATO. It is evident, however, that the value of these new techniques has a special meaning when given universal application. It is all right to play the new instruments within the framework of a limited, relatively homogeneous association of states. But what is to be done concerning the relations between such associations if they are pitted one against the other? Each group may rejoice in the development of cooperation among the states belonging to it, and feel safer in the strength yielded by this cooperation. But where is the possibility of finding ways towards a reconciliation with other groups?

The prevailing differences will hardly be lessened if one group or the other maintains its strength, no matter how valuable this may be to its defense of shared values, while in other respects it simply adopts a waiting attitude in the hope of some more or less automatic improvement in the general situation in the course of time, perhaps following a breakdown within a competing group. Present risks being what they are, even an advocate of such a course must recognise that it is necessary at the same time to preserve the best possibilities available for understanding and reconciliation between the groups. This is so, quite apart from the fact that those forms of universal organization are also motivated by the need

(more)

of solving the thousand and one lesser differences which are reported daily by the newspapers and which are objects of almost daily activity by the United Nations.

At last I have reached the third part of my reply to the question: Why the United Nations? It is often said that the solution of the problem of international co-existence must be world federation. Unfortunately, it is necessary to learn to crawl before one can walk. And it is rather risky to refuse to move at all just because one has not learnt how to walk.

It is difficult to see how a leap from today's chaotic and disjointed world to something approaching a world federation is to come about. To attain such a goal, elements of organic growth are required. We must serve our apprenticeship and at every stage try to develop the forms of international co-existence as far as is possible at the moment, if we are to be justified in hoping some day to realize the more radical solutions which the situation may seem to call for. We must, for instance, feel our way along the road of majority voting and get to know its political and psychological possibilities and difficulties in international life. We shall have to create a corps of administrators and diplomats who know, from within, the questions facing an international organization with political tasks. For such a development, the United Nations offers a framework which appears as good as the world situation permits at present.

The road towards more satisfactory forms of organization for a world community of states does not lead through publicized "successes" of the United Nations. It leads through a series of good or bad experiences with the specific techniques made possible by the United

(more)

Nations. It goes via the conclusions we are able to draw, in action, about these experiences. In this respect, the continuous, but unsensational and therefore little-known work on current tasks which is conducted within the United Nations is also of importance. Each conquest of new ground for diplomatic activity and international cooperation is a lasting gain for the future. Its value is not nullified if the tested techniques, in spite of their continued developments, should prove incapable at any particular moment of coping with one of the crises facing us.

These new techniques have already yielded important results, apparent to everybody. Without discussing the decisive importance of the national policy of various Member States for the solution of, let us say, the Suez crisis, I should like to recall that the success of the policy followed was predicated on the specific possibilities of shaping an organized cooperation within the universal United Nations framework. Furthermore, only through this Organization was it possible to create the police force - the UNEF - without which things would have developed quite differently, and probably catastrophically.

What I have now said refers, of course, primarily to the diplomatic and political tasks of the organization in the narrow sense. It applies also to the technical, economic and social assistance activities of the United Nations, particularly in relation to the so-called underdeveloped countries. These activities, however, deserve attention in their own right, as another important element in evaluating the United Nations.

(more)

- 9 -

It is unnecessary to dwell on the need of aid to underdeveloped countries. Two-thirds of the world's population live under economic conditions in sharpest contrast to the relatively high standards enjoyed by the remaining third. Unfavorable economic conditions prevail in areas strongly influenced by the new nationalism which is such a prominent feature of the present situation. This should be enough to demonstrate the importance of this general problem for political developments in the world as a whole.

In various forms, those countries which have the capabilities have launched an extensive aid activity in underdeveloped countries. Like the Marshall Plan in its day, this activity is not a form of charity but rather an effort of enlightened self-interest to enable the underdeveloped countries, by exertions of their own, to improve their economic and social conditions. Experience has shown that such technical assistance faces certain typical difficulties when conducted bilaterally. If the country offering financial means and experts is small enough for its activity to be without political overtones, there is the risk that its resources are too small for its contribution to be adequate. In the case of a Great Power, on the other hand, it is difficult to avoid giving a political overtone to its technical assistance, even though all such conditions may be expressly waived. The beneficiary tends to feel his economic dependence as a political liability. Political considerations apart, the fact remains that the beneficiary country - often a new-comer on the world scene - feels the burden of maintaining relations of indebtedness and gratitude to another country.

Because of these political and psychological factors, multilateral forms of assistance have emerged as superior to the bilateral ones in important respects. If aid is channeled from the giver country to the beneficiary country through the United Nations or one of the Specialized Agencies within the United Nations framework, a political accent is avoided and psychological pressure is eased in
(more)

other ways at the same time. It is not my contention that the multilateral form should supplant the bilateral one. Both are needed. What I want to stress is that bilateral forms are insufficient and face difficulties which make it urgent to pursue the multilateral course further and fully utilize its potentialities. This focuses attention from another side upon the question of the necessity of the United Nations. The United Nations itself, the WHO, the FAO and the other agencies within the framework of the Charter offer forms for states to "multilateralize" their assistance activities, thus by-passing the difficulties attendant on assistance in the bilateral form. The recent decision to establish a United Nations Special Fund seems to indicate that the view I have now developed is shared to a high degree also by the governments of the countries giving assistance.

However, the need, in the technical and economic field, of the techniques available through the United Nations, goes far beyond these assistance activities. Three years ago, the first conference on the peaceful uses of atomic energy was held in Geneva. Its scientific and practical value has often been stressed. There has been less awareness of the political significance of the conference. In a vital and sensitive field, it led to a break-through for the free exchange of information and of the fruits of research among nations. The very fact that it was possible to organize such a conference, and even more the manner in which it developed and the results it yielded, showed that regardless of the dominant political conflicts of today there are possibilities of progress few had dared dream about before. A second atomic conference of ever larger scope will be held this fall in Geneva, as you know. There are many indications that it will be at least as important as the first one.

Both these large atomic conferences have been convened by decisions of the General Assembly of the United Nations. Both have been organised within the
(more)

United Nations. The road has been long and sometimes arduous. This is only natural in view of the problems which had to be solved. In the light of our experience it is safe to say that neither of the conferences could have been brought into being in the satisfactory way we have witnessed, had it not been possible to work within and through the United Nations. The complex, continuous negotiations, and the need of guarantees for a balanced international and scientific representation, surmounting all political difficulties, have been dependent on the techniques available within the Organization and the atmosphere the U.N. has been able to maintain in this context. To say that we would be equally well off without the United Nations, therefore, would mean among other things a willingness to reduce appreciably the chances of such constructive international cooperation as that represented by the atomic conferences.

Much of the background of the question : "Why the United Nations?" is explained by misconceptions of what the Organization is. Much is explained by lack of knowledge of what has been achieved within its framework and of the further possibilities it offers. There is no point in debating with those critics who do not want to see the problem as it is. But it is essential to make clear to a broad public what the Organization means in the life of today in the respects I have dealt with here. It is valuable to clarify what is gained by the smoothing out, within the United Nations, of periodic or continuing conflicts between states and groups of states, as well as by the creation of increased opportunities for a more favorable economic and social development.

I cannot end this talk without saying a word of thanks for what Norway and its representatives have done for the evolution within the United Nations. This country has been one of our staunchest supporters in the work within the

(more)

Organization. I am convinced that nobody will feel passed over if I single out for special mention in this connection Foreign Minister Halvard Lange, my predecessor during the early years of the Organization, Governor Trygve Lie, and my tireless friend and helper in difficult periods, Secretary of State Hans Engen.

Our gratitude also goes to the Norwegian Association for the United Nations, our host tonight, for its perceptive and valuable work in support of the purposes which the organization is meant to serve.

* *** *

U N I T E D N A T I O N S
Department of Public Information
Press and Publications Division
United Nations, N. Y.

(For use of information media -- not an official record)

CAUTION -- ADVANCE RELEASE

Not to be made public before
9:30 PM (EDT) Monday, 26 May

Press Release SG/679
26 May 1958

ADDRESS BY SECRETARY-GENERAL DAG HAMMARSKJOLD

TO THE 10TH ANNIVERSARY COMMEMORATIVE SESSION

OF THE WORLD HEALTH ASSEMBLY, MONDAY 26 MAY 1958, 8:30 P.M.

Mr. President, Mayor Paterson, Governor Freeman, Dr. Candau, and Delegates:

It is a great privilege and pleasure for me personally to be present at this observance of the 10th Anniversary of the establishment of the World Health Organization. I bring to you the greetings and congratulations of the United Nations itself. At the request of the Executive Heads of the other members of the United Nations family of agencies I also present to you, on their behalf, their equally warm best wishes and their regret that they could not be here in person to share in this occasion.

All of us take pride in the many great contributions made by the World Health Organization in its first ten years toward better international cooperation in safeguarding and improving the health of the peoples of the world. The League of Nations had taken the first steps in this field. WHO has, of course, been able to advance much further. Its achievements in its first ten years constitute a striking demonstration of the possibilities inherent in the use of world institutions for the welfare of mankind.

There are many others here today better qualified than I am in the field of public health to review these achievements and I shall not attempt it. However, I would like to say a few words about the developing role in world affairs of this family of United Nations institutions in which the World Health Organization plays so important a part.

Since the United Nations Charter was signed in San Francisco thirteen years ago next month there has been a vast expansion in the areas of human life served by world institutions dedicated to international cooperation for economic and social progress. The principles which have animated this expansion are stated in Article 55 of the Charter which begins with the words: "With a view to the creation of conditions of stability and well-being which are necessary for peaceful and friendly relations among nations..."

(more)

It is only necessary to call the roll of the institutions of the United Nations family of agencies to show the extent of this development -- the World Health Organization, the International Labor Organization, the Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations, the United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization, the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development and the International Finance Corporation, the International Monetary Fund, the International Civil Aviation Organization, the International Telecommunication Union, the Universal Postal Union, the World Meteorological Organization and, most recently, the International Atomic Energy Agency.

With few exceptions, these world institutions have been established since the Second World War. The creation of so many of them in so short a time speaks, in itself, of the desire of the governments to give practical application to the objectives of Article 55 of the Charter. It also speaks for the common need of the nations. The problems of economic, social and technical development for all of them have evolved in such a way since 1945 as to make organized international cooperation across all barriers of politics, ideology and culture a sheer necessity if each of them is to reap the benefits of the new developments in science and technology without creating new tensions and risks.

I have spoken thus far of the commitment of the nations as reflected in the very existence of these world institutions. At the same time we must recognize that the resources so far made available to world institutions for multilateral programs have been small compared with bilateral and regional programs and even smaller, of course, when compared with the need of the nations for finding peaceful and constructive solutions to the many problems of economic and social development which face them.

Thus the impact of the United Nations agencies upon each of the problems which they are called upon to face -- valuable as it has already been in many fields -- has so far been a comparatively modest one. It has been natural for the governments to proceed cautiously with multilateral programs while the United Nations and the specialized agencies were gaining experience in these first years in the administration of such programs. There have also been causes deriving from the political climate prevailing in international affairs for the somewhat secondary role assigned so far by the member states to the United Nations family of agencies in the field of economic and social development as a whole.

(more)

As to the development of a sound administration and coordination of the programs of the United Nations family, this is, of course, a responsibility that is shared, on the one hand, by the governments acting through the Economic and Social Council and the inter-governmental organs of the specialized agencies and, on the other hand, by the secretariats concerned.

I believe that, on the secretariats' side, we have made good progress in improving administration and coordination during the last few years. In this connection I should like to pay a personal tribute, in my capacity as Chairman of the Administrative Committee on Coordination, to Dr. Candau and, before him, to Dr. Chisholm, for the cooperation and help which they have given.

Because the major problems of economic and social policy are so closely inter-related, the tasks and activities of our international organizations are inter-dependent. Between some of these organizations and WHO, relations are especially close. I refer to FAO in respect particularly of its work on nutrition, which is of direct importance to public health. I refer again to UNICEF, an organ of the United Nations itself, which has been able to provide supplies of many kinds buttressing WHO programs on behalf of children. I might mention also ILO, in whose work there are important public health aspects; and UNESCO particularly because of the relationship between primary education and the health of children. In fact, every one of our international organizations affects every other and requires its support to a greater or lesser extent in respect of some part of its activities. Hence, the emphasis that has been placed over the years on the need for cooperation and coordination, and the development where possible of concerted action.

Of course, interagency cooperation is capable of further improvement, through the efforts of both governments and secretariats. But it is working better than before, both in the ACC and, in respect of technical assistance, in the Technical Assistance Board. This is also true not only at our respective Headquarters, but around the world. Officials and experts of the United Nations agencies are demonstrating how world institutions can carry out multilateral programs with efficiency and effectiveness and in close cooperation with each other.

Thus, the governments now have at their disposal in the United Nations system a well-tried multilateral machinery. This machinery has also shown itself to be capable of adaptation to meet new needs as they arise. An outstanding example is the work of the United Nations system in furthering international cooperation in the peaceful uses of atomic energy, including the creation of the International

(more)

Atomic Energy Agency. New forms of relationship between international and national action have also emerged, as in the great malaria eradication program and the Mekong River Development Project.

I referred a few moments ago to the political causes, added to those reasons based on sound administrative caution during the first experimental years, for the comparatively modest resources so far allocated by member governments to the multilateral programs of the world institutions of the United Nations family. The sharp conflicts between states and groups of states which have dominated the international scene since the United Nations was established have naturally created strong pressures for placing the main emphasis on bilateral and regional programs. However, the unanimous votes of the General Assembly last fall for the new Special Fund in the field of economic development and the new United Nations Economic Commission for Africa, apart from adding new dimensions to international action, seemed to reflect a growing recognition on all sides of the political, as well as the economic value of the multilateral United Nations approach.

I hope that this trend will continue. The close relationship of the economic and social programs of the United Nations family of agencies to the problem of making progress towards a stable peace has been too often forgotten. The carrying out of such programs is necessarily complex and difficult. But the difficulties are far less than the contributions which such an approach can make to the cause of peace by lessening tensions and by gradually breaking down the barriers to understanding between the nations of the traditional West and of Asia and Africa, and between groups of countries with different beliefs about the relationship of man to society.

The United Nations agencies are pioneers in an experimental undertaking in the direction of a better international order. Although still in the early stages of their development, they have, I believe, fully justified the faith of the member governments which established them, that such world institutions are essential to the nations in their efforts to cope with the great challenges of our times.

In bringing to this gathering the best wishes of the United Nations family to the World Health Organization on its 10th Anniversary, may I, therefore, express my conviction that its past achievements will prove to be foundations upon which an increasingly effective contribution to the welfare of mankind can be made in the years to come.

* *** *

U N I T E D N A T I O N S
Department of Public Information
Press and Publications Division
United Nations, N. Y.

(For use of information media -- not an official record)

Press Release SG/680
26 May 1958

STATEMENT BY THE SECRETARY-GENERAL ON DEATH OF COLONEL FLINT

I am sorry to confirm that Lieut. Colonel George A. Flint, Chairman of the Hashemite Kingdom of Jordan-Israel Mixed Armistice Commission and representative for Mount Scopus of the Truce Supervision Organization, died today from a head wound, inflicted in the course of an incident on Mount Scopus. A report on the whole incident and the circumstances surrounding Colonel Flint's death will be made public as soon as it is received.

I wish to express our deep regret at the tragic loss of the life of Colonel Flint. He served the Truce Supervision Organization for a long period with great distinction. He was an upright and courageous representative for the Truce Supervision Organization and for the United Nations itself, straight in his judgments, strictly impartial and with a strong sense of his responsibilities under the Armistice Agreement. During periods of difficulty and tension when his every action might lend itself to criticism, he never compromised with his sense of rightness. Assigned to a duty which often must have seemed to him a thankless one, he pursued his task as he saw it, heedless of the difficulties and dangers to which, as he well knew, this must expose him. The United Nations owes him a great debt of gratitude.

Our deepest sympathy goes to Colonel Flint's family.

I wish to express also our sympathy concerning the other serious casualties suffered as the result of this incident.

The sacrifices of this day should be a reminder of the vital necessity for a radical change of the attitudes which have led up to the latest tragic event and which must be overcome if peaceful conditions are to be restored in the area.

* *** *

U N I T E D N A T I O N S
Department of Public Information
Press and Publications Division
United Nations, N. Y.

(For use of information media -- not an official record)

CAUTION -- ADVANCE RELEASE
Not to be made public before
6:15 PM (EDT) Monday, 19 May

Press Release SG/678
19 May 1958

TEXT OF ADDRESS BY SECRETARY-GENERAL DAG HAMMARSKJOLD
AT THE STATE DINNER OF THE 50TH ANNUAL MEETING OF THE
GOVERNORS' CONFERENCE IN MIAMI, FLORIDA
19 MAY 1958 AT 7:15 P.M.

Governor Stratton, Governor Collins, Members of the Governors' Conference:

You have paid honour to the United Nations by inviting its Secretary-General to speak tonight. It is also a special and highly appreciated personal privilege for me to meet with all of you.

One of the deepest desires of the people in this country -- and this is true of the peoples of all countries -- is to make better progress towards a peace which is more than just a state of "no war"; peace in spite of the strong conflicts between groups of countries with different concepts of the organization of society and of the place of man in society, peace also in spite of the conflicts between what history calls the West and the new sovereign states emerging out of the old civilizations on the vast Asian and African continents.

How is the United Nations to help to overcome these conflicts and to secure peace? Does it perhaps represent an unrealistic approach, or even an obstacle, in a situation so different from the one anticipated at the time the Charter of the United Nations was drawn up in San Francisco 12 years ago, when the Grand Alliance was at its moment of victory.

To the conflict which is referred to as a "cold war", and to the revolutionary developments in the parts of the world once under colonial rule, other changes of unforeseeable significance for the future of peace have now been added. This is the age when, for the first time, man has pioneered into the field of the unlimited potentiality which is hidden in matter and made his first experiences in the use of nuclear energy-- for destruction and for construction. This is also the age when, for the first time, space travel has been lifted out of science fiction and into the world of practical possibilities. Again: what does an organization like the United Nations mean in such a situation?

(more)

My thesis would be that, far from having been rendered unrealistic or outmoded by the developments to which I have referred, the Organization has gained a new significance from these developments. Its necessity as a venture in international cooperation is more clear today than when it was founded.

Although the conflict between the Western world and the Soviet world has fundamentally changed the conditions in which the United Nations must now work, it has not rendered the United Nations efforts less essential. On the contrary, the deeper the cleavages, the greater the need to maintain, by such means as we have, contacts across the frontiers, a forum for discussion and, above all, the possibilities for reconciliation. The United Nations is not an instrument for so-called appeasement from the point of view of either side, but it is a platform where a businesslike mutual exploration can go beyond what is possible in regular diplomatic forms. The public diplomacy of United Nations meetings, and the private diplomacy for which the United Nations also provides a framework, have served and will continue to serve to limit and reduce the impact of the basic conflicts. Even one who looks over the history of the past years in the most sceptical and critical spirit would have to admit that without the possibilities offered by the United Nations, the world would be bogged down much deeper in the difficulties caused by the "cold war" than it finds itself today.

The political rebirth of the great Asian nations and the emergence of a new Africa which is apparent in the creation of a number of independent states, reflect deep dynamic tendencies in the history of the present age. There is not time here to discuss or analyse the roots of these developments. This much may, however, be said. Although the changes are in line with the principles of human rights and self-determination set out in the Charter, the forces which determine the development naturally are not set in motion by the United Nations. However, the role of the Organization has not been insignificant, as the development, under a system of order and equity, of the new balance which we see emerging between the old West and the peoples of Asia and Africa, has been considerably facilitated by the United Nations.

Thus we see that the Organization has corresponded to basic needs of our time. In order to do so it has had to develop along lines somewhat different from those anticipated. It has shown the flexibility of a sound institution. The Organization has not been able, always and fully, to master the great difficulties it has had

(more)

to face. But it should in justice be said that it has lessened the tensions or paved the way for peaceful solutions of most of the conflicts on which it has been called upon to try its strength. Although it is a new venture, with possibilities only partly explored, it has justified the hopes of those who have served it and supported it as a pioneer undertaking. It may, as such an undertaking and with a development of its institutions guided by experience, pave the way for a future structure of international life in the firmer forms and with the greater authority which, I believe, one day must come.

Let me now turn to the revolutionary technological changes of our age.

The great scientific discoveries in the atomic field have, as you well know, given entirely new dimensions to the problem of armaments and war. At the same time they have opened vistas to a new age of plenty, following a new industrial revolution. In both respects the world community is faced with a major challenge which cannot be solved within the limited orbit of any single nation. The problem of disarmament has taken on a deeper sense of urgency which more than ever makes it a matter of general concern. And the problem of technical and economic development has moved into fields where international cooperation has become necessary if we are to reap the benefits from the new inventions without creating new tensions and risks.

It is well known how, on the initiative of President Eisenhower, the United Nations embarked on an exploration of the possibilities of wide international co-operation for the peaceful uses of atomic energy. The results are also well known. In the first place there was the Atomic Conference in Geneva in 1955. In the second place there was the creation, under the aegis of the United Nations, of the International Atomic Energy Agency.

The Atomic Conference of 1955 was the first great break in the wall which for long had separated scientists in various countries and slowed down the progress which would have been possible if there had been full international cooperation. In spite of the conflicts which dominated the political scene, the Geneva Conference in 1955 established a very wide exchange of views and experiences. It created contacts which served to promote the practical application of the findings of the scientists and a better international atmosphere in this vitally important field. In doing so the first Geneva Conference paved the way also for the creation of the

(more)

new Atomic Agency, which after long negotiations was set up last year in Vienna. In both respects the United Nations proved to be a valuable instrument of negotiation and bridge building. Without the United Nations, this creative process, assuming it would have been possible at all, would undoubtedly have taken much longer and been much more complicated.

A few days ago I attended in Geneva a meeting of the United Nations Advisory Committee on the Peaceful Uses of Atomic Energy. This Committee, which was created in preparation of the first Atomic Conference in Geneva in 1955 and has continued in existence as a high-level advisory organ to the Secretary-General since then, met this time in order to consider the final programme for a second Atomic Conference in Geneva next September. In a couple of days this body, where the three big Western powers and the Soviet Union are all represented by leading scientists, reached agreement on all the remaining points under discussion. As usual in that body, there were no votes taken. The Committee works on the basis of agreement. That this has been, and is possible, is significant. Its importance goes beyond the limits of the immediate tasks of the Committee.

As to the coming Conference itself, it gives every promise to repeat the encouraging experience of 1955. The Conference is likely to lead again to a broad exchange of information, covering the latest developments in the scientific sphere and in engineering experience about the peaceful applications of atomic power. This time new fields will be opened, the most important of which probably is the progress made toward peaceful use of processes of fusion as a source of energy, a subject that was barely mentioned in 1955. The Conference will be of very considerable size. From the United States alone some 800 papers will be presented.

However, the United Nations interest is not limited to the questions of the peaceful uses of atomic energy. On its program for negotiations on disarmament figure the question of atomic bomb tests and the related problems of production of atomic bombs and a satisfactory system of inspection. There is no reason here and now to go into this question, which is at the centre of public debate. In the light of the Soviet attitude as expressed in Mr. Khruschev's most recent letter to President Eisenhower, let us hope that technical studies of an inspection system for a general suspension of bomb tests will now come about. We should not underrate the importance that it would have if at least in this field positive results could be reached in agreement among all the parties concerned. In a situation where, for years, we have had to register no results at all, the first break is bound to be limited, if regarded by itself alone, but its significance

(more)

may be unlimited when considered as an opening to further exploration of possible areas of agreement. In this exploration the United Nations will remain at the centre of the picture, whatever the procedures chosen for specific questions or situations. I firmly believe that the possible value of the contribution of the Organization to progress in the field of disarmament warrants such a position.

The problem of the effects of atomic radiation, resulting from test explosions or from peaceful uses of atomic energy -- especially from radioactive waste from atomic power plants -- has also been a major concern of the United Nations during the last two years. This summer a 15-nation United Nations Radiation Committee will publish the results of an evaluation of all the scientific knowledge available on this problem up to the present time. This Committee also includes scientists from both sides and every continent. Its evaluation of the problem and its success in ironing out important differences of opinion are likely to provide another example of cooperation in areas of vital concern to all nations for which the United Nations provides special possibilities.

The General Assembly of the United Nations will, at its next session, consider a report regarding the continued activities of the Radiation Committee. It is my intention to propose to the General Assembly that the Committee be continued as a centre for inter-governmental activities in this highly important field. I also intend to suggest somewhat broader terms of reference, so as to render it possible for the Committee to serve its purpose with increasing efficiency.

In another field of historic scientific and engineering progress, that of space exploration, the United Nations also faces a dual problem. We have the question of the inter-continental ballistic missiles and the new challenge which they represent for the disarmament effort. On the other hand, we have recently witnessed the successful launching of satellites by the United States and the Soviet Union as part of the programme of the International Geophysical Year. The technical achievements signalled by these events give rise to new problems which have rightly attracted wide attention. The legal aspects are now being studied by a Secretariat Committee in the United Nations.

(more)

It would take me too far if, on this occasion, I were to embark on a discussion of the intricate questions which will arise once the exploration and exploitation of outer space goes beyond its present modest limits and restricted scientific purposes. A few preliminary conclusions seem, however, to be of such relevance to this short survey of the role of the United Nations in the modern world, that I would like to mention them tonight.

The precedents which have been set during the International Geophysical Year would seem to indicate tacit acceptance that outer space, as distinct from air space, is "res communis", at least when used for such joint scientific purposes as those of the International Geophysical Year. That means that outer space has been considered as belonging to no one and as not being subject to appropriation or to sovereignty. In that respect a parallel might be drawn with the high seas, which, likewise, are considered as not capable of appropriation.

We have here a vital field of activities and joint interests for which rules must be established and procedures must be created that will render it possible for the world community to safeguard the observance of those rules. A new need for international negotiations and for the establishment of appropriate international organs has thus come into being. The matter is on the agenda of the United Nations General Assembly and will come up for debate this fall. It would be my hope that the General Assembly, as a result of its consideration, would find the way to an agreement on a basic rule that outer space, and the celestial bodies therein, are not considered as capable of appropriation by any state, and that it would further affirm the overriding interest of the community of nations in the peaceful and beneficial use of outer space and initiate steps for an international machinery to further this end. Were the General Assembly to reach this point, the governments cooperating in the United Nations would have laid what seems to me to be a valid basis for the future development, in international cooperation, of the use of outer space for the benefit of all.

Politics in general, and international politics in particular, was once an area in the main reserved for experts and of comparatively limited significance to the common man. Our time, however, is one of an expansion of politics into increasingly broad areas of common life. This is as true of international politics as of national politics. Anyone who today tries to disengage himself from the political aspects of life cuts himself off from developments of the deepest direct significance for his own destiny.

(more)

It is natural in these circumstances that political questions should claim much of the time and space of all the media of mass communication. To the extent that this means that each and everyone of us is enabled to develop his own knowledge and judgement concerning the way that a society is growing and the way its leaders are trying to frame its future, it is certainly welcome. But we cannot disregard the fact that the expansion of the part played by political concerns in the life of our society may create dangers of which especially we, whose professional responsibilities are in the political sphere, must remain aware.

A "politicised" world is a world where individual reactions have to be disciplined and subordinated to group interests, and where for that reason conformism easily becomes an ideal. It is a world where tactics often are given priority over substance and in which, for this reason, we may lose sight of the real interests in our search for propaganda points to be scored. To use a comparison, it is also a world where the preacher may be tempted to give greater effort to winning the approval of the converted than to converting the sinners. If we succumb to such dangers, we lose the ability to communicate our sincere reactions to others who are of a different view, forgetting also how to listen to what they may have to say in explanation of their stands. To the extent that this is permitted to happen, a politicised world becomes a de-humanised world.

These indications of risks implied in the life of today may be considered as exaggerated. I am afraid that they are not. Any student of politics and its impact on common life today could easily find examples showing to what extent the intrusion of politics into common life has had the consequences to which I have referred.

I have found it justified on this occasion to recall these dangers because I believe that it is impossible to reach a clear understanding of the present international situation without taking such factors into account. They explain in part the seeming paradox that certainly no single people wants anything but peace and no single government would take the responsibility for starting a war, but that, all the same, the world situation, politically, represents a picture of interlocking stalemates.

It is one of the surprising experiences of one in the position of the Secretary-General of the United Nations to find in talks with leaders of many nations, both political leaders and leaders in spiritual life, that the views expressed, the hopes nourished and the trust reflected, in the direction of reconciliation, go far beyond what is usually heard in public. What is it that makes it so difficult to bring this basic attitude more effectively to bear upon

(more)

the determination of policies? The reasons are well known to us all. It might not be understood by the constituency, or it might be abused by competing groups, or it might be mis-interpreted as a sign of weakness by the other party. And so the game goes on -- towards an unforeseeable conclusion.

The United Nations, about which I have talked to you today, can be viewed from many angles and evaluated in many different ways. It may be criticised as a place where we lose our time in pursuing a debate sterilised by the weaknesses so often flowing from a narrowly tactical approach to the problems of the community of nations. But the United Nations may, for better reasons, be hailed as a forum where delegates, inspired by their responsibility and guided by the spirit of the Charter, can find means to further, in international political life, the kind of human communication with other nations which is the basis of fruitful debate and, alone, can lead to the solution of conflicts.

The value of public diplomacy in the United Nations will depend to a decisive extent on how far the responsible spokesmen find it possible to rise above a narrow tactical approach to the politics of international life, and to speak as men for aspirations and hopes which are those of all mankind. To follow such a course renders more effective the means offered by the United Nations for resolving the international conflicts which endanger peace. It reflects the traditional ideals of spiritual freedom and individual responsibility which have made the democracies strong.

* * * *

U N I T E D N A T I O N S
Department of Public Information
Press and Publications Division
United Nations, N. Y.

(For use of information media -- not an official record)

CAUTION: ADVANCE RELEASE

Not to be made public
Before 6 PM. EDT (2300 GMT),
Wednesday, 7 May, 1958

Press Release SG/673
6 May 1958

MESSAGE BY UN SECRETARY-GENERAL DAG HAMMARSKJOLD
COMMEMORATING 'WORLD RED CROSS DAY,' 8 MAY 1958

Recent events have again demonstrated the universal need, as reflected in the demands made upon the Red Cross, for organized relief of human suffering. Natural and man-made disasters -- floods, earthquakes, political upheavals, and even armed conflict -- have occurred on almost every continent, leaving death and destruction in their wake.

But always the devoted men and women of the Red Cross -- through a world-wide network of 80 national societies in as many countries, and often in complete disregard for their own safety -- have quickly and effectively responded to the call for help.

Truly this is the kind of "Universality in Action" for which we must all be grateful as we pause once more to observe "World Red Cross Day," on 8 May.

I wish again to express my particular pleasure at the recognition extended the League of Red Cross Societies when, last September, it was awarded the 1957 Nansen Medal in appreciation -- as the Award read -- "... of its constant humanitarian efforts for the victims everywhere of wars and natural and other disasters, and particularly for refugees, and in recognition of the prompt, efficient and humanitarian manner in which member societies of the League responded to the heavy demands so suddenly made on them by the Hungarian refugee influx...".

Such activities exemplify what can be accomplished by those imbued with the spirit of neighborliness, brotherhood, and faith in "the dignity and worth of the human person" as expressed in the United Nations Charter.

On this, the 11th annual observance of "World Red Cross Day," we are happy that the International Committee of the Red Cross, and the League of Red Cross Societies and its member societies, assure the continuing expansion of the humanitarian work of the Red Cross which recognizes that one of the first obligations of human society is concern for the well-being of every individual.

* *** *

U N I T E D N A T I O N S
Department of Public Information
Press and Publications Division
United Nations, N. Y.

(For use of information media -- not an official record)

Press Release SG/677
2 May 1958

MESSAGE FROM SECRETARY-GENERAL DAG HAMMARSKJOLD FOR CEREMONY
DEDICATING PLAQUE TO THE LATE UN HIGH COMMISSIONER FOR REFUGEES,
DR. G. J. VAN HEUVEN GOEDHART, GENEVA, 2 MAY 1958*

I am happy to be able to share today in this ceremony honoring Dr. van Heuven Goedhart.

As the first United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees, he worked tirelessly to carry out his mandate from the General Assembly -- to give international protection to refugees, to seek permanent solutions for their problems, and to administer emergency aid to relieve the most acute suffering. In that assignment, he had to fight to convince the world that a major refugee problem continued for so long after World War II and to find funds to hasten its solution.

How well he succeeded was illustrated by the award of the Nobel Peace Prize to his Office, the Wateler Peace Prize to him personally, and posthumously the Nansen Medal which he himself had instituted two years before.

The Nansen Medal bears the words "Love of Man Is Practical Policy." These words seem especially fitting for Dr. van Heuven Goedhart; as editor, wartime resistance leader and United Nations official, he thrust the love of man into vigorous battle against indignity to man.

Today, in dedicating this plaque, we pay further homage. The best tribute of all, however, would be final success in the clear-the-camps drive now being waged by the High Commissioner's Office. Such success, by putting an end to the eroding years experienced by refugees, would be a truly lasting memorial to Dr. van Heuven Goedhart -- a humanitarian, a man of peace, and a fighter against injustice in every form.

* * * *

*See Press Releases REF/149-150.

U N I T E D N A T I O N S
Department of Public Information
Press and Publications Division
United Nations, N. Y.

(For use of information media--not an official record)

Press Release SG/675
29 April 1958

STATEMENT BY THE SECRETARY-GENERAL IN THE SECURITY COUNCIL

29 April 1958

It is most unusual for the Secretary-General to intervene in a debate of the Security Council. Indeed, it would be out of order and rightly criticized if such an intervention from his side would mean a taking of sides in a conflict before the Security Council.

However, on a previous occasion I have stated as my opinion, that the Secretary-General has not only the right but the duty to intervene when he feels that he should do so in support of the purposes of this Organization and the principles laid down in the Charter. He cannot assume for himself the right to "speak for man" but he must subordinate himself to his duty to express the significance of the aspirations of man, as set out in the Charter, for problems before this Council or the General Assembly.

Some time ago in a press conference I found reason to welcome the decision of the Soviet Union to suspend unilaterally tests of the Atomic bombs. I did so solely on the basis of an evaluation of the possible impact of that move on the stalemate reached in the disarmament debate.

In the same spirit and on the same basis I wish today to welcome the initiative taken by the United States in presenting a proposal which might break up the stalemate from the angle of a limited system of inspection. I note that this is in response to the expressions of the Soviet Union of their fear for the possible consequences, in a direction of immediate concern to them, of the present state of extreme preparedness in the field of armaments.

It would be against my rights and duties to comment on the background of the Soviet initiative or of the United States' response. I am concerned only with the consequences.

(more)

The stalemate in the field of disarmament has been permitted to last for far too long. Attempts to break it through negotiations have so far proved of no avail. I think there are reasons of different kinds behind this deeply worrying failure. One is that in a sense governments have been too ambitious, not being satisfied with just making a dent in this intricate and vital problem from which a rift could develop, opening up the possibilities of a true exchange of views. Another reason has been a tendency for each government to wait for others to take the first step. Still another reason and, of course, the basic one, is the crisis of trust from which all mankind is suffering at the present juncture and which is reflected in an unwillingness to take any moves in a positive direction at their face value and a tendency to hold back a positive response because of a fear of being misled.

Such initiatives as those to which I have referred, one of which is today being considered by the Security Council, are steps which could make a dent in the disarmament problem. They might have a major impact if treated in good faith -- which is not the same as to let down one's guard. And they could, if followed through, provide a first frail basis for the development of some kind of trust.

Each government is in close contact with the opinion of the man in the street in its own country. For that reason, I am sure that all governments are in a position to confirm my statement that the peoples are eagerly and anxiously expecting leadership bringing them out of the present nightmare. The government taking a fruitful initiative will be hailed as a benefactor by the peoples. The governments responding in a positive spirit so as to give effect to such an attempt to turn the development, will share the merit with the one who took the first step.

I have felt it incumbent on me to state these few simple reactions. I have done so under my obligations to the peoples whose voice is reflected in the Charter under which I am acting. I trust that my intervention will not be misinterpreted as a taking of sides, but merely as an expression of profound feelings which are current all over the world and which have a right to be heard here also outside the framework of government policies.

I hope that each one of the governments, represented around this table, will wish to try out the line of trust as a way out of the disintegration and decline under which we now all suffer.

* *** *

NOTE TO CORRESPONDENTS

The following is the transcript of remarks by K.K. Tsien, Chairman of the Staff Committee, and Secretary-General Dag Hammarskjold at a meeting of the UN Staff to mark the beginning of the second term of office of the Secretary-General:

Mr. K.K. TSIEN (Chairman, Staff Committee): Mr. Secretary-General, we have had a Staff Day every year since you came here. Today is the Secretary-General's Day. We have not arranged for any elaborate programme of professional entertainment, such as we have on Staff Days. We have not attempted, for example, to bring Mr. Marlon Brando back with his bongo drums. But we do want you to know we are happy to have you with us here for the next five years during your second term.

The staff takes pride in the many achievements you have accomplished which have added greatly to the stature of your office and of the Organization as a whole. Through your single-minded devotion to the cause of the United Nations and through your matchless skill derived from an inner strength, you have put the principles and purposes of the Charter into the forefront of the world scene. You have created a new style in contemporary diplomacy which you carry out with imagination and with verve. You have provided a quiet centre and a calm course in the turbulent and troubled times in which we live.

The staff, of course, is not in a position to propose increased remuneration for you, for example, in the form of longevity increment with a personal ceiling, and still less to propose a promotion for you, because you are unpromotable. But it must have been a source of great satisfaction to you, as it was to us, that you were re-elected by such universal acclaim six months ago in this very hall.

Speaking of increased remuneration reminds me inevitably of the problems of the staff, which you have come to know and to understand so well in the past five years. We are glad that a harmonious relationship has prevailed between you and the staff. You have a deep grasp of the staff's problems so that you are certainly aware how much more remains to be done in order to lay the foundations of a real career service for the staff. We know that you have the interests of the staff close to your heart, and we also know that whenever you make special efforts on our behalf, your great prestige and influence with the General Assembly

(more)

Note No. 1782
10 April 1958

invariably bring results. Therefore, I would not be surprised if the new Staff Council will have a programme with which to approach you between your next trip abroad in May and your next but one trip abroad in June.

Incidentally, we hope that improvements in the world situation during the next five years will lighten your load and reduce the amount of travel you have to do, perhaps to the extent of permitting you to take a leisurely boat trip across the Atlantic for once, even if it is charged to annual leave.

Mr. Secretary-General, today it is not possible for all of us to come and shake hands with you, as you did with us five years ago. But I know that I am speaking for all of us here when I say that you have earned not only our esteem but also our affection. So, on behalf of the staff, may I pledge our continued support and co-operation, and wish you every success and happiness during your second term of office.

(more)

Note No. 1782
10 April 1958

The SECRETARY-GENERAL: Mr. Chairman, Friends and Colleagues: The surprise you have given me -- because this is a surprise, I heard about it only late yesterday night -- is really a kind of "increased remuneration" of the type which makes me very happy. There are possibilities of remuneration and promotion also for the Secretary-General, and here today you as the staff have in a sense given him increased remuneration and promotion, and I thank you for it.

I was standing here in this very place five years ago this very day, and in fact this very hour. I was facing a rather unknown kind of journey. I knew only one thing and that is that nobody can do more than is in his power, and I had only one intention and that was to do that much. I had only one simple rule, which may sound terribly selfish, but that rule is a fairly valid rule. I felt that this kind of job -- and it is true not only of my post but of very many of the jobs held here -- is a job which carries with it very considerable risks. There is very much you can lose on them. But I knew one thing: that there is one thing that nobody ever needs to lose, and that is his self-respect. And if I had any promise which I had in mind and which I gave to myself five years ago, it was just this one: Whatever happens, stick to your guns, so that you can feel satisfaction with what you have done, whatever the outcome.

I knew, however, that it would be vain indeed and very selfish if I felt that that depended on personal efforts, personal contributions alone. I knew only too well that every real achievement, in whatever field it is, is always the work of many. I knew for that reason that, for me to meet in any way the demands put upon me in this job, it was necessary to build on the work of every single colleague in the staff, on the organization and the staff as it had been built up over the years. For that reason, I also felt that the first duty of the Secretary-General must be to give to the staff and to staff problems their proper priority in the efforts. How can you possibly go into the field of political activity, try your efforts in the diplomatic sphere, if you have a feeling that the very basis on which these efforts have to be developed is a weak one -- not in the professional sense, but in the sense of human satisfaction in the job, human feeling of belonging to the joint effort?

(more)

Note No. 1782
10 April 1958

For that reason, as you may remember, in a way which caused some surprise in some quarters, during my first term here I felt that the staff problems should indeed have the first claim on me and that, without pushing political and diplomatic duties out of view, I should regard them as things that had to follow once we, so to say, had gotten together in the right way and felt that we had this whole operation, as colleagues in a joint effort, on the rails.

To what extent that has succeeded, I do not know. But I know that personally, after, let me say, a couple of years, I felt that at least we were moving in the right direction. If that was so, it was very largely due to the way in which you had supported those very efforts, the way in which you had responded, and a kind of cooperation which was built up and growing between your representatives and yourself on the one side and the Secretary-General representing that curious abstraction, the Organization, on the other side.

It would therefore be but proper for me on this occasion, looking back over the five years, to thank you and to thank you most sincerely for all the support and encouragement you have given me, both directly as man to man, and indirectly by your own devotion to your own work. It is also the right time for me to thank your representatives, those now acting and those whom you have had in previous years, for, so to say, understanding my side of the problem. There are not two sides, but after all there are different aspects of the problem and we have to represent those different aspects. And my own feeling is -- and I felt that to be implied in what you said, Mr. Chairman -- that this kind of understanding, which is a two-way traffic, also has been growing over the years and is now as solid as it ever was, if not more solid, and providing very great encouragement for the future development of staff relations within this building.

(more)

NOTE No. 1782
10 April 1958

I would say this much, and I say it with the greatest sincerity: I am both happy and proud to be one of you.

I previously used the phrase "to belong". It is all right talking about teamwork, but teamwork may easily mean simply that people work for the same purpose, that we are, so to speak, formally tied together by the very fact that we are on the same payroll, that we are under the same rules, and so forth, and that we have the same general objectives. From my point of view, that is not enough. We are not what we should be, we have not reached the full strength of our possible contribution, until we have managed to develop within ourselves, and in our relations with others, the sense of belonging. We are no Vatican, we are no republic, we are not outside the world -- we are very much in the world. But, even within the world, there can be this kind of sense of belonging, this deeper sense of unity. I hope that we are on our road to that sense. I feel that we have moved in that direction and, to the extent that it depends upon me, I can give you one assurance: whatever I can do for that purpose, I will do.

In that connexion, I should like to tell you about a decision that I really took quite some time ago. From your point of view, it may seem unnecessary, perhaps even sentimental. But why not? I think it is the right time for me to repeat a very fine and very encouraging experience I had when I came here. So I hope, within the next fortnight, to be able to go around the house -- all over it again -- and meet with you all again personally.

Our friends were singing a Swedish song, the melody of which I think is very beautiful. The words are perhaps a little bit on the sad side. If I may translate the first line of the song, it runs like this: "Will the flowers of joy ever grow?" Those words, in fact, were taken up later by a Swedish poet, who developed the theme in a way which I would like to mention today as a kind of background for what I would like to say in conclusion. The poem culminates in the words: "Will the day ever come when joy is great and sorrow is small?"

Looking at it in terms of humanity, looking at it in terms of the development of human society, it can be said, of course, that what we are trying to do here is to make our small contribution, during our short time, to a

NOTE No. 1782
10 April 1958

development which will finally lead us to the day "when joy is great and sorrow is small."

However, you can also look at those words in a much more personal and intimate sense. I think it is possible to interpret them superficially but it is also possible to interpret them in a sense which goes to the very heart of our way of settling our relation to life. And then I would say that, on the day we feel that we are living with a duty, well fulfilled and worth our while, on that day joy is great and we can look on sorrow as being small.

I excuse myself for striking this serious note after the very, very enjoyable observations of your Chairman. I can assure you that I would like to respond in the same vein -- but, frankly, he has such wit that I am a little bit afraid of competing with him, and I feel it is much wiser for me not to attempt it.

In these few words, I have at least tried to get across to you, as best I can, some of my feelings about our life together and about these last five years in the light of staff problems and staff relations. And, in ending, I simply want to repeat what I said before : that I am happy and I am proud to be one of you.

* * * *

U N I T E D N A T I O N S
Department of Public Information
Press and Publications Division
United Nations, N. Y.

(For use of information media -- not an official record)

CAUTION: ADVANCE RELEASE
Not to be made public before
12:30 PM (EST) Thursday
10 April 1958

Press Release SG/671
10 April 1958

ADDRESS BY SECRETARY-GENERAL DAG HAMMARSKJOLD
AT THE NEW YORK CITY LUNCHEON

10 April 1958

Mr. Mayor, Commissioner Patterson, Distinguished Guests:

First of all, may I say how deeply grateful I am for the generosity and the friendship which have moved the City of New York and all those who have come here today for this occasion. May I also express my thanks for the kind messages from President Eisenhower and Governor Harriman.

To be the recipient of so public a tribute would be somewhat embarrassing if I had to regard it as addressed to me personally. However, I can accept it, with sincere gratitude, not for myself, but for the World Organization which I serve -- the United Nations.

You, Mr. Mayor, have granted me the freedom of your city. This is a great privilege and one which I shall value all my life. Ever since I have come to live and work among the people of this city, I have always been made to feel that I was at home. This city is known for the warm welcome it gives to those who come from other lands -- whether they have been called, as I have been called, for a "limited engagement," or whether they have chosen to come to make their lives among you. I shall feel even more at home here from now on than I have before, and that is saying a great deal.

May I next thank you for the generous gift you have offered for the Meditation Room in the General Assembly Building. You, Mr. Mayor, have rightly said that the improvement of the Meditation Room has been a special concern of mine through the years of my service with the United Nations. This room should, I believe, be a central one in what we in the United Nations are accustomed to call "this house," meaning the Permanent Headquarters Buildings. Your gift will make it possible for us to make further improvements, especially at the entrance to the Meditation Room,

(more)

so that it may better serve its purpose -- that is to be a place of stillness, and silence, honoring those who are giving their lives for peace. You could not have given any gift on this occasion which meant more to me personally than this.

For the Secretary-General to be granted the freedom of New York City, as an international civil servant, means much, both as to the relationship of the United Nations with the City of New York and as to the meaning of the United Nations to all the people, not only of this city, but of the whole world.

We of the United Nations have been most happy about our relationship with our host city through all these years. Of course, there may have been problems of adjustment from time to time on both sides, as there always are among even the best of neighbors. But I think that the public servants and citizens of this great city all can feel that we try to live up to the privilege of sharing its life with them.

Mr. Patterson referred to the inscription on Tensing's mountain climber's pick which has a place of honor over the fireplace in my apartment -- "So you may climb to even greater heights." I think that that inscription was meant mainly for the United Nations as a whole. I think it was an expression of a faith which all of us must share -- a faith that humanity itself can climb to greater heights.

The United Nations reflects that faith and at the same time it gives recognition to the realities of human life. The United Nations should always be understood as an Organization of sovereign national states. Those who work for it as international civil servants, like myself, are just as much citizens of our own countries, and have just as much feeling for our nationality as anyone else. But we also believe, as do you and most other people in the world, that the United Nations, with all its imperfections and weaknesses, is an instrument which may, if rightly used and developed, help us to make progress toward a better international order.

When I accepted re-election as Secretary-General last fall, I tried to express my own philosophy about the United Nations. I said that service to the World Organization is profoundly meaningful -- whether it bears immediate fruit or not. If it paves one more inch of the road ahead, one is more than rewarded by what is achieved. This is true whatever setbacks may follow: if a mountain wall is once climbed, later failures do not undo the fact that it has been shown that it can be climbed. In this sense, every step forward in the pioneer effort of the United Nations inevitably widens the scope for the fight for peace.

(more)

It is in that belief that I begin my second term as Secretary-General. And it is in that spirit, I hope, that you who have gathered here today to honor the United Nations, by honoring the office I happen to hold, will understand and give support in the years ahead to the work carried on by the peoples through the Organization.

In that spirit also may I once again thank you Mr. Mayor, and all those who are here, for this occasion.

* *** *

Note # 1781
9 April 1958

NOTE TO CORRESPONDENTS

Transcript of remarks by the Secretary-General and the President of the UN Correspondents Association at UNCA luncheon, 9 April 1958:

Mr. Bruce MUNN (President, United Nations Correspondents Association):

Ladies and gentlemen, we are without the facility of the speaker system, but I trust we can be heard. We regret this untoward happening, and nobody regrets it more than Professor Bokhari. The doctor says he will be all right and immediately after his seizure, he expressed his regrets to the Secretary-General and of course to you. We thought it best that we should come in here, for obviously he needs some care and attention for the next short period of time. So I am sure you are all willing to put up with the inconvenience of being crowded into this room.

Now for an introduction I can give you only the words of authority, the man who said "I am not much a believer in anniversaries". We in the Correspondents Association knew this. We knew that with this characteristic modesty there would be no official UN celebration, although word reaches me by the grapevine that the City of New York is going to make a fuss of sorts tomorrow. That frankly had occurred to us. But today we will present no scrolls, we will issue no proclamations. To be frank about it, we are a little short on scroll-writers and proclamation issuers.

We had thought of perhaps a formal dinner, a presentation, flowery oratory. We thought that was not in keeping with the relationship that we all have with the man. So we thought it would be better if we sort of asked him to come and have a spot of lunch with us on an informal basis, much the same way as all of us, when the expense accounts come in on time, call up a friend and say, "Why don't you drop by for a bite". And this is what we have done. It is of course an occasion.

I think most of you can recall five years ago when there was an election campaign of sorts. There were four candidates who were pushing hard and being hard pushed. As I recall, there was a Canadian, who at that time had some political repute; there was a Filipino soldier; there was a Polish tongue-twister, if my Slavic friends will forgive my Anglo-Saxon inadequacies; and

(more)

Note # 1781
9 April 1958

there was an Indian beauty. When the Security Council voted for the last time, I happened to be off and my staff -- the UP was affluent in those days, we had a staff -- my staff called me and said: "The new Secretary-General is Dag Hammarskjold." And as I recall, my reaction was, "Who is he?"

Now five years later I do not believe there is anybody in the world who asks that question. His name has become a world-wide household word. I think it is probably even better known than Oleg Popov or Bob Hope in the countries affected. His name has even for most of us become a pocket-piece. Most of you carry it in your pocket. I might say that his signature has outlasted those of five of your own Presidents. And quite a signature it is. On the authority of the author, I might say that it looks the same backwards and forwards. And he acknowledges that at least in appearance it has some resemblance to Arabic. I suspect this may be one of his secrets--diplomatic of course--of success in dealing with the Middle East. Now five years have gone by and today he comes to us, regrettably, to speak to us for the last time in his first term as Secretary-General.

I regret that and as I look around here, if you will forgive me, I see reason for quite a few others of you to regret it, because we have all aged at least five years in trying to keep up with the man. He himself is unchanged. As a matter of fact, I have information that a major reason why Jack Benny decided to advance his age from the perennial thirty-nine was that Hammarskjold looked younger than Benny.

Mr. Secretary-General, if this is not a record crowd for an UNCA lunch, it will do until we move our affairs into the Coliseum. I suspect that you have had larger crowds at your news conferences, but I would point out that today they paid to come here. And this is an infallible test of their esteem for you.

Ladies and gentlemen, I could very formally present the Secretary-General of the United Nations. I prefer, as I suspect you do, to give you our friend, Dag Hammarskjold.

(more)

The SECRETARY-GENERAL: I thank you, Mr. President, or rather, Bruce, and ladies and gentlemen, or rather, friends. I am rather tempted to continue on a kind of first-name basis with very, very many of you, who, in the course of these five years, I have got to know in such a way as to give me the right to address you in that way. In fact, by choosing this way of showing your friendship at this anniversary, you have followed the same line -- you have really approached the whole situation and me on a first-name basis, and I am very, very grateful for that. You certainly could not have struck a note which, from my point of view, would be more of a sign of how things have developed over five years and how they should develop in the future. I can tell you that I think that this gesture of yours is a better summing up of how I look at our relations than any words I could use myself.

We meet in this way not only as friends, but I would say as collaborators in what I think is a common cause. As you said, I am really not very much for anniversaries. But, on the other hand, they are quite useful things because they force everybody to look backwards and to look forwards. They give you a strong feeling of how quickly things are moving, how quickly time passes, and they give you a very strong feeling of how short a time you have to do what you care to do and want to do.

I must say that the time to which you went back in your words, which is in fact five years ago, seems to me to be only yesterday. And I am sure that if we are permitted to meet in the same way, certainly not for the same reason, five years from now, we shall look both at the new five years and at the whole of the ten years as just a day back of us. Well, that is food for thought, because it does mean something concerning the very short span of time in which we can work together as collaborators in what I call the common cause. That is to say, in a sense I feel that anniversaries, although they are a cause of rejoicing -- we have had a good time together -- they are in a certain sense more a cause for serious reflection and consideration.

(more)

Note # 1781
9 April 1958

You know I have again and again used one word which must test your patience very badly, and that is the word "patience". You rightly expect if not results at least progress reports in the true sense of the word, and not in the diplomatic sense of no progress at all, reports which indicate that things are moving and moving at such a pace as to be noticeable. The slow, slow growth which goes not beyond only our time but really beyond the span of generations is something which seems to us too slow, because it cannot be put down in figures and letters and dots and points. There is just no way of saying how far we have got. You have to have it in your fingertips; you have to have the feeling, and even what you have in that way is insufficient for you to say, "We have made progress". Finally, you fall back on that most elusive of things, your confidence in the fact that progress has been made, that we are moving in the right direction, although you cannot prove it, perhaps not even to yourself.

It certainly does happen to me that in that way I doubt whether anything really has happened, whether we have really moved. At the same time, I feel it in a sense with every fibre that it has, that we are there, that things are going in the right direction; that is to say, a thing which is impossible to get across obviously in a press conference with a give and take of questions and answers. It is difficult to get across even in a private talk when you can sit together as friends one evening. And I do not hope to get it across here to you, but that is really the kind of side comment I would like to make to our exchanges in press conferences.

Very often I ask myself in line with your own questions: "But really, have you got a solid basis for what you say when you voice this so-called optimism?" And somehow the whole system replies, "Yes, you have", and yet I cannot spell it out.

There is a Swedish poem which I'll have to translate to you. It is very, very good in my own language; it will probably be a fairly poor translation, but I can at least get across the idea. It was in fact written at whatever hundredth anniversary of the University / ^{of} Uppsala by a close friend of mine who is now dead. He wrote at one point that: "The past is always with us and to the coming days we are those who carry the past centuries and also our own few days!" I think that is really the way we must look at all our various efforts in the realm of international peace, of the movement towards a world of order and justice.

(more)

Note # 1781
9 April 1958

We have back of us the responsibility created by, in fact, centuries of development. We have in front of us millennia. And in between those centuries and those millennia there are a few years which we might measure in days and weeks and years and five-year terms of office of the Secretary-General, if I look at it from my angle, and those days are really nothing in comparison to what is back of us, and what is in front of us. But they get their sense from what is back of us, and they get their sense in what they mean for the future; that is to say, what we can hand over after our time of work is not just what we have managed to add to the heritage, it is the whole heritage with the little we have managed to add.

(more)

Note # 1781
9 April 1958

It is a confession to a kind of conservatism, a confession to a belief in the continuity of human history, of the history of society, of the history of human endeavour. It is also a belief in the steady growth of human endeavour in a sound direction. I cannot belong to or join those who believe in our movement towards catastrophe. I believe in growth, a growth to which we have a responsibility to add our few fractions of an inch.

It is not the facile faith of generations before us, who thought that everything was arranged for the best in the best of worlds or that physical and psychological development necessarily worked out towards something they called progress. It is in a sense a much harder belief -- the belief and the faith that the future will be all right because there will always be enough people to fight for a decent future.

I do not think that there is anything automatic in progress. I do not think that there is anything we get for nothing in success. But I do believe firmly that here in this room, around this Organization, in this city, in this country, in the world, there are enough people who are solidly engaged in this fight and who are strong enough and dedicated enough to guarantee its success. It is in a sense a switch from the atmosphere of pre-1914 to what I believe is the atmosphere of our generation in this time -- a switch from the, so to say, mechanical optimism of previous generations to what I might call the fighting optimism of this present generation. We have learned it the hard way, and we will certainly have to learn it again and again and again.

This accent, of course, is an accent which may strike a somewhat jarring note to your ears on an occasion like this. But I think that you understand that really reflects the kind of thoughts which are unavoidable when you try to look back over this very short span of time and you try to look ahead. In that work over this short period and with this short future--but with the endless future on the other side of the future in which we will be active--we have been working together and we will be working together.

I think that this is a very proper occasion for me to thank you for many things which I have no need to spell out in any detail -- for patience, the word I already mentioned, for confidence, for encouragement and for friendship. This is, as you well know, a tough job. I do not like to talk about it in such terms, but I can easily make that confession. However, it is rendered infinitely easier by the kind of reaction which I have enjoyed from you. It has not

(more)

Note # 1781
9 April 1958

perhaps been always very quick in the build-up, but I think that it is all the more solid. The best I can wish myself for the future is that we may still further develop this kind of relationship, that we will get to know each other even better and that, in that light, we will come to share in an even more essential sense than we have so far this feeling of joint responsibility to the past and to the future, which I tried to interpret.

I really have nothing to add. I do believe that we know each other well enough for you to understand and understand fully what I have tried to get across. So my final words in this little speech of thanks to you, Bruce, and to all your friends and colleagues is just a renewal of what I said -- the warmest, warmest thanks for this invitation of yours and for what it shows of confidence, friendship and the will to go ahead along the road we have to follow.

* *** *

U N I T E D N A T I O N S
Department of Public Information
Press and Publications Division
United Nations, N.Y.

(For use of information media -- not an official record)

CAUTION — ADVANCE RELEASE
Not to be made public before
11:00 a.m. EST (1600 GMT)
Wednesday, 2 April 1958

Press Release SG/668
2 April 1958

ADDRESS BY SECRETARY-GENERAL DAG HAMMARSKJOLD TO A MEETING
OF MEMBERS OF BOTH HOUSES OF PARLIAMENT UNDER THE AUSPICES
OF THE BRITISH GROUP OF THE INTER-PARLIAMENTARY UNION

London, 2 April 1958

(The following text is being released simultaneously in London.)

The pioneering work upon which the United Nations is engaged in international life owes much to those, who in these precincts of Westminster, generation after generation, sought to establish and apply the principles of orderly government in the life of the British nation.

Over the centuries your ancestors pioneered in the development of the parliamentary system, in the defense of human rights and in the techniques of peaceful adjustment of your institutions to the changing needs of peoples. In that process your kingdoms became united, borders within this island ceased to divide and the individual interests of your different peoples were left to express themselves individually within a common framework. And then the principles which your nation had learned to apply were exported and transplanted throughout an empire, carrying with them the seeds of self-government and of the structure for a commonwealth of nations that is a unique achievement in the history of man.

Now that the cycle of growth can be seen within its perspective of several centuries, it is easier to see that it had to be a slow process, that a pragmatic development served your interests best, and that periods of conflict did not stop the process of growth. It is more difficult to study the conditions of growth for the United Nations in the same perspective and with the same detachment. As contemporaries we are apt to be too much swayed by the immediacy of danger and conflict and to lose sight of the positive responses that are also evoked by the underlying need for more effective world organization.

(more)

These developments come at a time when we are still far from being prepared for world community. It is because world community does not exist at a time when world interdependence has become a reality, that world organization has become a necessity as a bridge which may help us to pass safely over this period of transition.

The United Nations,despite some formal resemblances, has none of the powers of a world government or parliament. It is a framework for diplomatic operations. The power of decision remains, in almost all cases, with the member governments. Beset as we are with what often seem to us to be the truly desperate anxieties of our age, it is easy to be impatient with both the evident weaknesses of world organization as thus constituted and the new complexities of international relations which it reflects.

Some are tempted to seek for a solution in constitutional reform which would turn the United Nations into a world authority enforcing the law upon the nations. While respecting the goal of those who advocate such a course, most of us would agree that the political realities with which we live, rooted as they are deep in the disparate histories and cultures of many peoples, make this course impracticable for the foreseeable future.

Others are tempted to go in the other direction. World organization sometimes seems to be more of an added complication than an agent helping to resolve the procession of harassing problems with which they are faced. So there is a natural temptation to direct policies and programs through familiar channels that avoid the interposition of world institutions and, in the short term, seem to be more manageable or to be more in accord with what are thought to be realistic politics. Such a course, if it were to be persisted in, would consign the United Nations to the fate suffered by the League of Nations.

I think most of us agree that between these two extremes lies the sensible and truly realistic course. We should recognize the United Nations for what it is -- an admittedly imperfect but indispensable instrument of nations in working for a peaceful evolution toward a more just and secure world order. At this stage of human history world organization has become necessary. The forces at work have also set the limits within which the power of world organization can develop at each step and beyond which progress, when the balance of forces so permits, will be possible only by processes of organic growth in the system of custom and law prevailing in the society of nations.

(more)

Since a universal collective security system which can enforce peace is not yet within reach, since the nations in the meantime are maintaining systems of alliance for collective self-defense against armed attack, as they are authorized to do under Article 51 of the Charter, what is the role the United Nations can and should play today and in the immediate future as a contribution to the national security and well-being of its member states?

It seems to me that the Organization has a unique and vital role to play in this respect.

The present systems of alliance, reflecting as they do the prevailing balance of forces in the world, are, in the opinion of many, necessary expedients for a period of transition. But they do not lead directly toward solutions. To move toward solutions which will make the future of the nations more secure than it is today, we need to take whatever steps we can toward reducing the tensions and toward blunting the sharp edges of conflict.

I believe, as I said in my last annual report to the members, that, "If properly used, the United Nations can serve a diplomacy of reconciliation better than other instruments available to the member states. All the varied interests and aspirations of the world meet in its precincts upon the common ground of the Charter. Conflicts may persist for long periods within an agreed solution, and groups of states may actively defend special and regional interests. Nevertheless, and in spite of temporary developments in the opposite direction under the influence of acute tension, the tendency in the United Nations is to wear away, or break down, differences, thus helping toward solutions which approach the common interest and application of the principles of the Charter."

It is quite true that the United Nations cannot assure even-handed justice in the settlement of disputes, mainly because it does not have power to enforce its recommendations. But what the United Nations can do, if wisely used, is to help us to move forward in the direction of that goal. A diplomacy of reconciliation -- I use the term of the Charter -- practiced under the Charter, must be guided toward the goal of justice, and it is not only a pious phrase.

(more)

On the contrary, whatever success that can be achieved in this direction would be the greatest contribution that could be made to the reality of national security for the member states.

It is sometimes said that the system of one vote for one nation in the United Nations and the consequent preponderance of votes by the middle and smaller powers damages the usefulness of the United Nations for the purposes to which I have just referred. It is certainly not a perfect system, but is there any proposal for weighted voting that would not have even greater defects?

In any case, this criticism seems to reflect in part the illusion that the United Nations, because the form of its legislative processes resembles a national government, is in fact like a government. Of course it is not. The General Assembly, for example, is not a parliament of elected members but a diplomatic meeting of delegates of member states who represent governmental policies. These policies are subject to all the influences that would prevail in any case in international life, where all nations are sovereign but the minority of greater powers obviously exert more influence than the majority of smaller powers.

It is also sometimes said that the representation in the United Nations of the nations of Asia and Africa, many of them newly independent, is out of proportion to their power and tends to exacerbate the many problems of transition in the relationship of these continents to the West, especially to Europe.

I believe a careful appraisal of the realities of our time would lead most of us to the opposite conclusion in both respects. In the United Nations we see reflected the political rebirth of Asia and the awakening of Africa. But the United Nations, of course, is in no sense a cause of these great changes. Indeed, the conscious policy of the United Kingdom has played a very large part indeed in the appearance upon the world scene of so many newly independent states. And I believe that the role of the United Nations, like the policy of your government, in the evolution that has occurred over the past 12 years has tended, on balance, to ameliorate rather than to exacerbate conflicts that would have occurred in any case.

As to the future, a more effective and increasing use of the United Nations as a diplomatic instrument, in which the functions of debate and vote are used more frequently to further a diplomacy of reconciliation in the sense of the Charter rather than merely to score propaganda points, or to defend against them, offers the best hope, I believe, for a peaceful evolution in the relationship of Asia and Africa with the West, just as it should do in the relationships of the West with the Communist countries.

(more)

Criticism has been directed against the great emphasis which I have in recent years put upon the adaptation of private diplomacy to the multilateral framework of the World Organization in pursuit of the goals of the Charter. But, whether you call it private diplomacy, or quiet diplomacy or something else, I believe it is in the interests of the member states that we move in this direction.

I would not for a moment suggest that the functions of debate and vote do not have their essential place in world affairs today. Nor would I suggest that any step be taken that would retard the development of an increasingly influential role for a well-informed public opinion in the making of foreign policy. But the United Nations is subject to the same principles as apply to diplomacy in all its forms. Long experience has shown that negotiation in public alone does not produce results. If the United Nations is to serve as an increasingly effective instrument of negotiation, the principles and methods of traditional diplomacy need to be applied more fully alongside its public procedures.

There are many opportunities for the greater use of private diplomacy in the United Nations in conjunction with its parliamentary procedures. Let me give you a few examples drawn from the experience of recent years. Some of them have a direct relevance to the relationship of the West with the Communist countries, some with the relationship of the West with the Middle East. All of them have served the aims of UN and have been used to reduce the tensions and dangers of conflict.

The first example is the follow-up to the Atoms-for-Peace plan adopted by the General Assembly in 1954. One part of that plan was to bring the atomic scientists and engineers of the world together for an exchange of information on the peaceful uses of atomic energy, as distinct from its military applications. To help in planning the first such scientific conference, the General Assembly created an Advisory Committee on Atomic Energy to advise the Secretary-General. On this Committee of seven, outstanding nuclear scientists like Sir John Cockcroft have served as governmental representatives of the three major atomic powers, the United Kingdom, the United States of America and the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics.

This Committee, which always sits in private, contributed a great deal to the success of the first Geneva Conference in 1955 on the Peaceful Uses of Atomic Energy and is making a similar contribution this year in the preparation for a second such conference to be convened in Geneva next September 1st. We already know enough about the scope and character of the papers which will be presented at the coming Conference to assess the remarkable extent to which barriers

(more)

have been and are being broken down in this important field.

Another point: while it was the General Assembly which voted in public session for the creation of an International Atomic Energy Agency within the United Nations' family, agreement on the statute for this Agency was reached only after months of patient and private negotiation among the member states named to prepare the way.

The United Nations Radiation Committee established by the General Assembly is another organ on which "East" and "West" are represented which also has met consistently in private in the preparation of its forthcoming report. There has been, in this committee of specialists, a consistent effort to arrive at conclusions which will represent the consensus of the best scientific thought of the whole world, regardless of political considerations, about a problem which deeply concerns all the peoples of the world.

My second example concerns the establishment and operations of the United Nations Emergency Force which has done much to bring quiet to the Armistice Line between Egypt and Israel and to act as a stabilizing influence in the entire area. You will recall that the General Assembly decided to establish UNEF and gave the Force its terms of reference by an overwhelming vote within a couple of days. This was, of course, an emergency situation, but it was possible to achieve this result only because the informal procedures of private diplomacy had been very intensively exercised during the short time available. When the Assembly created UNEF, it also established a UNEF Advisory Committee to advise the Secretary-General on the many questions that arose concerning the operation and functioning of the Force. This Committee, meeting in private, has continued to play a most valuable role ever since. We have, in this case, an example of a three-stage operation which is natural in the United Nations and can be very helpful in getting constructive results: private diplomacy preceding public debate and then employed again to follow through.

I believe that a greater use of private diplomacy in the work of the Security Council might also yield fruitful results. There is an unused paragraph in the United Nations Charter, Article 28, paragraph 2, which reads: "The Security Council shall hold periodic meetings at which each of its members may, if it so desires, be represented by a member of the government or by some other specially designated representative." In his commentary to Parliament at the time the Charter was being considered, the then Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs of the United Kingdom said of this paragraph, "It is by these meetings in particular that governments

(more)

would be able to carry out the fourth Purpose of the Organization." This fourth purpose is "to be a center for harmonizing the actions of nations in the attainment of these common ends."

I do not suggest any move at this time to give formal effect to this paragraph, but I do think that its application from time to time to the negotiation of appropriate questions might contribute not only to the processes of conciliation but also toward developing in a new direction the important role that the Security Council is intended by the Charter to play in the task of peace-making.

Another example relates to the special responsibilities borne by the United Nations for the Armistice Agreements between Israel and her Arab neighbors and in encouraging a course of development that we hope will lead in time to conditions more favorable to the peaceful settlement of the Palestine question than now exist. This United Nations responsibility is, as you know, shared by the Security Council and the Office of the Secretary-General. Each has its part to play in upholding the Armistice Agreements and its obligation to seek, whenever opportunity presents itself, to move toward restoring these agreements to their full application and toward lowering the temperature -- even if it be by only a few degrees -- in an area where, as you well know, the temperature has fluctuated wildly.

It so happens that the Office of the Secretary-General has a place in many of the examples I have cited. But this need not be so. There are many opportunities open to the member governments and to their representative organs in the United Nations which do not involve my office for the greater use of private diplomacy of a traditional kind side-by-side with the public procedures of parliamentary diplomacy, either through the use of additional formal procedures or on a purely informal basis.

Let me now turn briefly to two questions with which all of us are deeply concerned: first, the problem of disarmament and, second, the problem of economic development for Asia and Africa.

It is obvious that controlled disarmament will be possible only through the United Nations, because any disarmament system has to be adopted and administered by a world organization whose members include practically all nations of the world. However, that does not exclude the use of private diplomacy both within and outside the United Nations. Indeed, such diplomacy is necessary in preparation of decisions in the UN on disarmament.

(more)

How it can best be exercised is a matter for the governments principally concerned to decide. What is of the utmost importance and, indeed, of the utmost urgency, is the exercise of diplomacy at whatever levels, within or without the United Nations, may be necessary to win agreement upon some first step or steps which would put some brake upon the armaments race and contribute to the real national security of all concerned.

As to economic development, particularly in Asia and Africa, the role of the United Nations and the specialized agencies has been small compared with bilateral aid programs. It has been natural for the governments of the industrially advanced countries to proceed cautiously in the direction of multilateral aid while the United Nations and the specialized agencies were gaining experience in the administration of such aid programs. But there have been political reasons, as well, for the somewhat secondary role assigned so far by the member states to the United Nations in this field.

I was, therefore, glad to observe during the last session of the General Assembly evidence of a growing recognition of the political value of the multilateral United Nations approach, as reflected in the unanimous votes to establish a Special Projects Fund and a new United Nations Economic Commission for Africa.

The Special Projects Fund, if carried through as intended, will more than triple the present Technical Assistance program of the United Nations family and tie it more closely to basic economic development projects. The new Economic Commission for Africa will strengthen the influence of the United Nations in an area where political tensions are likely to become higher in the years immediately ahead, and it can help to a considerable extent in reducing these tensions.

I hope that the industrially developed countries, both western democracies and communist, will give increasing weight to the United Nations approach in their economic relationships with Asia and Africa. The dominant mood of the peoples of these continents is often described as nationalism. This is a fair enough description. But the real basis of this great change goes deeper, I think. There is back of it also a desire of countries of Asia and Africa to see applied what the Charter calls "the equal rights of men and women and of nations large and small."

(more)

These peoples are inclined to resent economic aid offered with political strings. When this happens they sometimes tend to shop around in an effort to take whatever advantage they can of the competition for political influence. But they do not like it. Nor do they like to be placed in the position of recipients of charity. They would much prefer a hard-headed system of technical assistance, carried out mainly through the United Nations family of agencies.

So much attention has been paid to the need for greater capital investment in economic development that the pressing need of most of the newly independent countries for trained administrators has tended to be overlooked. Here, again, it seems to me that the United Nations can perform a useful service.

It will take many of the new countries 20 to 30 years to train enough administrators. If they are to carry out their development plans, what are they to do in the meantime? They do not want to be directly dependent on other nations. But the main sources from which they can draw trained manpower for administration are the industrially advanced countries.

I have suggested the creation by the United Nations of an International Administrative Civil Service as a way of solving this problem. Under this plan the United Nations would recruit the administrators, but they would then serve as seconded members of the national administrations of the countries requesting them, in much the same way -- but in reverse -- as national civil servants are seconded for service for a period of years to the international civil service of the United Nations.

I am sure there are many thousands of able men and women who would be glad to dedicate part or all of their lives to such a service. And I am equally sure of the need for their service and of the welcome they would receive if they went under the auspices of the World Organization.

The relationship of the economic and social programs of the United Nations to the problem of increasing the national security of its member states is too often overlooked in practice. An increasing emphasis on the multilateral approach -- in economic as well as in political matters -- offers many difficulties, as I have noted earlier. But it also offers more hope than any other method I have heard advanced for dealing with some of the gravest dangers of our times. The political and economic goals of the Charter need to be integrated with the policies of governments if the possibilities for relaxing tensions and increasing security are to be more fully exploited.

(more)

Those who fought here in these precincts in past centuries for the rights of men belonged to the world and not only to England. Across the earth many lands can fairly boast of such champions of freedom through the centuries. In this sense, the United Nations is not a new idea. It is here because of centuries of past struggle. It is the logical and natural development from lines of thought and aspiration going far back into all corners of the earth since a few men first began to think about the decency and dignity of other men.

Now the lines between national and international policy have begun to blur.
What is in the national interest, when truly seen, merges naturally into the international interest.

I am reminded of a memorandum written in 1907 by Mr. Eyre Crowe for the British Foreign Office. He advised then that Britain's best safeguard for the future would be a national policy that is "so directed as to harmonize with the general desires and ideals common to all mankind, and more particularly that . . . is closely identified with the primary and vital interests of a majority, or as many as possible, of the other nations."

This seems to me to be a policy -- and a principle -- which it would be both right and wise for all nations to seek to follow. It is, in effect, the policy and the principle of the United Nations Charter.

* *** *

U N I T E D N A T I O N S
Department of Public Information
Press and Publications Division
United Nations, N. Y.

(For use of information media -- not an official record)

Press Release SG/668/Add.1
2 April 1958

INTRODUCTORY REMARKS BY SELWYN LLOYD, UNITED KINGDOM
SECRETARY OF STATE FOR FOREIGN AFFAIRS, BEFORE THE ADDRESS
BY UN SECRETARY-GENERAL DAG HAMMARSKJOLD TO A MEETING OF MEMBERS
OF BOTH HOUSES OF PARLIAMENT, LONDON, 2 APRIL 1958

(The following is a transcription of a United Nations Radio voice circuit from London received this afternoon. It precedes the text of the Secretary-General's address given in Press Release SG/668.)

Mr. LLOYD: ... introduce the Secretary-General of the United Nations to you this afternoon. I think he was already well known to many of us as a very distinguished public servant of his own country in the field of finance and economics and also foreign affairs. But, over the last five years, he has become known throughout the world as a great international public servant. (Transmission unclear.) ... the way in which he does his job is the extreme skill and sagacity with which he carries out the functions of his office, the unique knack he has of keeping his problems in proper perspective. And I think that the services which he, as an individual, has made to the cause of peace cannot be exaggerated in any audience on either side of the Iron Curtain. He is also a personal friend of some of us here. For these reasons, it gives me great pleasure to ask him to speak to us.

* * *

INSERTS IN THE TEXT OF THE ADDRESS BY UN SECRETARY-GENERAL
DAG HAMMARSKJOLD TO A MEETING OF MEMBERS OF BOTH HOUSES
OF PARLIAMENT, LONDON, 2 APRIL 1958

(The following should be inserted in Press Release SG/668, Page 5, after the first sentence of the last paragraph on that page, referring to the Advisory Committee on the Peaceful Uses of Atomic Energy.)

Perhaps I might at this point mention a question of procedure which may be of particular interest in this House of Parliament. In order to overcome in this Committee the difficulties which necessarily arise because of predominant political conflict, and to get unanimity or, at least, to reach agreement, I have, as Chairman,

(more)

ruled -- and I have got it accepted from the beginning -- that no vote is ever taken. Instead of a vote, the Chairman sums up his conclusions from the debate, and any member of the Committee is free to go on record with his objections to the summing up. Never in the course of these years has any such observation been put on record in the Committee.

It does serve one purpose -- and that is that, if we can get over some of the procedural hurdles, the meeting of minds is closer at hand than one would sometimes believe from reading what is published about the very same questions.

Let me revert to the question of the second Atomic Conference. We already know...

* * *

(The following should be inserted in Press Release SG/668, Page 6, regarding the Advisory Committee on the United Nations Emergency Force.)

Also, this second Advisory Committee, by the way, applies the somewhat extraordinary procedure to which I referred -- and, so far, with the same happy result.

I might perhaps add here another word by way of a kind of footnote on this Emergency Force, as an illustration of how we work in the United Nations. The Force was created in an emergency situation, and for that reason we had to improvise. We had to improvise in the field of international law, in the field of military organization, in various fields where usually one does not really like to jump into the cold water and start swimming without having learned how best to swim. That means that the Force, as established, cannot, in my view, serve as a good foundation on which to build anything permanent of the very same form. But it does serve as an extremely useful and valuable experiment. We have learned very much. And, in the Secretariat, I have started a study which will digest our experiences, work out in form some kind of blueprint, master texts of the kind needed for this kind of operation. That means that, if another operation of a similar type should arise, where the same need would be felt, we would not have the Force but we would have everything ready in such a way that we would not again improvise. We would not again make those unavoidable mistakes into which, so to speak, you rush when you just must get the thing going without having had the time to study it carefully before.

(more)

In a sense, what I have said here is a reply to the question of whether or not, at the present stage, we should work for a permanent Force. I think the counsel of wisdom is, in the first instance, to digest the experience, to work out what I call the blueprints, the master texts for agreements, for orders, and so on and so forth... (inaudible)... to get that firmly in hand, and then work with that as the emergency arrangement.

Those who are interested in the financial question may, I think, take special pleasure in the fact that this does not cost anything -- and the other operation is an extremely costly one, as our experience has shown.

To turn to a more regular field of United Nations activities, I believe that a greater use of private diplomacy...

* * *

U N I T E D N A T I O N S
Department of Public Information
Press and Publications Division
United Nations, N. Y.

(For use of information media--not an official record)

CAUTION -- ADVANCE RELEASE

Not to be made public before
9:30 PM (EST) Tuesday, 4 March
(0230 GMT Wednesday, 5 March)

Press Release SG/661
3 March 1958

STATEMENT BY THE SECRETARY-GENERAL AT OPENING OF
ECAFE'S 14TH SESSION IN KUALA LUMPUR, MALAYA

(In the Secretary-General's absence, his statement will be read to the opening meeting in Kuala Lumpur of the 14th session of the UN Economic Commission for Asia and the Far East by Philippe de Seynes, Under-Secretary for the Department of Economic and Social Affairs.)

Two years ago I was privileged to be present at the session of this Commission. Since then there has been a further welcome accession to the Commission's membership. I am referring of course to the admission of the Federation of Malaya, in whose beautiful capital city this Commission has the good fortune to convene today. May I take this opportunity of extending my warmest congratulations to the Government and the people of Malaya who are now united with us in our global organization. I should like also to express my heartfelt thanks to the Prime Minister and the Government of the Federation of Malaya for their generous invitation and their gracious hospitality.

On more than one occasion I have emphasized the valuable work and constructive influence which the regional economic commissions contribute to the activities of the United Nations. The General Assembly at its last session could give us no better proof of its appreciation of the work of the commissions than its decision recommending to the Economic and Social Council the establishment of an Economic Commission for Africa.

Convening in Malaya, in the first year of its independence, a Conference devoted to economic cooperation highlights two of the most inspiring aspects of the United Nations mandate, the twin objectives, embodied in our Charter, of emancipation and development. Here, as elsewhere, the problem of peace and security continues to dominate our thoughts, heightened by the increasing efficiency of weapons of mass destruction. Indeed, our reflection on economic matters cannot fail to bring into focus the paradox that, at a time when amazing technical progress seems to make possible a decisive attack on human misery and poverty, an understanding has not yet been reached which would banish from our lives the threat of total destruction.

(more)

The diversion of factors of production from constructive uses to the manufacture of armaments with an exceedingly high rate of obsolescence significantly narrows the limits of economic development. That, in spite of such limits, a remarkable pace of progress was achieved in this region during the past decade is primarily a testimony to the enormous efforts of the peoples and to their readiness to make sacrifices in order to secure a better future. It is also a consequence of the great measure of international cooperation which, under programs of mutual aid, has in the last ten years and in spite of the burden of armaments, taken place in the form of transfers of capital and skills, from industrialised to less developed countries. During this decade, in fact, organized transfers, supplementing the traditional movements of capital and skills, seem to have emerged as a new and accepted permanent feature of the world economy.

While the world cannot as yet feel relieved from its preoccupations with problems of security and disarmament, a large number of constructive activities are going on in which the United Nations and its family of organizations have a growing share. Even in the face of the problems still dividing the major powers, the value of these constructive efforts can hardly be minimized. It is in that light, and in the hope that all these peaceful efforts made throughout the world will one day bear upon the approaches to the crucial issues of our century, that the work which this Commission, within its limited means, is patiently and unobtrusively performing to improve the well-being of the Asian peoples deserves praise and admiration.

While the Charter of the United Nations is all-embracing so far as improving the well-being of people throughout the world is concerned, our actual activities started ten years ago on a very modest scale. In spite of all limitations and in the face of growing impatience, our work has considerably developed. The year 1957 can be remembered as one in which new departures were made in various directions.

I have already referred to the creation of an Economic Commission for Africa.

During the past year also a new agency was born in the family of the United Nations, designed for international cooperation in the peaceful uses of atomic energy: it has established its Headquarters in Vienna, and is now linked to the United Nations through an agreement the terms of which were

(more)

approved by the last General Assembly. This will mean a new endeavor in the exchange and pooling of experience in the development of a new type of energy which may become in due course a primary factor in the acceleration of economic growth. It may eventually help countries which at present have to bear the heritage of centuries of poverty in shortening the period required for the earlier stages of economic development; and it is quite important that it has been conceived and set up to act in consonance with the broader international activities which have their center in the United Nations.

Technical assistance continued to receive considerable attention as well as proposals for financing economic development itself, and the General Assembly, at its last session, took a major step forward in facing certain of the requirements of development, although this may fall short of certain expectations.

In the course of its recent debates, it recognized that "neither the Expanded Programs of Technical Assistance nor other existing programs of the United Nations or the specialized agencies can now meet certain urgent needs which, if met, would advance the process of technical economic and social development of the less developed countries, and, in particular, would facilitate new capital investments of all types -- private and public, national and international -- by creating conditions which will make such investments either feasible or more effective." In order to fill this gap, the Assembly decided to establish "as an expansion of the existing technical assistance and development activities of the United Nations and the specialized agencies a separate Special Fund which would provide systematic and sustained assistance in fields essential to the integrated technical, economic and social development of the less developed countries." A Preparatory Committee is scheduled to meet at United Nations Headquarters in the very near future, and it is hoped that the Special Fund will be established on 1 January 1959.

With the setting up of this new instrument of international cooperation, it becomes all the more important that the various parts of a highly diversified system find their proper place and their appropriate functions and, in particular, that the often artificial barriers established between our research and our operational activities be eliminated, so that all our efforts may be more directly concentrated toward the advancement of economic progress.

(more)

After ten years of reflection and elucidation, we now see more clearly the most effective ways in which assistance can be provided within our limited resources. Among the fields which, in my view, need more intensive action I would like to mention that of public administration. I have drawn the attention of member governments some time ago to the vacuum which frequently confronts the countries entering the industrial age and for which it is often difficult, without outside help, to solve problems arising from the lack of a sufficient number of experienced officials to administer national economic development plans and other branches of expanding public functions. For this reason, I suggested the creation, within the United Nations, of an international administrative service, to provide for the under-developed countries, at their request, experienced administrators to work in their civil service, public enterprises and other economic organizations in an executive capacity. I am glad to report that the Economic and Social Council has encouraged me to make a start in this direction. Consequently, we are now proceeding along the lines indicated on an experimental basis, and we are also surveying more thoroughly the needs and the desires of the governments with a view to more comprehensive and systematic action in the future.

The development of the ECAFE's work in the past few years appears fortunately to have kept pace with the progress achieved elsewhere. Particularly in the development and utilization of resources which are prerequisites for accelerated economic growth, the Commission seems to be coming to grips with some of the problems of great importance in the vast stretches of your region. It is, for example, under ECAFE's auspices that four countries, Cambodia, Laos, Thailand and the Republic of Vietnam have joined forces in the exploration of possibilities of development of the Lower Mekong basin. This important project met with enthusiastic support not only in this Commission but in the Economic and Social Council and in the General Assembly. A United Nations mission headed by General Wheeler has now found that the Mekong has impressive potentialities for multipurpose development and has recommended a five-year program of studies and investigations. I should like to congratulate the riparian countries for their effectiveness in creating, among themselves and within the United Nations, the coordinating machinery which is indispensable for the intensive investigations which will be required. From Headquarters, I shall continue to give personal attention and support to this cooperative effort.

Basic to the origin as well as to the future of this Commission is, of course, the continuing analysis of problems of growth in the countries of the region.

(more)

In this respect, I welcomed two years ago, in my address to this Commission, the establishment of an ECAFE working party on economic development and planning. It is encouraging to note that, after having reviewed the general problems of methodology underlying the formulation and means of implementation of comprehensive plans and programs this working party is now concentrating on the more detailed study of certain aspects: the agriculture sector in 1957, industrialization in 1958, and perhaps in 1959, balanced programs of social and economic development, a problem which is everywhere assuming crucial importance in the free enterprise countries as well as in the centrally planned economies. Special attention was directed to this problem of balanced growth in the World Economic Survey and met with considerable support in the Economic and Social Council from representatives of countries with different political, economic and social systems.

May I perhaps express the hope that the work of analysis pursued in the working party on Economic Development and Planning may be the prelude to discussion of actual policies and plans with a view to their harmonization and coordination. By this, I do not necessarily mean the search for elaborate institutional schemes of customs unions, free trade areas or regional markets, but the practical and gradual recognition of economic interdependence leading to continuing cooperation among governments, and to mutually beneficial specialization.

One of the most striking features of the world of today is the multiplicity and variety of these efforts toward "integration" beyond national boundaries, to use the favourite word of the social scientist. There is, it seems to me, growing awareness of the fact that the delicate fiber of international cooperation must be based on the harmonious development of the components of the world community. We see eloquent proof of this tendency in the numerous endeavors taking place in Western Europe and Scandinavia, in the new efforts at coordination of plans among countries of Eastern Europe, in the progress of work on a common market in Central America, and studies on a regional market in Latin America as a whole, and now also in the new trends emerging in the Middle East. There are many motivations behind these efforts; among these in almost all cases, is the recognition of the requirements of industrialization and the desire, particularly on the part of the smaller countries, to overcome the handicaps of limited markets. The initiation and promotion of such schemes can, of course, only come from the countries themselves, and I would not venture to make a forecast as to how and when a need for them will be felt in this region; but the growing importance attached to intra-regional trade is perhaps a sign that the time may not be too far off. My purpose

(more)

today is mainly to point out that the United Nations in its various ramifications offers adequate machinery for the development of such policies within the framework of world-wide cooperation, if and when governments want to make use of it.

In this context, I would like to emphasize here that the potentialities of the United Nations are not necessarily exhausted by the methods of public debate, but that quiet consultations in the economic as well as in the political field may lead to mutual adjustments and cooperation. I mention this particularly because a resolution adopted last year by the Economic and Social Council requests me to review the existing scope and machinery for such consultations. This resolution, to my view, testifies to the desire of member countries to survey all possible methods which may help to bring under control the problems of our time.

It seems to me that this Commission, which is now strong with the experience of ten years, may in the future serve not only as a forum for a useful exchange of views and experience, and as an instrument for the provision of much needed services, but also as a center for harmonisation of policies in the very meaning of the Charter.

May I thank once again the Prime Minister and the Government of Malaya and wish you every success in your deliberations.

* *** *

UNITED NATIONS
Department of Public Information
Press and Publications Division
United Nations, N. Y.

(For use of information media -- not an official record)

CAUTION -- ADVANCE RELEASE
Not to be made public
Before 8:30 PM (EST)
Tuesday, 4 February 1958

Press Release SG/657
4 February 1958

ADDRESS BY DAG HAMMARSKJOLD, SECRETARY-GENERAL OF THE UNITED NATIONS,
AT THE INAUGURATION OF THE INTERNATIONAL "BUILDINGS FOR BROTHERHOOD" CAMPAIGN
OF THE INTERNATIONAL COMMITTEE OF YMCA'S OF THE UNITED STATES AND CANADA,
AT CLEVELAND, OHIO, TUESDAY, 4 FEBRUARY 1958

Mr. Chairman, Ladies and Gentlemen:

I was very glad to accept the invitation to meet with you tonight, as you inaugurate a campaign with the purpose of strengthening international friendship through a united effort to help the youth of the world.

It is a further pleasure to me that among your guests are representatives from many parts of this country as well as from Canada.

The objectives of the program being undertaken by the International Committee of the Young Men's Christian Associations have points in common with those which the United Nations itself pursues in many lands. The aims sought by you reflect some of the aspirations which we in the United Nations have set for ourselves. Indeed, it may be said to be upon the concept of brotherhood -- a concept involving mutual understanding and respect -- that the Charter of the United Nations was written and the Organization founded.

With this parallel in mind, I would like, if I may, to join with you in looking toward the future tonight.

The force and the urgency of events essentially political and the onrush of vast scientific discoveries of overwhelming potential power have, during the last decade, tended to distract our attention from the simpler truths and the human values without which the fraternity we all desire cannot emerge. We have lived in a world harassed by a sense of insecurity. Perhaps it was to be expected, therefore, that such a large part of our resources, energies and ingenuity should have been predominantly engaged by our fears rather than by our belief in man's capacity to build a better future.

(more)

- 2 -

However, I do not believe that we can much longer answer with half-hearted and timid measures the positive demands of the present. They are here and they must be faced. The adequacy of our response to them will in great measure determine the future. They spring largely from two major revolutionary developments of our time -- the increasing fulfillment, in the form of new and independent nations, of the urge to self-determination, and the realization of a vast majority of mankind that they too may improve their economic and social conditions by establishing their claim to a share in the benefits of a modern technology.

These two trends are, of course, intimately related, and they should be met with sympathy, with vision, with humanity.

The goal of the International Committee of the YMCA which envisages the construction of more than one hundred buildings in 33 countries, dedicated to the service, education and training of youth, is encouraging evidence of this spirit.

The United Nations, with far less publicity than attends it endeavors in the political field, is working in the same spirit to meet these needs. I refer especially to activities of the Organization that are directed at meeting the demands springing from the two major revolutionary developments to which I have referred.

The Technical Assistance Program of the United Nations was created less than ten years ago. Limited in resources, and modest in scope though it still is, it provides tangible proof that effective economic and social cooperation can be developed through the United Nations between donor and recipient countries, as equals, in the management of projects based on the principle of mutual help. Thus, through the United Nations and the Specialized Agencies, over 5,000 technicians have been made available to more than 130 countries and territories in projects ranging from the improvement of agricultural methods and health and education standards to advanced techniques of large-scale production and financial administration. Some 1,000 fellowships have been awarded; seminars and study tours have been conducted; pilot projects have been undertaken.

The United Nations General Assembly took action at its last session which, I hope, will open the way to a further development of such programs in the future. I shall return to these new possibilities later. But I believe it would be useful first to turn our attention to the needs of the communities of people around the world which these programs are created to serve.

In a real sense our program tonight centers upon the community, whether that community be urban or rural. Your institutions serve not only the youth of the cities but reach into the rural areas, where the impact of your constructive programs

(more)

is also felt. The majority of communities in the world are inhabited by peoples who lack the normal opportunities for reasonable well-being and progress. The most recent United Nations report on the world social situation indicates that more than half of the population of the world is still living at levels which deny them reasonable freedom from preventable diseases; a diet adequate to physical well-being; a dwelling that meets basic human needs; the education necessary for improvement; and development of conditions of work that are technically efficient, economically rewarding and socially satisfactory. The impact of these problems upon each other can best be seen at the community level and they can best be approached on a planned and coordinated basis at the community level.

One of the most important and difficult problems for the economically less developed countries is to achieve balanced and integrated programs of development for the rural and urban sectors of their population. In the planning of technical assistance and economic aid programs, more attention must be directed to that half of the population of the world which continues to live on the bare margins of subsistence in the rural villages of the economically under-developed areas. The future economic and social development of these areas will depend on the ways in which it will be found possible for the people living there to raise their level of living within the framework of national economic and social progress, with as much reliance as possible on their own effort.

We must, I am convinced, place increased emphasis on what has become known as community development in helping to meet this need. In order to guide the rural areas toward more modern forms of social and economic existence, community development programs may play the essential role of mobilizing simultaneously the potential human and natural resources which ultimately will make possible a substantial improvement in the levels of living of the people concerned.

(more)

Press Release SG/657
4 February 1958

Such programs are most soundly devised when they utilize fully local leadership, initiative and interest. These local resources can only be put into motion by national initiative and applied through a combination of national and local effort with such help as may be necessary from the world community. A beginning must be made with an effort to grow more food, to improve sanitation and health, to educate adults as well as children, to stimulate rural arts and crafts; but, whatever the beginning, unless all the elements of balanced economic and social development are eventually encompassed, the program will fall short even in reaching specific technical goals.

These community development programs are the product of the difficult processes of trial and error by which nations are seeking to fulfill the promise of independence and to narrow the gap in material and technological progress between themselves and their more fortunate neighbors.

We have seen such programs bear fruitful results all across South East Asia. The Indian Community Projects and the Village Aid Program in Pakistan are now very well known. The Community School Program in the Philippines and the Community Development Program in Korea have slightly different emphases, but the common purpose of raising standards of living at the village level is central to all of them. In many of the Asian programs the United Nations has contributed technical aid alongside the larger resources of the United States bilateral programs and the important contributions of the Ford Foundation.

(more)

The United Nations has played a considerable role in introducing the concept of community development programs at both national and local governmental levels in five Middle East countries within the last five years. Governments have also built upon the foundations laid by such organizations as the YMCA and the YWCA, and the Near East Foundation. The importance of combining the resources of the people themselves with the efforts of voluntary organizations and governmental services can hardly be overemphasized if we are to achieve our political, economic and social objectives throughout those vast regions of the world which are economically under-developed. Such programs of community development are a necessary complement to national economic programs which emphasize industrial development, power and transport.

I turn now to another field in which international cooperation is needed. This is the task of building up a class of national administrators in countries where an independent administrative tradition is lacking. A country without a trained civil service finds itself at a grave disadvantage, all the more so when it is embarking on major schemes of economic and social development and wishes to obtain and use to the best advantage international assistance for its projects. Many new countries lack a social structure which permits a corps of administrators to be rapidly recruited. Moreover, the process of building up a trained cadre of administrators is a long one and the competing demands for the services of the better-trained citizens of a young country are considerable.

Here is an area where the multi-national approach of the United Nations could be put to good use. New countries, whose attachment to the principle of self-determination is strongest, can accept more easily help through an international cooperative scheme than from an individual country, particularly in the sensitive area of government.

I have suggested developing a United Nations international administrative service through which such countries could employ administrators of high caliber. Recruited by the United Nations, they would have to have the sense of an international mission but they would be solely responsible to the Governments to which they were assigned. Such a Service would be closely linked with training facilities aimed at strengthening and enlarging the country's own corps of administrators. I hope that at least a start toward the development of such a service can be made soon.

The General Assembly at its last session decided to establish a United Nations Special Fund, which will place at the disposal of the United Nations additional resources to meet some of the urgent needs of the under-developed

(more)

Press Release SG/657
4 February 1958

countries which cannot now be met by existing United Nations programs. It will be the task of the Fund to assist in carrying out extensive surveys of natural resources and establishing training, research and pilot demonstration projects. It will thus pave the way for the establishment of those basic facilities which directly lead to the expansion of national productive capacity and to investments of all types -- private and public, national and international.

This new United Nations venture can have a commanding influence on the further development of United Nations technical assistance and other activities. The Technical Assistance Program, in an effort to achieve widest participation of the under-developed countries in its operations, often has had to spread thinly its limited resources. The new Fund will enable us to consider a number of projects, some embracing several countries or even an entire region. A striking example of how those resources could be used may be witnessed in the United Nations activities in surveying the vast resources of the Lower Mekong River. When developed, these resources could bring immense benefit to four countries through which this great river flows -- Cambodia, Laos, Thailand and Viet Nam.

The Special Fund, when established, will represent a significant step forward. Associated with the lending operations of the International Bank and with the United Nations programs of technical assistance, it will be an important link in the chain of international action which is being forged to assist countries in their economic development.

The United Nations is a sensitive barometer of the impact of change. Not long ago from Asia, more recently from Africa, new States became members of the United Nations. These States are lending their thought and suasion to the understanding of the large issues that affect the peace and stability of the world community. The United Nations is stronger for their presence. But they have also come onto the international scene with expectations of their own. A newly independent state knows that in an international forum it has the opportunity to discuss the problems which impede or retard the development of its individual life, and that it will be heard; it likewise believes that in the United Nations lies its best hope of finding the assistance which will enable it to achieve progress and well-being in terms acceptable to its sense of nationhood and its search for the realities of freedom.

So, as the Organization becomes more universal, the burden of its responsibility increases and the areas where it must strive to further its basic purposes expand.

(more)

I have spoken here of problems that will not be resolved for many years to come. If the peoples of the world are to meet this larger challenge in the same spirit which has animated the launching of your campaign for "Buildings for Brotherhood," we shall need to redress the present balance between our fears and our belief in man's future. Prudence is, in any case, a better defense against danger than fear. More important still, we should direct more of our attention to efforts to build, with courage and a true sense of brotherhood, the kind of world in which there will be a better chance for all to live a life more worthy of man's promise than is within their reach today.

The United Nations symbolizes for most of us the hope of a more peaceful world. But peace-making consists of more than direct efforts to bring the arms race under control and to settle conflicts among the nations by negotiation instead of by war. Progress in the search for peace depends to a large extent upon the understanding of people like yourselves of the importance to peace of such programs as I have discussed with you tonight and upon your support for the sustained endeavor that will be necessary if they are to be more adequate to the need than they are today.

* *** *

U N I T E D N A T I O N S
Department of Public Information
Press and Publications Division
United Nations, N. Y.

(For use of information media -- not an official record)

CAUTION: ADVANCE RELEASE
Not to be made public
Before 10:30 a.m. (EST)
Wednesday, 5 February 1958

Press Release SG/656
3 February 1958

ADDRESS BY MR. DAG HAMMARSKJOLD, SECRETARY-GENERAL OF THE UNITED NATIONS,
AT OHIO UNIVERSITY, ATHENS, OHIO, WEDNESDAY, 5 FEBRUARY 1958

"THE ELEMENT OF PRIVACY IN PEACE-MAKING"

I have chosen as the subject of my talk "The Element of Privacy in Peace-Making" because I believe a discussion of this problem is both timely and especially appropriate to a university audience. You are concerned as scholars and students with the historical background of today's efforts to maintain peace and to strengthen those influences working for peace. You are equally concerned with what past and present can tell us as guiding lines for a future in which somehow or other we must find means of settling disputes between nations without war.

The task of peace-making in our times differs in important respects from the task of past centuries.

There is, first, the greater urgency of the need for peace-making and the fact that this urgency makes itself felt on a universal basis. This results from the rapidly increasing destructiveness of modern weapons and the growing interdependence of all parts of the world, an interdependence which makes every "local" war a potential world war.

Nations have responded to this need by supplementing the instruments and procedures of classical diplomacy with the permanent machinery of international organization, established by treaty. The League of Nations was the first expression of this response and the United Nations is a second. The purpose of the United Nations, like the purpose of the League of Nations before it, is to add strength to the force of the common interest, as expressed in the Charter and the consensus of member nations, in the tasks of peace-making and peace-building.

Yet another difference between the task of peace-making in our times and the task of past centuries arises from the form given to world organization and the simultaneous development of the modern media of communications, which, taken together, have made it possible for public opinion to become a major factor in international life. The form of international organization, beginning with the

(more)

League and continuing in the United Nations, has been aptly described by Professor Philip Jessup as parliamentary diplomacy. This parliamentary diplomacy, with its public debates, is in part the reflection of a desire to introduce democratic procedures in the field of international politics. Back of the introduction of parliamentary diplomacy is also the belief prevalent at the end of the first World War that the catastrophe might have been avoided had the peoples been fully informed by the governments about their international agreements and policies. The reaction was summed up in Woodrow Wilson's famous call for "open covenants openly arrived at."

War as an instrument of national policy, except in individual or collective self-defense against armed attack, is outlawed by the United Nations Charter. However, the arms race continues unabated. This is so because there is not yet sufficient trust among the nations to reach a disarmament agreement with adequate safeguards against attack. But each new advance in the continuing development of weapons of mass destruction is making more evident that the risks of war to any nation which might be tempted to break the law of the Charter by embarking upon it are too great.

In these circumstances it has become more essential than ever to seek and apply on a world scale other techniques for settling disputes -- to seek agreements which are fair and just and to shape national policies to circumstances in such a way as to make war both redundant and obsolete. We cannot afford to reckon peace as merely the absence of war. We have to make of it a positive and overriding discipline of international life.

The new institutional forms for this discipline, which are to be found in the United Nations, have, as I have just indicated, given emphasis to public procedures recalling those followed under the constitutions of democratic states. The resemblance is real, but it is also misleading. There is an essential difference between the nation and the society of nations, each of which remains individually sovereign. The United Nations General Assembly is patterned on a parliament but with power only to recommend, not to legislate. Its Councils and Secretariat resemble in some respects the executive branch, but with strict limitations on their powers. Its judicial branch, the International Court of Justice, is again much more severely circumscribed.

This resemblance in form, but not in the substance of power, between the institutions of parliamentary diplomacy and the institutions of a democratic national state has both its positive and negative aspects. On the positive side

(more)

the public discussion of world issues, even in a forum without legislative power, may contribute -- and in fact often has contributed -- to an easing of tensions and to progress toward accommodation or agreement. There are usually more than two sides to any dispute, and debate in the United Nations provides an opportunity for the representatives of nations not directly involved in a conflict to bring their influence to bear in the direction of arriving at a reasonable consensus of views as to the common interest. Furthermore, insofar as United Nations debates are fully and fairly reported, the possibilities are increased for giving to the public an opportunity to appraise national policies as expressed in these debates and to arrive at an objective opinion concerning them.

On the negative side, it must be said that public debates in the United Nations can just as readily be used to make a propaganda case for home consumption or for use in other countries as it can be used as a genuine step toward peaceful accommodation. The public conception of the peace-making role of the United Nations also tends to be distorted, because it is so largely based on reports of these debates which emphasize the conflicts that make news.

Finally, the public processes of parliamentary diplomacy tend to create a dangerous optical illusion in another respect. This arises from a confusion between the form and the substance of the legislative process in parliamentary diplomacy as practiced in the United Nations. A voting victory in a national legislature leads to decisions which have the force of law. The legislative process in the United Nations, on the other hand, leads only to the passage of recommendations which do not have the force of law. The force of public opinion behind such a recommendation may influence the decisions of the governments toward whom the recommendation is directed, but the power of decision remains with the individual national governments.

The legislative process in the United Nations is not a substitute for diplomacy. It serves its purpose only when it helps diplomacy to arrive at agreements between the national states concerned.

It is diplomacy, not speeches and votes, that continues to have the last word in the process of peace-making.

I think the experiences of the past 12 years have demonstrated that there is need to redress the balance between the public and private procedures of the United Nations if we are to make better progress in peace-making. When I speak of private procedures I mean here the methods of classical diplomacy as applied

(more)

within the new framework provided by the Charter and the institutions of the World Organization. There has always been this practice of private -- or quiet -- diplomacy in the United Nations, and there has been a marked increase in its use within the past year or two. But the need for it is not sufficiently understood.

The best results of negotiation between two parties cannot be achieved in international life, any more than in our private worlds, in the full glare of publicity, with current public debate of all moves, unavoidable misunderstandings, inescapable freezing of position due to considerations of prestige, and the temptation to utilize public opinion as an element integrated in the negotiation itself.

"Open agreements" represent the response to a sound demand. How, and to what extent they should be "openly arrived at," on the other hand, is a principle which requires serious consideration in the light of the very aims which the public procedures are intended to serve.

Considered simply as the only meeting place on the common ground of the Charter of the ambassadors of 82 member countries, the United Nations provides a unique opportunity for the continuous exercise of classical diplomacy for peace-making without any formal procedures. We can register efforts to give such diplomacy the support of firmer procedures. Such procedures may help and they represent a further elaboration of classical diplomacy as exercised within the United Nations. They are, however, to be regarded as particular cases, the bulk of the private diplomacy at the United Nations being wholly informal.

Let me give you three examples of such procedures. Two constructive and highly useful committees established by the General Assembly in the past three years are very small committees which meet entirely in private. Both of them happen to be advisory committees to the Secretary-General, but a similar pattern could be usefully followed even if this were not the case. It is quite likely that most of you in this room have never heard of either of them, because they meet with little publicity.

One is the Advisory Committee on Atomic Energy -- that is, its peaceful uses. On this Committee of seven, outstanding nuclear scientists sit as governmental representatives of the three major atomic powers, the United Kingdom, the United States of America and the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics. It has contributed a great deal to paving the way for agreements and action by governments which have helped to break down the barriers of the cold war so far as peaceful uses of atomic energy are concerned.

(more)

The other Assembly committee is the Advisory Committee on the United Nations Emergency Force, which has done much to bring quiet to the armistice line between Egypt and Israel. This is a committee exclusively of smaller member states, most of whom have provided contingents serving with the United Nations Force. Its work is an example of the practical value in the United Nations of a formal instrument of private diplomacy in carrying forward action once the main policy lines have been laid down by a decision of the General Assembly. That decision, in turn, was made by the General Assembly in the public proceedings of parliamentary diplomacy only after the informal procedures of private classical diplomacy had done their work. Thus, this case is also an example of a kind of three-stage operation which is natural in the United Nations and which is capable of yielding constructive results for peace-making not to be achieved by other means: private diplomacy preceding public debate and then employed again to follow through.

My third example is the experiment in private negotiation of the Suez Canal issue in which the Security Council engaged in early October 1956 before the invasion of Egypt. This experiment brought together the Foreign Ministers of the member nations of the Council in private session instead of the usual public session. It led to informal meetings of the Foreign Ministers of France, the United Kingdom and Egypt in my office which resulted in unanimous agreement on six principles for the peaceful settlement of the Suez Canal question. These principles established the basis for the further private diplomatic steps toward such a settlement which are now in progress.

I am confident that such private diplomacy, within the framework of the Security Council, can be usefully employed on other issues and, if so employed, could contribute in new directions to the importance of the role the Charter intended the Council to play in the task of peace-making.

I do not suggest that the Assembly and Councils of the United Nations should replace public by private diplomacy. Far from it. Public debates must continue to be a primary function of these organs. I wish only to stress two points.

First, since the "legislative" processes of the United Nations do not lead to legislation, and the power of decision remains in the hands of the national governments, the value of public debate in the United Nations can be measured only by the degree to which it contributes to the winning of agreement by the processes of diplomacy. If public debate contributes to winning consent either immediately or in the long run, it serves the purpose of peace-making. If it does not so contribute, then it may be a useless, or even harmful exercise.

(more)

Second, I believe that more attention and effort need to be given to using the unique opportunities for private diplomacy that exist in the United Nations. Private diplomacy is just as necessary as ever in arriving at agreements between sovereign nations. Sometimes its primary role is before a public debate, sometimes in the intermissions of debate, sometimes afterward, and often at all of these times. Classical diplomacy continues to be usefully practiced in the old tradition on a bilateral basis. But more of it is needed now in the practices of the United Nations if we are to develop to the full the capacity of the Organization as an instrument of peace-making.

Unlike the Assembly and the Councils, the Office of the Secretary-General, by its very nature under the Charter, must practice private diplomacy on almost all occasions until results are reached. In recent years the Secretary-General has increasingly been used for operations of a purely diplomatic type, either on behalf of the United Nations as such, or for one government in relation to another on a good offices basis. He is in a position of trust vis-à-vis all the member governments. He speaks for no government. It should go without saying that in the course of a negotiation, or a mission of good offices, he must respect fully the laws of diplomatic discretion. He can never give away what must be considered the property of the government with whom he is working. Nor could he pass public judgment upon their policies without wrecking the use of his office for the diplomatic purposes for which experience shows that it is much needed. Of course, when a mission has resulted in a formal agreement between the parties, the agreement is made public, but it is, of course, not for him to evaluate it in public.

In my discussion so far of "the element of privacy in peace-making," I have not dealt with one problem of major importance. This is the problem of the relationship of the increased need for private diplomacy with the need for a better informed public opinion on international affairs. It is a problem of some difficulty and one where the responsibility for a solution is shared by the governments, by those who direct the mass media of communications, by international civil servants serving the world community like myself and by the general public of which you in this audience tonight are a part.

The media of mass communications, when supplemented by education in world affairs in schools and universities, provide powerful tools for developing a better informed public opinion. However, they can also be misused. We learned between the first and second World Wars that public diplomacy could not in itself

(more)

provide insurance of peace, for in the hands of a ruthless group of rulers the mass media had been misused to build strong public support for the wildest aspirations of these rulers and thus to place an additional weapon in the hands of those who wanted to lead the world in the direction of war, not peace.

Thus the mass media can be misused under certain circumstances for harmful propaganda. Where competitive conditions prevail there is also a tendency to play up conflict because conflict usually seems more dramatic than agreement. For the same competitive reasons there is the natural desire to be "first with the story." In international affairs, this may result in premature and often poorly informed publicity about an issue at a time when the privacy of quiet diplomacy is essential to achieving a constructive result. At the same time I recognize that public opinion cannot be truly well informed about the progress of peace-making unless it understands the part that is played at all stages by private diplomacy and its relationship to the public proceedings of parliamentary diplomacy which are so fully reported. This creates difficulties both for the private negotiator and the representatives of the mass media.

There are no easy solutions and I would not attempt to suggest them here. I only wish to emphasize that all of us share an overriding responsibility to work toward creating, through the mass media and education alike, a wider public understanding of and respect for the needs and uses of private as well as public diplomacy. In this way we can help to develop a better informed public opinion capable of exerting an increasingly positive influence in support of the task of peace-making in our time.

* *** *

U N I T E D N A T I O N S
Department of Public Information
Press and Publications Division
United Nations, N. Y.

(For use of information media -- not an official record)

Press Release SG/655
27 January 1958

STATEMENT BY SECRETARY-GENERAL DAG HAMMARSKJOLD AT THE OPENING
OF THE FOURTH SESSION OF THE SCIENTIFIC COMMITTEE ON THE EFFECTS
OF ATOMIC RADIATION, 27 JANUARY 1958, AT UN HEADQUARTERS

May I welcome you again to the Headquarters of the United Nations.

The heavy responsibility entrusted to this Committee needs no underscoring. The special importance of calm and scientific appraisal of the effects of ionizing radiations in place of public speculation and alarm, too often nourished by misinformation, has apparently increased since this Committee first met here. Indeed, the Twelfth General Assembly reaffirmed the importance it attaches to the Committee's work when, last November, it requested you to expedite the completion of the comprehensive report which you are now preparing.

In earlier meetings the Committee has considered the scope and organization of its task, the detailed information it requires, the form and content of its full report. Now the crucial stage of formulation of the report has been reached. I can well understand, therefore, that the immediate future for this Committee promises only very hard work. It is no small task to try to expound, with scientific precision and accuracy, but still in words simple enough to permit some understanding by the layman, the profoundly technical subject-matter of radiation.

I suppose that in this regard what is most important for all of us to bear in mind is that, although this is a United Nations Committee, its members are scientists and are expected to speak as scientists. It goes without saying, I take it, that all that you say will be reviewed intently by your scientific colleagues all around the world. It will certainly mean very much to the world if international science, as here represented, can speak on this vital subject of radiation effects with a single, objective voice.

Thinking of the report to be prepared, it would seem worth repeating what was said at an earlier meeting: this Committee is not called upon to try to produce answers to questions which cannot be answered on the basis of present scientific research; rather, to define and delimit what that research does and does not tell us today is in itself a uniquely valuable service.

(more)

Press Release SG/655
27 January 1958

In concluding, may I point to further evidence of the continuing concern of the General Assembly with the subject of ionizing radiations, expressed in its resolution of 14 November 1957, which requests the Secretary-General, in consultation with this Committee, "to consider the question of the strengthening and widening of scientific activities in this field, .." and to submit his findings to the Thirteenth Session of the General Assembly. This will provide an opportunity, at an appropriate time, for further fruitful collaboration.

And now, I have no doubt, you will wish to get on with the serious work which has brought you here, and which I am sure, will produce good results.

* *** *