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STATEMENT MADE BY ACTING SECRETARY-GENERAL U THANT
BEFORE ADVISORY COMMITTEE ON THE CONGO, 29 JUNE

I called this meeting in order to bring the members up to date on developments in the Congo, particularly with regard to the Adoula-Tshombe talks in Leopoldville. Since issuing the call for this meeting, those talks, as you know, ended early in the morning of the 26th of June without agreement, thus creating a new critical phase for the UN operation in the Congo.

You will have seen by now the text of Mr. Gardiner's* report on the Adoula-Tshombe talks, which I have distributed as Security Council document S/5053/Add.10. The Annexes, however, which are voluminous, are still being processed and have not yet been circulated.

Mr. Rolz-Bennett,** the ONUC Representative in Elisabethville, who sat with Mr. Gardiner in the second phase of the talks, has returned and I intend to call upon him to give you first-hand information supplementary to the written report about the talks.

It is, I think, a bit early to attempt to draw any conclusions as to the significance of the failure of the Leopoldville talks to end in agreement. There is no provision for their resumption but we will press for them to do so.

The decisive question, of course, will be whether Mr. Tshombe and his lieutenants in Katanga will now undertake to resume their secessionist efforts. They may or they may not.

As you know, Mr. Tshombe, at Kitona and on other occasions since then, has renounced secession, but what he will actually do now remains to be seen, particularly since some of his colleagues, most notably Mr. Kimba, have increasingly evidenced a lack of sympathy with Mr. Tshombe's participation in the talks and with the so-called "conciliatory" line he was pursuing at Leopoldville.

(more)

* Robert K.A. Gardiner, Officer-in-Charge of the UN operation in the Congo.
** Jose Rolz-Bennett formerly held that position and is now back at UN Headquarters.
I might add that while we were hoping that the Leopoldville talks might end in agreement, we were always prepared for their likely failure, despite the fact that Mr. Gardiner was exhibiting great skill and doing everything humanly possible to keep them going and to achieve fruitful results from them.

I have suggested to Mr. Gardiner that he come here for consultations in the next few days, since I would wish to have the benefit of his analysis in giving thought to the immediate future. You may be sure that our people in the Congo have been told to be very much on the alert for any contingency as a consequence of the breakdown of the talks.

It is quite possible that in the light of developments in the few weeks ahead I would find it necessary to consult you about courses of action and even to invite the Security Council to review the entire Congo situation and to consider the advisability of clarifying and strengthening existing mandates and providing certain new ones.

You may be sure, of course, that in the meantime we will continue the policy of giving all possible assistance under the Security Council resolutions to the government in its efforts to achieve unity and protect the territorial integrity of the country. In this respect, I may read to you the text of the message which I am sending today to Leopoldville in connection with the second anniversary of independence of the Congo which will be celebrated on Saturday, 30 June [message being released at 5 p.m. on 29 June].

I may also inform you that the Katangese authorities some time ago informed our people in Elisabethville of their intention to celebrate "Katangese independence" on 11 July and to bring a thousand or more Katangese gendarmes from places outside Elisabethville to participate in the parade on that date.

Our people have taken a firmly negative position against bringing in any additional gendarmerie to Elisabethville for this or any other purpose and, indeed, we have informed the Katangese authorities of our strongly negative view of any so-called independence celebration at all by them.

I think it might now be advisable to call upon Mr. Rolz-Bennett and after his statement to invite discussion about the situation in general.

* *** *
Mr. Chairman and Members of the Committee,

It is a great pleasure for me to join your deliberations this morning. I regard this Committee and the task it performs on behalf of the General Assembly as a most significant and indeed essential part of the budgetary procedure, serving, as it does, as a link with the Administration on the one hand and a valued counsellor to the General Assembly on the other. I intend to take full advantage of the opportunity this Committee offers to obtain, at relatively short notice, advice and guidance on special problems as they arise. On this occasion, I have deferred my appearance before you until you were about to consider the two sections of the budget estimates which constitute not only the major portion of the appropriations proposed, but cover the most vital element of the budget, namely, the staffing requirements of the Secretariat and related costs. I understand that, with the assistance of my senior colleagues, you have made good progress in your consideration of the other budget sections. Should you require my personal participation at any subsequent time during your present session, I will give this the highest priority. I might mention, in this regard, that I expect to be in New York until July 4.

Members of the Committee will by now have received an advance copy of my foreword to the budget estimates for 1963. In addition to providing a synopsis of the provisions requested under the main parts of the estimates, I have sought to formulate certain broad policies which I believe should govern the assessment of the minimum financial support necessary for the implementation in the coming year of the responsibilities placed on the Secretariat by Member States.
Members are already familiar with the level of the proposed appropriations which, on a gross basis, show an increase of $4.5 million compared with 1962 and on a net basis, an increase of some $3.8 million. Of the gross increase, some $3.3 million occurs in respect of the estimates, under Sections 3 and 4, for salaries and wages and common staff costs. This reflects my proposals for a staff increase in 1963 of five per cent above the existing level.

The foreword contains a distribution by office location of the estimates under Part II - staff costs - and Part III - buildings, equipment, and common services - which together constitute the main area of expenditure. This table indicates a proposed percentage growth compared with the level for 1962 of 5.5 for Headquarters and Geneva, 26, 12, and 8 for the economic commissions of Africa, Asia and the Far East, and Latin America, respectively, and 19 for the information centres.

These estimates do not, of course, represent the total which the Assembly will be asked to consider at its forthcoming session. The items not yet included have, however, been reduced to a minimum and can all be readily identified.

In the first instance, the usual revised estimates will need to be submitted in respect of the financial requirements arising from decisions of the Economic and Social Council at its thirty-third and thirty-fourth sessions in the course of the current year. In this regard I have included in my foreword a special appeal for restraint and rational evaluation on the part of the decision-making organs, since the controlled expansion of staff which I propose for 1963 depends on a corresponding effort to confine further programme growth to clearly defined major objectives. The workload in the economic and
social field has been considerably intensified in recent years, particularly in the fields of industrialization, natural resources, economic projections and programming, and balanced economic and social development with particular reference to housing, rural and community development. Plans for the Decade of Development will no doubt set bold new objectives for the United Nations. While additional staff resources will inevitably be required in the light of the programmes to be decided upon, I would venture to point out that this initial stage offers an excellent opportunity for the organs involved to make a fresh effort to achieve a balanced general programme based on priorities. The Economic and Social Council may to advantage give further consideration to this aspect of the matter.

A further addition to the budget may result from the proposals to be submitted at a later stage in respect of major capital improvements to the Headquarters building, and in particular, the permanent expansion of meeting-room facilities to accommodate the considerable additions to the membership of the Organization since the building was planned. Members of the Committee will recall that at the fifteenth session plans estimated to cost some $7.7 million were submitted, but that for reasons of financial stringency, only temporary measures have been taken to relieve the pressure to date. I fear that implementation of more permanent projects cannot be delayed beyond 1962.

In the third instance we are faced with the need to increase in 1962 the salaries of general service staff and manual workers at Geneva and manual workers at Headquarters. This Committee has been associated with these requirements which, after promulgation, will have a corresponding effect on the level of the 1963 estimates.
Lastly, provision will have to be included in the 1963 budget, in accordance with the Assembly's resolution on the subject, for the interest charges on United Nations bonds sold and installment payment of principal due on such bonds. It is intended to defer the calculation of the amount to be provided, on the basis of total sales in 1962, until the final stage of the forthcoming General Assembly session.

Before commenting on the estimates themselves, I should like to refer to a matter which is of great concern to us all, although, in my view, not the over-riding consideration in establishing the level of requirements necessary for the proper functioning of the Organization. I have in mind the financial position of the Organization. It is perhaps premature to predict how the situation is likely to develop in 1962. Much depends on the financial impact of any conclusions which may be reached as a result of the forthcoming advisory opinion of the International Court on the nature and treatment, in terms of the Charter, of peace-keeping expenditures. The progress made in respect of the sale of United Nations bonds and the rate at which assessed contributions are received is also a vital factor. At this stage it will be of interest to the Committee to know how matters stand at present.

The net cash resources of the Organization at the end of 1961 totalled $14.6 million, representing an increase of $11.8 million above the 1960 year-end figure. However, total liabilities in respect of the regular budget, UNEF, and ONUC on 31 December 1961 increased to $126.4 million as compared with a corresponding total of $89.7 million at the end of 1960. During the first quarter of 1962, obligations incurred exceeded income by a further $20.1 million, even after taking into account receipts during this period in the amount of $5.8 million from sales of United Nations bonds.
Of the $200 million bond issue authorized for 1962 and 1963, bonds in a total amount of only $65.7 million have been subscribed for, of which $25,680,000 have been sold. The proceeds of the sale of bonds to date have been entirely expended for settlement of the most urgent claims of the Organization; in addition, it has been necessary on two occasions in 1962 so far to resort to borrowing from special funds and accounts in the Secretary-General's custody to meet the payroll of the Organization. Similar use may need to be made of these resources in the immediate future depending on the extent to which further sales of bonds or receipts of assessed contributions are forthcoming.

Quite apart from the problems which have arisen as a result of the unusual expenditures incurred in recent years in respect of certain major peace-keeping operations of the Organization, I shall at a later stage ask this Committee to consider whether the time has not come to effect a sizeable increase in the level of the Working Capital Fund, purely from the point of view of restoring a reasonable relationship with the overall level of the annual regular budget as it has increased since the amount of the Fund was last adjusted.

I have dealt at some length in the foreword with programmes and related staff requirements, with special reference to the conference schedule and the needs of particular areas of staff activity, substantive and otherwise. It can be said in general that the conscious limitation of staff requirements to the absolute minimum in the last few years has resulted in a situation where the existing staff now has great difficulty in coping successfully with the steadily expanding activities of the Organization. Among the factors producing an increased workload have been the substantial increase in new members, many of whom urgently require advice and assistance; a virtually uninterrupted schedule of meetings throughout the year as a result, inter alia, of resumed sessions of the
Assembly and a significant increase in the number of special committees
created by the main organs; and a constant growth in programmes and projects
entrusted to the Secretariat, mainly in the economic and social field. I have
stated in the conclusion to the foreword that while the financial difficulties
in which the Organization finds itself are of great concern, the ability of the
Organization to play an effective international role deserves equal consideration.
I am sure the Committee is well aware of my views on the need for the United
Nations to maintain a forward look, as well as on the interest which the smaller
nations of the world have in its strength and its continued growth. That Member
States share my optimism in the Organization's future is evident from the new and
expanding programmes to which they have given their support, in particular, the
far-reaching and challenging concept of the Decade of Development. In the same
spirit I have endeavoured to make initial provision in the present budget for a
controlled expansion of the staff to meet the demands which will be made upon it in
the years immediately ahead. The need for additional staff is most pressing in the
economic and social area. Some strengthening also of the conference servicing
and language staff cannot, however, be delayed beyond this year. It is no
exaggeration to state that in these key areas a very strained situation is
developing which, if not relieved, can only result in unsatisfactory planning of
work, a growing backlog, and a falling-off of the quality of service which the
Secretariat has hitherto sought to provide, and member governments have become
accustomed to expect.

I trust the Committee will give the most careful and sympathetic consideration
to the minimum measures of controlled expansion which I have proposed. I also
intend to take every opportunity to point out to the main organs the prime
importance of rational planning of overall additions to programmes and a pattern
of conferences and meetings which takes due account of the servicing capacities
of the Secretariat.
In conclusion, a word needs to be said on the relatively high level of supplementary estimates which are likely to be submitted in respect of 1962. I am aware of the strict budgetary approach to expenditures of this description which has, quite correctly, been taken by this Committee in the past. In particular, the Committee has felt that the level of the appropriations should not be exceeded unless there were compelling and unavoidable reasons for doing so and that there should be the largest possible measure of compensation by the application of priorities to, and the achievement of actual savings under, other items of the sections involved. I wish to assure the Committee that a determined effort is being made to avoid any over-expenditure of provisions for normal purposes in 1962. However, as acknowledged by this Committee in the past, the nature of the Organization, being subject in many respects to the pressure of events, precludes a completely rigid limitation in this regard. Moreover, the 1963 budget clearly indicates that in most important areas the limits of absorptive capacity have been reached. Most noteworthy, however, is the fact that in 1962 in an unusual number of cases, the costs of certain activities were, in terms of the relevant decisions of the Assembly at its sixteenth session, left to be incurred under the provisions of the resolution on unforeseen and extraordinary expenses in 1962. Thus the bulk of the total of some $2.8 million which may well be submitted in the form of supplementary estimates will therefore relate to costs resulting from such decisions, while additional requirements for normal purposes will be kept to an absolute minimum.
NOTE TO CORRESPONDENTS

PRESS CONFERENCE BY THE ACTING SECRETARY-GENERAL AT UN HEADQUARTERS

ON THURSDAY, 14 JUNE 1962

The Acting Secretary-General first made an introductory statement, as given in Press Release SG/1223.

The press conference then continued.

(more)
The ACTING SECRETARY-GENERAL: Ladies and gentlemen, I had intended to stay on here for a few more minutes to answer questions which you may wish to put to me, but I very much regret that I shall have to leave now to keep a very urgent appointment. You have here with you my colleagues who are directly responsible for United Nations operations in regard to the Development Decade and they will be only too happy to answer questions that may be put to them arising out of this statement and, of course, arising out of the whole pattern of the Development Decade. You will recall that the sixteenth session of the General Assembly asked the Secretary-General to submit plans for the Decade at the next session of the Assembly. Thank you very much for your very patient attention.

QUESTION: I wonder whether, in this new endeavour on behalf of the Decade of Economic Development, the United Nations will seek to correlate the present agencies such as the WHO, the FAO and the Technical Assistance Programmes in a sort of liaison under one direction for world-wide endeavour, whether the present endeavours will be brought together in fostering this new programme which U Thant has now outlined.

Mr. HOFFMAN:* I will give the first answer to that question and perhaps Mr. de Seynes* and Mr. Owen*will also want to address themselves to us.

I think that we already have excellent co-ordination through the ACC,** which meets twice a year and which discusses in its meetings any mutual problems. I think I can report to you very honestly, coming into the United Nations only three and a half years ago, that there has been a growing awareness that we must operate as a family and, speaking from the standpoint of the Special Fund, which is not an operating agency but a financing agency, our statement is that the co-ordination today is excellent. That does not mean that it cannot be improved, but it is excellent.

Perhaps Mr. de Seynes would like to add to that from a greater knowledge.

(more)

* Paul Hoffman, Managing Director of the UN Special Fund and Chairman of the Secretary-General's Economic Policy Board; Philippe de Seynes, Under-Secretary for Economic and Social Affairs; David Owen, Chairman, Technical Assistance Board.

** Administrative Committee for Coordination
Mr. de SÈVRES: Not from a greater knowledge but just to confirm what you have said. I do not think that we are seeking constitutional changes in the family of the United Nations. We have found that over the years the constitutional system under which we live was serviceable and we have improved its operation considerably over the years and intend to improve it further in the course of this decade.

QUESTION: It seems to me, reading the report, that this document foresaw the use of vast new sums of money and, since you are having difficulty in comparatively minor operations in getting pledges of enough money of your own, for instance, I wonder where these new sums might come from.
Mr. HOFFMAN: Before I attempt to answer that question, I wonder if Mr. Owen would not like to comment on the activities of the ACC.

Mr. OWEN: Addressing myself to the previous question, what I would like to say is that I am in charge of a United Nations programme which already involves nine international organizations and we have very close liaison with two more. We found that we already have a technique of inter-agency co-operation which, after the usual difficulty of beginning that kind of operation, is proving itself to be very successful. I believe that we shall not be able to make the best of this Development Decade unless we make full use of this machinery of joint action between different international organizations. But I think we have the machinery and we can make it work even more effectively in the future.

Mr. HOFFMAN: In answering the next question, I think that we begin to get the financial problem in focus if we separate the financial needs between pre-investment needs and investment. Now there are no figures on which everyone agrees, because you have to first define what you mean by development aid, and in some cases it is broadly defined and in other cases it is narrowly defined. Narrowly defined, I think about $6 billion of aid will probably flow from the advanced countries to the less developed countries during the year of 1962. Again, giving not statistics but a guess, my guess is that about $600 million of that is in the pre-investment field -- pre-investment defined as covering investigations, the establishment of applied research laboratories, so that native materials can be processed and made commercial, assistance in the establishment of institutes of training and in some cases, in the broader educational field, secondary school-teacher institutes.

Defined that way, as I say, I think that the total amount will be in the neighbourhood of $600 million. The importance of this distinction between the two is that, if the work in the pre-investment field is expanded sufficiently and rapidly, then you have laid the basis for the sound investment of the billions. In other words, it is investment of millions for pre-investment that lays the sound basis for the billions that are necessary in the way of actual capital investment in these countries.

(more)
You ask about the chances? I would say that there has been a good, not satisfactory, but a good increase in the amounts available to the United Nations. If you go back to 1958, you will find that for pre-investment work, for the United Nations itself and the specialized agencies, it would probably have been in the neighbourhood of $50 million. This includes, speaking of the specialized agencies, that part of their funds devoted to pre-investment work. By 1960 there was quite a jump. I think it will be nearly $150 million for this year. This includes the money flowing directly to the United Nations and that flowing through the specialized agencies. You might say that an increase from $50 million to $150 million for four years is not satisfactory progress — but it is progress. What we do need, and need very much and must have for next year if we are to meet our responsibilities, is $150 million, which the General Assembly of course has already proposed as a target for the Technical Assistance Board and for the Special Fund.

**QUESTION:** Mr. Hoffman, I want to ask you, with regard to certain assumption about the world economy and the world situation that necessarily had to be made in this vast visualization of the Decade, about three matters. First, was there an assumption that the Common Market might or might not, as it develops in the next ten years, be a disruptive element, or certainly some element of change, that may slow down this thing? Secondly, how much of the assumption depends on savings from disarmament, which are mentioned on several occasions in the report? Thirdly, how much of an assumption is based around the fact that the economies of the big Powers are going to continue to be as strong as they have been, because obviously two events in the last two weeks, one in Moscow and one in Washington, show that these two mighty economies have their strains and stresses and their vulnerability.

**Mr. Hoffman:** That is quite a series of questions. As to the first question, will the Common Market disrupt any programmes, my answer is an emphatic no. In other words what is most necessary in the world today is a very substantially increased and perhaps better distributed production. It seems to me that the goal we all must seek, talking about what all countries must seek, is a

(more)
rapidly expanding world economy, because we have a rapidly expanding population. I believe that the Common Market is going to result in substantially increased production in Europe; it already has. I would say, therefore, that any movement that tends to increase production, and at the same time has in it elements that make for better distribution of that production, is a plus and not a minus.

The second question is on the relationship of disarmament to economic development. Of course, I think we all should be distressed that we have a world in which $120 billion is going to be spent for armaments and for defense programs by all the countries, and as against that we are talking about $6 billion as the total for actual development in 1962. The relationship, I am sure, would not look good to a man from Mars. But nevertheless, I think that associating the two is a mistake. One of the very best ways to cut down on the armaments expenditure, in my opinion, is to proceed with development. So that I think the emphasis ought to be on getting the development under way as rapidly as possible, in the hope that that will be a contributing factor to cutting down on these enormous expenditures for armament. And I think it will.

Now as to the third question about the big Powers, the stock market and other things, I really can not give an adequate answer to that. I would say that as far as the United States is concerned, if you get your eyes off Wall Street and on retail sales, you will find that business is good in America. We have this disturbance in the stock market. I do not pretend to be an expert in this field, but I think the conditions of this country, while we have some serious problems, are basically sound. I am not at all, as of the moment at least, concerned about the capacity of the United States, the Soviet Union and all other 104 nations which contribute their appropriate share to what really is a relatively inexpensive job, and that is this job of speeding the development of the less developed countries.

**QUESTION:** In the report of the Secretary-General, he has pointed out that the doubling of the national income in the developing countries might be possible in about thirty years provided the population growth is kept at the present rate. However, in the set of proposals for action there is no proposal at all as to how to tackle the population question. Does not this indicate a certain assumption that the population problem will take care of itself?
Mr. HOFFMAN: Not necessarily. I am not passing a tough question over to Mr. de Seynes, but, after all, the Population Branch does operate under his direction, and I think that he would be a more appropriate person to answer the question -- although I am perfectly willing to answer it.

Mr. de SEYHES: I think the position of the United Nations vis-à-vis the very difficult problem which has been raised is quite well known. We are studying the population process, we are studying the relationship of population growth to various economic factors and to the over-all economic situation. We are doing this in a certain global way at Headquarters, and we are also doing it regionally so as to place our services at the disposal of those countries which are interested in certain particular aspects of that problem. We have already established centres in Santiago, for Latin America, and in Bombay, for Asia, and those centres are working and are continuing to work and to place their services at the disposal of those Governments which want them for any kind of study or any kind of advice. There is no indication that there will be any let-up in these activities in the course of the decade, and, as the request for them and the demand for them grows, we will see to it that they are intensified.

QUESTION: I note that you say that those Governments that want this assistance will get it. But is there no need to mobilize world opinion and world resources to tackle this problem? Or is it considered politically too hot an issue to handle?

Mr. de SEYHES: It is quite obvious that it is a hot issue, politically and otherwise: there is no question about that. This does not prevent the issue from being debated, and it is being debated. Very soon we are going to hold, in the region where this problem is perhaps the most acute -- in Asia and the Far East -- a population conference at which this issue will be fully debated on the basis of studies prepared by the Secretariat and by other bodies, and debated with the participation of all Governments of the region.

(more)
QUESTION: On that same topic, I wonder whether Mr. Hoffman or Mr. de Seynes could answer this hypothetical question: If you put through this programme as it is outlined in this book, and if you had population stability as opposed to this very, very extensive population growth, then, instead of 1 per cent or, say, instead of 2 per cent a year -- or is it 2 per cent over the period? -- what would the increase in per capita income be? In other words, you give a figure of a 2 per cent increase in per capita income under this plan. If population remained stable, what would this plan produce in increased per capita income?

Mr. HOFFMAN: Mr. de Seynes may want to give a different answer. I think that the assumption in this programme is that the rate of population growth will remain relatively stable --

SAME QUESTIONER: Not on this figure. I believe this is the one that takes account of population growth. I therefore wondered what the per capita increase would be if you had stable population.

Mr. HOFFMAN: Do you mean if there were no increase in population whatever?

SAME QUESTIONER: Relative stability -- along European lines, say.

Mr. HOFFMAN: I might just say that one reason I am a little embarrassed about answering all the questions of this nature is that I have seven children. Mr. de Seynes has none. In other words, I have been part of the explosion. However, I think I understand the question now. As nearly as one can arrive at it, the population growth during the fifties was a little over 2 per cent. It might increase slightly -- not decrease -- in the sixties, as I understand it. That is our assumption. And I think it should be said at once that the growth is not due to a great increase in the birth rate; it is due to a reduction in the death-rate. This is a fact that ought to be taken into account.

(more)
QUESTION: The Soviet Union's attitude toward the programme, as indicated in this report, is that the purpose should be the liquidation of the economic and social consequences of colonialism and the influence of foreign capitalistic monopolies. How are you going to have a co-operative programme and a common effort if there is such a wide divergence as to the purpose of the programme?

Mr. HOFFMAN: I will answer that question in an oblique way and, if anyone wants to answer it more directly, he is entitled to do so; I will leave it to Mr. Owen and Mr. de Seynes.

I do not believe that ideology has any place in this matter of economic development. I think this is an area in which everyone should work together because every country, no matter what its ideology, has so much to gain from a rapidly expanding world economy that this is an area in which there should be co-operation and not competition. That is a somewhat oblique answer to your question, but it is the answer that I think I would like to give. As I say, Mr. Owen or Mr. de Seynes may want to answer it more directly.

Mr. de SEYNES: I might just say this:

We are perfectly aware of the fact that this decade is a period which is affected greatly by the process of decolonization. I think we have long recognized the importance of this problem and its economic aspects -- the problems of transition from one system to another. Two years ago, in fact, we did get a special appropriation from the General Assembly to deal precisely with the problem of the newly independent countries, to deal with those problems which arise out of the transition between the colonial system and the independent system. It is quite obvious, then, that our whole effort is going to take place within this context of decolonization.

Mr. HOFFMAN: Mr. Owen may want to add something to that.

(more)
Mr. OWEN: I have nothing to add except possibly to say that when you have a big scheme like this — a big concept like "a decade of development" -- all countries are going to approach it from their own ideological position, and their approach is bound to be affected by their political attitudes. But it has been discovered in United Nations work that, if one is patient and careful enough, there is sufficient concrete substance in everybody's position and that you can get most countries to put something useful into a scheme of this kind.

QUESTION: I should like to ask a question on this political aspect, and then another to follow it.

Much action on the political side is essential to the success of the Decade, which was itself a political creation by a political instrumentality, the General Assembly. Why is there not in this formula that you have a section devoted to specific political proposals on a national, regional and a United Nations level, especially in the field of world trade and especially for the breakdown of discrimination in trade, along the lines that were voiced in a resolution that I think was proposed by Brazil and supported by Mexico, and later supported by the Holy See, I think, and the USSR very vigorously. That is my first question.

My other question is devoted to the scope of this, and I would like to direct this question to Mr. Tavares de Sa if he is willing to answer it. What precisely is the extent of the mobilization of responsibility, money and personnel, right here in the United Nations and in the regional commissions, devoted to making this huge and significant project a success? The reason I ask Mr. Tavares de Sa for the answer is that we have all read with great interest about this new information unit on the economic side. This would be a lovely place to inaugurate it -- with this information.

Mr. HOFFMAN: I think perhaps the first question should be answered by Mr. de Seynes -- that is, the question about the importance of world trade, which is generally recognized and about which a good deal is going on.

(more)
Mr. de SEYNES: I am not sure that I quite see the distinction which the questioner establishes between politics and economics in this matter. It is obvious that international trade is an economic matter. It is also quite obvious that decisions made in respect of international trade are made by politicians and are, in this respect, political. So I think that perhaps the distinction is not so important. There seems to be the implication in the question that we have evaded the issue of international trade in our document on the Decade and in our proposals therefor. I think we have very emphatically stressed the importance of international trade in terms of the export revenues, the export resources, accruing to the underdeveloped countries as the most important element in the pattern of their development, and from that, of course, it very naturally follows that the organization of world trade in the future is of great importance to the success of the Development Decade.

As far as international trade is concerned, there is a very important and very large debate and a very intense series of negotiations going on on this question. Just as the previous decade will probably be remembered as the period during which international aid in the form of capital transfers came to be accepted as a durable element of the world economy, so in the same way, I think, the next decade -- the present decade -- will be remembered for very important changes in the field of international trade.

On the one hand, the implementation of the Rome Treaty and, on the other hand, the emergence of the underdeveloped countries at what one might call the bargaining table with growing strength and power have set in motion this important debate, and that new policies are going to result from what is going on right now.

I think it would have been somewhat foolhardy on our part to try to forecast what these new policies would be -- what the new international system of exchange and payments would be. What I can say, and what is, I think, said in the document, is that the matter of international trade has come to be one of the most important items on the agenda of most economic bodies of the United Nations. I could refer you in this respect to the recent debate on the Commodity Trade Commission in Rome and, also, to the important debate which took place at the last session of the Economic and Social Council on the question of a declaration of principles of international co-operation, where the matter of trade was obviously the most prominent in the debate and in the discussions which took place. I am quite confident that this trend will assert itself in the years to come in the United Nations. (more)
SAME QUESTIONER: How about the World Trade Conference?

Mr. de SEYNES: About the World Trade Conference I can give you a very bureaucratic answer if you want, inasmuch as we have sent a questionnaire to the Governments -- in response to a General Assembly resolution -- asking whether they favour or do not favour a World Trade Conference. I think that the document where the answers are recorded is something like E/3161. As I said, I think the debate on world trade matters will take place at many levels, in many places, and in many contexts. Whether there will be a World Trade Conference or not I just cannot tell you.

Mr. HOFFMAN: Perhaps Mr. Tavares de Sa would answer the other question.

Mr. TAVARES de SA: We are setting up in OPI a new service, the Economic and Social Information Unit. I shall not go into the details of the structure because I believe that they are available, at least in their broad outlines, in what I said in Vienna some two months ago and then in an address I gave to the University of London on 15 May. But what I should like to take this occasion to say is this. First, the motivations for the creation of this new service are, it seems to me, very clear, and I am sure that before a group of professionals and colleagues I do not have to stress the fact that economic and social information in the United Nations has always laboured under a handicap of being associated closely with political information, and thus being almost inevitably smothered under the impact of political news. It has always been very difficult to interest editors in our efforts in the economic and social field, however important, however worthy, when we are competing with important political decisions and activities. I used to be an editor myself, so I can see very clearly why I always get the cold shoulder when I try to interest a newspaper or a periodical, or for that matter a radio or television network. It is not easy to do it.
(Mr. Tavares de Sa)

On the other hand -- again from a purely professional point of view, of course -- you are all aware that in general terms economic and social news is of a feature nature whereas political news is spot news, so that it deserves, and would benefit we believe, from a different treatment. It should be treated mainly as feature news and thus be given a special treatment, not only in the periodicals, the magazines and the daily press, but also and very much so in terms of the visual media, television and cinema, and radio.

Based on this premise, and on the fact that the Development Decade is now in its decisive initial stage and, obviously, the Decade cannot become a success unless the support of the governments, the Member States, is bolstered by an active interest and support from public opinion -- and that support of public opinion, of course, depends to a large measure on the interest, the sympathy and the understanding which the Press, the radio and the television in each one of these countries will put into the Decade -- we are setting up within OPI this special service whose primary purpose will be to service the economic organs of the United Nations.

We shall do our best to see that everything that is done by the economic organs is properly presented to the news media. We are taking very much into account also what is done by the Economic Commissions in the field -- at Bangkok, Santiago, Addis Ababa and Geneva. We are also in very close contact with the specialized agencies, and we are looking forward to establishing a very practical, we believe, and productive scheme of co-operation with the specialized agencies which have, each and every one of them, such an important stake in economic and social activities in one field or another -- all of them, of course, are vitally interested in the Development Decade -- so that a joint effort of co-ordination will be possible.

(more)
Getting down to the mechanics, the mechanics will develop as it goes along, and we are, of course, starting on a modest basis. We are, however, creating within the unit a planning and co-ordination body which we are calling the Editorial Board, and on which we are looking forward very much to participation by the specialized agencies. We have a sort of day-to-day housekeeping group, which we are calling the Research and Liaison Section, and we are staffing it with professionals who are, we think, very, very well qualified in the field -- which is not easy because, as you know, we are stretched very thin. Between the two -- between the group at the top, which will plan the approach to information in the economic and social field, and this group of professionals which will open new channels of communication, which will keep them open, and which will keep the raw material flowing, so to speak -- we are looking forward to having production service in which we are having a new formula. It is not altogether new. There is nothing new, really, as you know, in news gathering or news dissemination, but we are looking forward at least, within this unit, to the establishing of what we call writer-technician terms by means of which we shall go outside OPI, outside the United Nations, and contract the services of highly qualified creative writers, be they in the journalistic, the radio and television or the cinema field, and associate them for a limited period during which we shall ask them to produce a specific assignment -- over six weeks or two months or three months -- of so many articles or so many radio and television scripts, let us say. During that period they will be working in close association with an expert, a technician, a specialist or a scientist from one of our economic organs or specialized agencies.

(more)
In this sense we hope, on the one hand, to draw on the creative talents of the highest order outside, anywhere in the world, for that matter, in accordance with the specific requirements of the information projects which we are required to present, and, on the other hand, to have this bolstered by the competence, detailed knowledge and experience of a man in the field who has actually been living with these problems but who, as a technician, is not expected to be able to write a radio script or a feature article.

We are also looking forward very much through the unit to establishing a special kind of co-operation with any news media, anywhere in the world. In each case in which they are interested in producing some material -- a series of articles or a script -- on any phase of economic and social work that takes place in this house or out in the field, we shall be willing to provide not only for the assistance we can through channelling to them all the data and information material but also to furnish one-half of this writer-technician team in case the radio or television network wants to handle the creative side on its own. In other words, it would be a joint effort in which the information service of the United Nations would work in direct co-operation with outside news media.

I repeat that there is nothing terribly new about all this. The only thing new is that, we hope, we are doing this on a concentrated and thought-out basis. We are devoting a great deal of time, energy and effort to it. We are trying to use highly qualified people. We propose to make a very sustained effort. We consider ourselves as a service at the service of the Development Decade and the substantive departments that are carrying it forward. The blueprint might look very pretty, but I am always suspicious of blueprints when they begin to look too pretty. It is time now to start work on it. We are starting this month on a very modest basis. We are not only open to suggestions and constructive criticisms, but we shall be very grateful for them.

Mr. HUSS: On behalf of the United Nations correspondents, I thank you.

The press conference ended at 11/25 a.m.
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The report which is being made public today entitled "The United Nations Development Decade -- Proposals for Action"* deals with a subject of such extraordinary importance that I felt it desirable to meet and discuss it with you at a press conference wholly devoted to it.

Last December, you will recall, the General Assembly adopted unanimously a resolution designating the current decade as the United Nations Decade of Development. The text of that resolution appears as Annex I to this report. In it, the Assembly requested the Secretary-General to develop proposals which would give more concrete shape to this historic concept.

This report, which has been prepared in response to that request, I hope to present myself to the Economic and Social Council at its session in Geneva next month. It will doubtless be the subject of further action by ECOSOC and by Member States this year. It will also come before the General Assembly at its seventeenth session in September. At each of these stages, I hope the Development Decade will take on new clarity and new momentum.

I know you are all well aware of what the United Nations family has been doing in the field of economic development and technical assistance for more than ten years. And I imagine you are also familiar with the efforts of the various bilateral aid programs, large and small, during the same period. Much good work has been done by all these programs, which do great credit to the generosity of the nations whose contributions have made them possible: but they have all suffered from the same basic limitation. They have had to respond to a need which is so staggering in its dimensions that they have not been able to deal effectively with more than a few segments of it. Now, for the first time, it has been decided to make a concerted

* The report appears in Doc.E/3613
attack on the age-old problems of poverty, ignorance and disease, using every resource which is available to us, whether it be national or international in character. Moreover, it has been decided that this concerted attack should be made under the banner of the United Nations itself.

The fundamental facts which underlie the development decade are not new to you who are present today. Some of you know them by hard experience. Others have learned them with us here and have reported them in your articles and broadcasts on the basis of the great volume of research and statistical analysis which the various organs of the United Nations have produced in recent years. You will however forgive me if I remind you of some of the factors which have moved governments to embark on this new initiative and to pledge their full cooperation.

First come certain facts about the world economic situation. In the decade of the 1950's the rate of economic progress of at least one-third of the human race -- the poorest third who are intent on conquering their own poverty -- was dangerously slow. Despite increasing economic development efforts in that decade, their average rise in income per person, when account is taken of their rapidly growing populations, has been less than 1 per cent per year. That means less than one dollar a year of improvement per person, which in human terms is an imperceptible advance. But in the same period the economies of the highly developed countries, starting from a very much higher base, have been growing faster. And thus the already huge gap between their living standards and those of the less developed nations has widened still further.

These material facts are dangerously in conflict with a psychological or spiritual fact: namely, that the peoples themselves who are victims of this situation, and still more their leaders, nowadays look upon the perpetuation of poverty in a world of plenty as morally wrong and politically intolerable. Most of them have only recently achieved sovereign independence, and they are determined to use their new political liberty to escape also from the bondage of want. From this state of affairs arise pressures for change which may build up to dangerous and explosive levels unless they can find a constructive outlet.

Another element in the picture is our knowledge that this situation is no longer unavoidable. It is now within the power of modern man to control and improve it. The investment capital exists, and wisely directed it will multiply itself. The scientific and technical capacities exist, waiting only to be redirected towards new goals and toward the solution of neglected problems. The natural resources and the human potential exist, waiting only to be discovered and put to work.

(more)
The ultimate goal of the development decade, as suggested by the General Assembly, is an annual five per cent of growth in the national incomes of the developing countries. Given the expected increase in population over the decade, it would represent a two per cent increase each year in personal income. Perhaps two per cent does not seem very great in itself. It is, however, twice the present estimated growth rate, and it can mean the difference between an economy which is going forward, and one which is standing still. Further, it can mean the difference between order and chaos, and between hope and despair for the millions of people whose earnings, for the most part, fall short of One Hundred Dollars per year.

The document which has been released today contains a series of concrete proposals as to how this goal may be achieved. The methods proposed do not represent any great innovation. They are essentially those which have proved most successful in the past. The proposals call, however, for a steady expansion of existing activities within the context of a better knowledge of what each country requires and what it can realistically achieve. The United Nations will assume an even larger responsibility than heretofore for helping governments to ensure that their national plans -- the core of the program -- are sound. I hope that the United Nations family will also be able to expand and develop its own assistance programs. It is up to the Member States to say how great and how rapid that expansion should be. But the United Nations family -- including the Expanded Technical Assistance Program and the Special Fund on a world-wide basis, the regional economic commissions at the grass-roots level, and the specialized agencies in their respective fields of competence -- has the merit of impartiality and an unrivaled range of technical skills on which it can draw from nations all over the world.

These United Nations assets have already proved themselves in action. They are not in any sense in competition with bilateral national aid, or with established trade patterns, or with private investment; on the contrary, the key activities of the United Nations should be a stimulus to greater and more fruitful efforts in every field which is vital to the total effort.

Perhaps, above all, the United Nations can be a center of coordination, of inspiration and confidence for the enormous complex of efforts on which the Development Decade will depend.

We are barely over the threshold of this adventure of development. We are only beginning to gather speed. It is tremendously important, in the months and years ahead, as the Development Decade takes concrete shape and substance, that the
public be aware of its broad implications. In this regard, we shall rely, as always, on the ability of the communications media to distill what is human and fundamental from the complex technicalities and statistical analyses on which the policies and programs of the Development Decade must inevitably be based. We on our side are planning to do what we can to help you by the preparation of suitable materials for wider dissemination.

I know that I can count on the cooperation of you all in this truly great enterprise which, second only to the safeguarding of peace itself, is the most important task of the United Nations today.

* *** *

* *** *
I am most grateful to Williams College for honoring me with the degree of Doctor of Laws honoris causa and also for giving me this opportunity to say a few words at the end of the commencement exercise.

Only three days ago the General Assembly of the United Nations resumed its Sixteenth Session in order to deal with the question of Ruanda-Urundi and I feel that it might be appropriate for me to say a few words on this occasion on the role of this world organization in bringing new nations into being.

The principle of equal rights and self-determination of peoples is one of the basic principles and purposes of the Charter. The Charter contemplates that non-self-governing territories may gradually emerge as full members of the international community, and has emphasized that those administrations in charge of non-self-governing territories should "recognize the principle that the interests of the inhabitants of these territories are paramount, and accept as a sacred trust the obligation to promote to the utmost ... the well-being of the inhabitants of these territories and to this end ... to develop self-government ... and to assist them in the progressive development of their free political institutions...."

In addition, as you are no doubt aware, the United Nations established, under its own authority, an international trusteeship system with the basic objective of promoting "the political, economic, social, and educational advancement of the inhabitants of the trust territories and their progressive development toward self-government or independence as may be appropriate...."

As a result of this preoccupation by the United Nations with the attainment of self-government by non-self-governing and trust territories, we have seen a remarkable expansion of the membership of the United Nations during its history of 16 years.
Thus, the membership of the United Nations, which was 55 in 1946, stands today at the figure of 104, with the prospect of at least five or six new members joining us before the end of the year.

In this connection I would like to recall that my own country, Burma, emerged as an independent and sovereign state only in January 1948 and became a member of the United Nations in the same year. The 1950's may well be called the decade of Asia because the number of Asian countries who were members of the United Nations at the beginning of the decade was 9 and the number at the end of the decade was 15. Similarly the 1960's will surely go down in history as the decade of Africa, because, of the 22 new members who have joined the United Nations since 1 January 1960, 19 are from the African continent and it also seems fairly clear that in the future the majority of our new members will be African states.

I could, of course, be more specific and describe in detail the role of the United Nations in the birth of new nations, but the facts are too well known to need repetition. It is mainly in the field of trusteeship that the United Nations has direct responsibility, and a number of trust territories which were former mandates of the League of Nations have been guided toward independence under the watchful eyes of the Trusteeship Council and the General Assembly.

Ruanda-Urundi is the latest instance of a trust territory gradually emerging toward independence and before long we will probably have two new independent nations born out of this trust territory.

In addition to such direct assistance, the debates in the General Assembly and in the Trusteeship Council have generally created a climate which is favorable to the emergence of independent nations, after long periods of colonial rule. I am almost certain that, without the pressure of international public opinion which was thus created and developed, many of these newly independent countries might still be only on the road to self-government and would not have arrived at nationhood so quickly. This process, will, I am sure, continue.

While on this subject I would like to refer very briefly to certain aspects of colonialism. A great debate has been going on for decades as to whether the imperialist method has morally justified itself: whether the impact of Western civilization has brought more blessings than disadvantages to the subject peoples. The colonial record can claim, with some justification, to have controlled or eliminated some of the worst aspects of primitive life in certain parts of the world. It has introduced hospitals and better sanitation. It has attempted to combat ignorance as well as disease. It has brought improved methods of transport and communication. Many other material accomplishments can be enumerated.

(more)
Nevertheless, against these substantial benefits must be reckoned many features and tendencies which have counteracted these progressive influences. Chief among them is the fact that, in the past at any rate, the primary motive of the colonial power in developing the natural resources of a colony was its own commercial profit. Consequently, the greater part of the wealth obtained from the colony went into the pockets of the colonial investors. Further, the colonies remained essentially as primary producers, with little industrial development.

There is still another disturbing feature of colonialism. Whatever advantages may have been gained by native societies consequent on the impact of a new civilization, they were offset by the fact that the colonizers often kept themselves aloof from native society. Very few of them bothered to learn the language of the people, or made a real effort to understand the indigenous culture. Wherever it existed, this aloofness and cultural exclusiveness created resentment, particularly in the minds of the educated subject peoples.

One very significant feature of independence movements is that, when independence is too long delayed, a mood of frustration and desperation sets in, and then some extreme forces come to the surface and gain the upper hand. This certainly does not help the cause of healing old wounds, or bridging the gulf between the past and the future. The role of the United Nations therefore should be not only to help expedite the emergence of new nations, but also to create conditions which will help establish friendly relations between the new nations and their former masters as also with other fellow members of the world organization.

While the United Nations can look back with satisfaction on the important role it has played in bringing these new nations into being, this historic process has had important effects on the structure and functions of the world organization. In the first place the emergence of these new countries has placed an additional responsibility on the United Nations in regard to their economic development. These countries, having become masters in their own house, have had to face serious economic problems and have turned for assistance to the United Nations and the international community. It is a heartening feature that in the last decade there has been a greatly increased sense of responsibility on the part of the international community and, specially the economically advanced countries. During this decade we have witnessed a tremendous increase in the volume of international aid, some of it channeled through multilateral institutions such as the United Nations and its family of specialized agencies including the International Bank, but most of it has been bilateral. Recently the General Assembly adopted resolutions calling upon the

(more)
advanced countries to set aside 1 per cent of their national income for the economic advancement of the less developed countries. The Sixteenth Session of the General Assembly also decided to designate the next 10 years as the United Nations Development Decade and you will hear a great deal more about what we plan to do to assist the less developed countries in stepping up their economic development at the summer session of the Economic and Social Council.

Apart from the increase of such constructive activity, especially in the economic and social field, the United Nations has been called upon to assume tremendous political responsibilities as a result of the birth of some of these new nations. I have in mind particularly the Congo, which has become one of our most important operations during the last two years. The responsibilities entrusted to the United Nations in regard to the Congo, beginning with the Security Council resolutions in July 1960, were completely novel besides being extremely onerous.

While this is not the occasion for me to deal at any length with the Congo problem, I think it will be generally conceded that the United Nations has played a significant part in preserving the sovereignty, independence, unity and territorial integrity of this new republic located in the very heart of Africa. The Congo is one of the hotly debated issues both within and outside the United Nations and it occupies a great deal of my time and energies, as also that of my colleagues. To those who are dissatisfied with the slow pace of progress in the Congo I would like to say only this: let us just look at the Congo picture today, with the possibility of the peaceful integration of the last of the secessionist provinces, and compare it with the situation this time last year, when practically two-thirds of the country was outside the control of the Central Government and in fact we had no legitimate Central Government to deal with. Today we have a legally constituted Central Government under the able leadership of Prime Minister Adoula, and we have only one province out of six still striving to maintain some form of separate identity. But it is a matter for congratulation that, during the last 22 months, not one member government of the United Nations has recognized this secessionist state, and there are now good prospects that this secession will be ended by peaceful negotiation between the Provincial President and the Prime Minister.

One consequence, of course, of the emergence of these new countries, especially from Africa and Asia, has been that the United Nations has made greater progress toward universality during the last decade than would have been considered possible
10 years ago. This, I am sure you will agree, is a good development. At the same time it has led to all kinds of complaints that the Afro-Asians are now running the United Nations, in fact, running away with it; and there are certain proposals for weighted voting. It seems strange to me that some of these suggestions about weighted voting come from countries which in their own domestic politics attach the greatest importance to democratic principles including the principle of one vote per adult human being, be he rich or poor; strong or weak, learned or ignorant.

It also seems strange that these critics of the United Nations should ignore one of the fundamental principles of the Charter, which states that "the Organization is based on the principle of the sovereign equality of all its Members" as also the principle of "equal rights of nations, large and small." I hope that this criticism of the United Nations is only a passing phase and before long even the critics will realize that the interests of humanity are best served by a universal organization practicing the true principles of democracy on the international plane.

* *** *

*"
NOTE TO CORRESPONDENTS

PRESS CONFERENCE BY THE ACTING SECRETARY-GENERAL AT UN HEADQUARTERS

ON TUESDAY, 5 JUNE 1962
The Acting SECRETARY-GENERAL: It is some six weeks since we last met. Many things have happened in the interval. The General Assembly is due to resume its sixteenth session on Thursday. I thought, therefore, we should get together once again at the present time.

Before throwing open the floor for questions, I would like to refer to one or two major issues. The first is the Congo, where the talks between Prime Minister Adoula and Mr. Tshombe, which had been interrupted in April under somewhat dramatic circumstances, were resumed in Leopoldville on 22 May.

ONUC officials deliberately avoided any role in the talks during their first stages, but now, at the request of the parties themselves, Mr. Gardiner and Mr. Rolz-Bennett are sitting in at each of the sessions in order to be available for any assistance that may be requested. Before the resumption of the second round of talks, Mr. Gardiner held exploratory discussions, first with Prime Minister Adoula in Leopoldville and then with Mr. Tshombe in Elisabethville. Having thus ascertained the positions of the two leaders, Mr. Gardiner formulated a number of informal suggestions with a view to facilitating and expediting the reconciliation of their differences.

The two leaders and their aides have been meeting regularly, usually, in fact, twice daily, morning and afternoon, their discussions centering on working papers prepared by ONUC in consultation with the parties. There is no need to talk about the progress made to date, as this is already known to you through the short joint communiques which, in accordance with an agreed procedure, are issued at the end of each meeting. It is noteworthy that the two parties have already agreed on integrating the Katangese Gendarmerie with the Congolese National Army, with United Nations assistance.

It is still too early, of course, to assess the ultimate results to be expected from the Leo talks, but the earnest manner in which the meetings are being held, the improved atmosphere, and the degree of accord already registered are at least encouraging signs.

(more)

* Robert K.A. Gardiner, Officer-in-Charge of the UN Operation in the Congo, and Jose Rolz-Bennett, Chief UN Civilian Officer at Elisabethville.
One more word, on a different subject, before inviting your questions. I hope to meet with you again -- at 11 a.m. on Thursday, 14 June -- in a press conference on a matter very close to my heart and one of great import to all the peoples of the world. The subject is the United Nations Development Decade. Copies of my Proposals for Action are available to you in Document E/3613. This, together with a press summary which will shortly be available to you, is to be released at noon, Eastern Daylight Time, on the 14th. In view of this, and the fact that the press conference next week will be devoted exclusively to the United Nations Development Decade, I suggest that we do not go into that important subject at this time.
QUESTION: Mr. Secretary, would you bring us up to date, perhaps, on the situation of the $200 million bond issue, including possibly a prediction of the final outcome in relation to the United States and the other United Nations Member-purchasers?

The Acting SECRETARY-GENERAL: Yes. The latest document the United Nations released on this subject is Press Release no. SG/1208, released on 29 May.* According to that press release, thirty-five countries have purchased or announced their intention to purchase United Nations bonds totalling $65,464,175. Of course, the document gives the breakdown of the various countries which have pledged to buy the bonds; and, of course, I was given to understand that the Congress in Washington will come to a decision perhaps at the end of June.

QUESTION: May I ask two questions: First, there has been some confusion as to whether you recognize East Germany. Would you be good enough to clarify your position on East Germany; and, second, how do you feel about the American high-altitude nuclear testing in the Pacific?

(more)

*On 31 May the total became 36 countries, with pledges or purchases amounting to $65,464,175.
The Acting Secretary-General: There has been a lot of misunderstanding of my action regarding the transmission of a communication -- an unsolicited communication -- from a country on the subject of "the conditions under which countries not possessing nuclear weapons might be willing to enter into specific undertakings to refrain from manufacturing or otherwise acquiring such weapons and to refuse to receive in the future nuclear weapons in their territories on behalf of any other country".

It is, I think, worth recalling that, since the inception of the United Nations, more than 1,665 resolutions have been adopted. In none of these resolutions -- I repeat: in none of these resolutions -- was the word "country" ever used. The word used was "State" or "Member State". Only in this particular resolution, resolution 1664, for the first time in the history of the United Nations was the word "country" used. Therefore, if you know a little of the background of the presentation of this particular resolution, you will have some food for thought.

I therefore felt, and I still feel, that because of the importance of the subject matter and because of the wording used in this particular resolution, I should transmit all communications on this subject from any quarter, irrespective of the fact that these communications came from Member States and from non-member States.

Then, of course, the controversy centred around the definition of the term "country". It would be fruitless to go into a juridical and legalistic discussion of the concepts "country" and "State". But my interpretation of the term "country", as distinct from "State", is that a State is a territory politically organized and a country is a territory not necessarily organized politically.

Therefore, when I received a communication on this subject from the Democratic Republic of Germany, or East Germany, or the Soviet-occupied zone of Germany -- or whatever name you may give that particular territory -- I felt that it was a subject which was so important that the Disarmament Commission might find it useful to study this particular document. I sought the views of my legal counsel, who agreed with me that this particular document should be forwarded to the Disarmament Commission.

(more)
Of course, in the subsequent exchange of letters between me and the Permanent Observer of the Federal Republic of Germany, I clarified my position. This transmission of a communication from that particular area does not in any way imply recognition, does not in any way imply any attitude on my part toward that particular territory. I acted as I did because of the importance of the subject matter and because of the wording used in this particular resolution. The exchange of letters to which I have just referred was simply meant as a clarification of my position. I made this clear in my reply to the Permanent Observer of the Federal Republic of Germany.

While on this subject, I wish to say that, if I had received a communication from Peking in time on this subject, I would have acted in the same manner in which I did act.

Regarding the second question, relating to the projected high-altitude tests: On a previous occasion, I made known my position on the general subject of nuclear tests. On that occasion, I made it clear that I was in complete agreement with the General Assembly resolutions of the sixteenth session on the banning of nuclear tests. The projected nuclear and thermonuclear tests at high altitudes belong, of course, to a different category and, I feel, a more undesirable one. In the first place, these tests, when announced, were objected to very vigorously by many eminent scientists all over the world, and scientists with no axe to grind. Secondly, it is common knowledge that outer space is no country's territory. It is the common property of all countries. And I feel that these projected high-altitude tests are a manifestation of a very dangerous psychosis which is in evidence today.

QUESTION: Are you satisfied with the way things are shaping up with regard to the New Guinea conflict and the way the countries concerned are responding to your continuous appeals?
The Acting SECRETARY-GENERAL: It is common knowledge that Mr. Ellsworth Bunker had been conducting private and informal discussions with the two parties concerned since the third week of March and when these discussions were suspended Mr. Bunker came to New York and discussed with me a formula which he proposed to present to the two Governments as a basis for further discussions. I was in complete agreement with the formula proposed by Mr. Bunker and I encouraged him to go ahead with his plans. Thus the Bunker proposals were presented to the two Governments in April.

The Government of Indonesia promptly announced that it was ready to resume negotiations on the basis of the Bunker proposals. The Government of the Netherlands suggested a few modifications. Among these suggested modifications is the one pertaining to paragraph 4 of the Bunker proposals.

These suggestions of the Netherlands Government were transmitted to the Indonesian Government by Mr. Bunker and the Indonesian Government again agreed to resume negotiations on these revised proposals. While Mr. Bunker was awaiting a definitive reply from the Netherlands, we had news of hostilities in West New Guinea. At that time, of course, it will be remembered, I appealed to both Governments to resume negotiations on the basis of the Bunker proposals, and then the Netherlands Government agreed to resume negotiations on these proposals.

That is the position. There was some misunderstanding regarding my non-compliance with the request of the Netherlands Government to send observers to the area. It will be recalled that the Government of the Netherlands made similar requests to my predecessor, Mr. Dag Hammarskjold, on several occasions, and Mr. Dag Hammarskjold did not comply with these requests. I also did not comply with these requests because my paramount consideration at that time was, and at the present time is, to bring the two parties together at the conference table. If I had to decide to send observers to the area because of the changing situation and new developments, I could not send civilian observers. I would have to send military observers and I did not feel competent to send military observers to any area without the authorization of the Security Council.

(more)
Therefore, since my whole purpose was to bring the two parties together at a round-table conference in the presence of a third party and settle their differences peacefully, I had to reject the request of the Netherlands, as my predecessor had done on more than one occasion in the last one and a half years. Now I should think that the two parties would get together, in the presence of Mr. Bunker, to thrash out the formula in more detail. If this formula is acceptable to both, formal negotiations will take place, under my auspices and in my presence, in the United Nations. That is the arrangement.

QUESTION: I have two unrelated questions. The first question is the following: The coming session of the Assembly will certainly discuss matters which bring up the competence and the necessity for altering and improving the peacekeeping machinery of the United Nations. Do you have any thoughts or suggestions on what line such a discussion might take?

The second question has to do with the stock market fall in the United States and in other countries which may indeed -- and I am sorry to say this affect the Decade for Development and a lot of other things, and yet one of the subjects now being discussed is compensatory insurance for primary commodities, and the primary commodity market may suffer. Do you have any comments on that?

The Acting SECRETARY-GENERAL: On your first question, of course the resumed session will take up the question of Ruanda-Urundi, and perhaps the discussions might involve the future role of the United Nations regarding its peacekeeping operations. Of course the report of the Ruanda-Urundi Commission* is in your hands -- I believe it will be released tomorrow -- and it is for the General Assembly to decide. I have my own views on the subject and perhaps at the appropriate moment, if necessary, I shall have to intervene during the discussions in the General Assembly. But I do not think it will be proper on my part to make any public statement on this question now.

(more)

*Doc.A/5126, embargoed for 6 p.m. (EDT) Wednesday, 6 June.
Note No. 2603
5 June 1962
(The Acting Secretary-General)

Regarding the stock market fluctuations, I must confess that I am completely ignorant of the operations of the stock market on Wall Street, and of course if the question is raised at the projected Press conference on the 14th, I am sure my competent colleagues in the Secretariat will be able to present the views of the Secretariat vis-a-vis the proposed Development Parade.

QUESTION: Sir, I wondered if it were accidental that you mentioned, in discussing communications from East Germany, that if you had received a communication from Peking in time, you would have included it. Does this mean that you have received communications from Peking on this topic of atomic armaments since that time in some manner?

The Acting SECRETARY-GENERAL: No, I did not receive any communication from Peking.

QUESTION: In connexion with what you said about the Bunker proposals, I understand you said that Indonesia immediately accepted them as a basis for negotiation. In the Press section the language was "accepted in principle". Was there some difference between the language we had in the Press section and the language you had, or do you consider both statements synonymous?

The Acting SECRETARY-GENERAL: I do not see any difference between the two wordings: "The Indonesian Government agreed to resume negotiations on the basis of the Bunker proposals" or "The Indonesian Government agreed to the Bunker proposals in principle". I do not see the difference between the two formulations.

QUESTION: Mr. Secretary-General, in view of the current status of the United Nations resources, financial and otherwise, in the Congo and in other parts of the world, do you feel that the United Nations is in a position to take on new responsibilities in Africa and Asia that will require additional resources and money?

(more)
The Acting SECRETARY-GENERAL: This will depend primarily on the attitude of the Member States. When the matter comes up, of course it has to be taken up by the appropriate organs of the United Nations and I think it is up to the Member States to decide whether they are in a position to bear the financial burden of the present operations and the projected operations.

QUESTION: Sir, do you think that a condemnation from the Secretary-General, with regard to the OAS activities, to stop terrorism, would help the situation? As you know, the Asian-Africans have already made an appeal to the world -- which is not Asian-African -- to give their moral support against these activities. Since you yourself have taken a very active role as a delegate in the Algerian question, do you consider that you will be able to make a declaration on this problem?
The Acting SECRETARY-GENERAL: I do not see how a declaration, or a public declaration, by the Secretary-General on the OAS atrocities in Algeria would help, but, personally speaking, I cannot find words to describe the bestial, beastly and inhuman crimes committed by the OAS in Algeria. I only hope that those responsible for the meaningless killings will come to their senses in time.

QUESTION: Mr. Stevenson said the other day that the United States favoured you for re-election to the post of Secretary-General next fall. Could you tell us whether you are available for a five-year term as Secretary-General starting next April?

The Acting SECRETARY-GENERAL: So far I have not come to any decision regarding the possibility of offering myself as a candidate for election for a full term at the seventeenth session of the General Assembly, and while on this subject I want to make one thing clear. Whatever I have said or done has been said or done with a very clear conscience and without any thought of how one big Power or another might react. Let me repeat. Whatever I have said or done in my new position has been said or done with a very clear conscience in full accordance with the Charter provisions as I understand them. And, of course, personally speaking -- from the point of view of self-interest or personal comfort -- I would be happier to be out of the thirty-eighth floor.

QUESTION: First, may I ask you what is the number of mercenaries in the Congo? Second, may I draw your attention to paragraph 329 of the Ruanda-Urundi report? There is a mention there of the practical possibility of replacing the Belgians either through the United Nations or bilaterally. Is the replacement to which there is reference to be decided by the Secretary-General or the General Assembly or the Security Council, and what are the possibilities?
The Acting SECRETARY-GENERAL: Regarding your first question, we have been receiving reports that more mercenaries are coming into Katanga. Of course, it is difficult to substantiate these rumors, and we have no means of knowing the exact number of foreign mercenaries now in Katanga.

Regarding the second question, on Ruanda-Urundi, the report of the Commission will be officially made available to all delegations and the Press tomorrow, and, of course, it is for the General Assembly to decide on the future course of action on the basis of that recommendation. I do not think that the Security Council should be involved in this particular item.

QUESTION: With reference to the United Nations financing situation, and possibly with reference to your personal remark just a minute ago on your feelings with regard to the thirty-eighth floor, there has been a sharpening in international conflicts over the past few weeks. In Geneva there was a failure to come to agreement on banning war propaganda. In the Committee of Seventeen, at the end of its New York session, there were a few votes taken which went contrary, to, let us say, the spirit of moderation which had prevailed before. Do they herald an intensification of United Nations involvement in a situation like that and, if so, how do you feel about?

The Acting SECRETARY-GENERAL: I do not think it would be proper for me, in my position, to venture an assessment of the results of the Geneva discussions now going on. Of course, the failure of the adoption of a declaration on the banning of war propaganda is deplorable, but I still feel that there is a pretty good chance for this conference to achieve some substantial results in the field of the banning of nuclear tests. As you all know, on this particular question the views of the big Powers are pretty clear regarding inspection. My feeling is that if only technical and scientific discussions take place to consider whether national instruments are adequate to verify nuclear weapon tests or not, that could help the progress of the discussions. Of course, it is common knowledge that, apart from underground tests and high-altitude tests, all tests in the atmosphere can be verified by national instruments. This fact is not contested by anybody. So I think the next step should be discussions on the technical and scientific aspects of this problem.

(more)
QUESTION: You said that these high-altitude tests were a manifestation of a dangerous psychosis in evidence today. Could you explain that a little further?

The Acting SECRETARY-GENERAL: I hope my observations are pretty clear, and I do not think any clarification is necessary.

QUESTION: Do you think there will be a world trade conference this year?

The Acting SECRETARY-GENERAL: I am afraid I have no means of knowing whether there will be a trade conference this year or next year.

QUESTION: May I come back for a moment to New Guinea. You mentioned the question of paragraph 4 of the Bunker plan. What kind of guarantees could the United Nations give for an impartial plebiscite in New Guinea, and could it give such guarantees without a special mandate of the General Assembly?

The Acting SECRETARY-GENERAL: At this stage the United Nations is not involved yet. After the two parties come to an agreement on a formula, formal negotiations, as I indicated earlier, will take place in my presence at the United Nations, and when those formal negotiations are completed satisfactorily then I have to seek the decision of the General Assembly. Of course, I cannot implement any agreed formulation without the mandate of the General Assembly. I have a feeling that, if everything goes well, this item will be inscribed on the agenda of the seventeenth session, and the General Assembly should adopt a resolution to take note of these agreements and to give directives to the Secretary-General on how to implement these provisions.
QUESTION: Can you comment on the situation in Laos? I know that one of the ambassadors of the great Powers visited you recently, and when he came down after the conference with you, we asked him whether he had discussed the question of Laos, because it is persistently rumoured that this great Power might put the question of Laos before the United Nations. Was that broached to you by that Power or any other Member of the United Nations?

The Acting SECRETARY-GENERAL: My answer is no; and regarding the Laotian situation, there is already a machinery in existence for dealing with the situation. Not only is that machinery in existence: the machinery is in operation; and, of course, although the situation is far from satisfactory, there are some encouraging signs regarding the situation in Laos. Both President Kennedy and Premier Khrushchev agreed at the Vienna Summit Conference last year that Laos must be neutral. Of course, this position is in strict conformity with the Geneva Armistice Agreements of 1954. It will be recalled that the Geneva Agreements of 1954 stipulated the whole of Indo-China to be neutral. Of course, what was then called Indo-China is now called Laos, Cambodia, North Viet-Nam and South Viet-Nam. Only Cambodia is neutral, as the Geneva Agreements of 1954 intended the whole area to be.

Another encouraging sign today is that both the United States of America and the Soviet Union have agreed to seek a diplomatic, and not a military, solution of the Laotian problem; and both the United States of America and the Soviet Union agree that Prince Souvanna Phouma is the only man who can wield more or less effective control over the country of Laos. I think these are encouraging signs.

QUESTION: Could you comment on whether you are considering sending a special representative of the Secretary-General to Ruanda-Urundi, particularly in view of the apparent Belgian reluctance to make economic and technical assistance available unless their troops remain?

And I have one other non-related question: Could you comment generally on the issue of self-determination, as frequently mentioned in regard to West Irian? Is self-determination always justified, and what is the difference between self-determination and separatist movements?

(more)
The Acting SECRETARY-GENERAL: Regarding your first question, I am considering sending a special representative to Ruanda-Urundi, as I feel — and as the Chairman of the Commission feels — that the presence of the United Nations in these two territories will be absolutely essential.

Regarding your second question on self-determination, I do not think I should elaborate on this, inasmuch as the prospect of the implementation of the right of self-determination of the Papuan people has been accepted by both parties concerned on the basis of the Bunker proposals; and of course this question will be taken up in detail in my presence when formal and official discussions take place.

QUESTION: Is it your intention to visit the Near East in the near future?

The Acting SECRETARY-GENERAL: Yes, I would like to visit the Near East, but not in the near future.

QUESTION: In the light of your observation that it is known to the United Nations that mercenaries are returning to Katanga, I wonder if you consider that a violation of any armistice agreement, and what does the United Nations propose to do about it?

The Acting SECRETARY-GENERAL: As I have indicated earlier, we have unconfirmed reports of the infiltration of foreign mercenaries into Katanga; and, of course, under the Security Council mandate, I have been authorized to use a requisite measure of force, if necessary, to arrest these mercenaries. Therefore, the question of the employment of force must be considered. But as you all know, the United Nations at present is in a rather peculiar position: many Member States have undertaken to bear the expense of the Congo operation do not favour any fresh United Nations military initiative in the Congo; and many Member States who do not pay anything to the United Nations for the Congo operation have been advocating a more vigorous policy. Hence, as I have said, the United Nations is in a rather peculiar position, and as I have indicated on an earlier occasion,
if the current talks break down, I propose to present my views on the next steps to the Congo Advisory Committee for advice; and, if necessary, I may have to seek the views of my principal advisors; and perhaps a fresh Security Council mandate may be necessary.

The press conference ended at 11:50 a.m.
STATEMENT BY ACTING SECRETARY-GENERAL U THANT
TO THE EXECUTIVE BOARD OF UNICEF, MONDAY, 4 JUNE

I am very happy indeed to open this meeting of the UNICEF Executive Board. I need not of course tell you how much the whole world appreciates the magnificent work of the UNICEF. As you all know, the main role of the UNICEF in the over-all United Nations' efforts toward economic development and social progress is in building potential human resources.

The activities of the UNICEF are primarily in the realm of children and youth in the less developed countries, with the sole purpose of making them healthy and happy and enabling them to enjoy all the rights and privileges due to them. These rights and privileges were defined for them in the Declaration of the Rights of the Child adopted by the United Nations General Assembly in 1959. It is gratifying to note that the UNICEF Executive Board declared in 1960 that it accepted the principles of that Declaration as the basis for its policy and programs.

But millions of children today do not enjoy the rights and privileges to which they are entitled. Never before in history had concerted effort been made to enable the children and young men and women to contribute effectively to the development of their countries when they grow up. There are today over 600 million children in the less developed countries crying for help in the promotion of their health, nutrition, social welfare, education and training for a full life. Whether we believe that the state exists to secure the conditions of a full life for the individual or that the individual exists for the service of the state, an international organization like the UNICEF has a very significant role to play.

Economists tell us that, since the end of World War II, rich countries are getting richer and poor countries are getting poorer. In the underdeveloped countries which comprise more than two-thirds of the world's population, the rate of production is below the rate of population growth. This widening gulf in the wealth of the peoples is a most disturbing phenomenon of our times, and this gulf applies of course to the children and youth also.

* Background on the Board session appears in Press Release ICEF/851 of 2 June.
I understand that the main theme before this meeting of the Executive Board is "Planning for Children in National Development." Wise and imaginative planning is the essential prerequisite for fruitful action, and action must be within the framework of comprehensive development plans which are the objectives of the United Nations Development Decade.

This Executive Board meeting is, therefore, taking up once more the challenge of ensuring for the world's children and young people the fulfillment of a useful and rewarding role in a developing society.

In conclusion, let me pay a tribute to the Executive Director, Maurice Pate, whose devotion and dedication to the work of the UNICEF has been extraordinary.

* *** *

- 2 -
ADDRESS MADE BY ACTING SECRETARY-GENERAL U THANT
AT CARLETON UNIVERSITY, OTTAWA, CANADA, 25 MAY

EDUCATION FOR PEACE

A little while ago Carleton University honored me by conferring on me the degree of Doctor of Laws, honoris causa, and you have now honored me further by asking me to deliver an address to this convocation. I deeply appreciate this dual honor, as also this opportunity to say a few words on a subject with which all thinking men today are rightfully preoccupied.

I recall that the first honorary degree conferred on my distinguished predecessor, Dag Hammarskjold, was by Carleton University in 1954. In your letter inviting me to accept the degree of Doctor of Laws, Mr. President, you mentioned that Carleton is a young and rapidly growing university in the capital of Canada. You also mentioned that my speaking on this occasion at your university in the capital of Canada would further strengthen the feelings that most Canadians have for the United Nations.

I feel therefore that it is appropriate for me not only to speak on the most crucial subject of this age, but also to address myself particularly to the younger generation. The Charter of the United Nations begins with a reference to determination of the peoples of the world "to save succeeding generations from the scourge of war" and "to unite our strength to maintain international peace and security." This preoccupation with peace is, however, not in any sense recent; it is in fact as old as recorded history. Throughout history men have fought and at the same time yearned for peace. All the great religions of the world have peace among men as their basic purpose.

(more)
At the same time I have often pondered, as I have no doubt many of you might have, on that truth which is so simply stated in the constitution of the United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization, "since wars begin in the minds of men, it is in the minds of men that the defenses of peace must be constructed." Thus the teachers are the true architects of minds and the students are the true builders of peace. If the teachers instruct the younger generation in the ways of peace, not only will their work succeed, but the basic idea of peace in our time will triumph. If we lose the minds of men, no matter how hard we may propagate the idea of peace through the United Nations and through collective international action, the idea will fail, leaving us in a lawless and disorderly world, if indeed a world should continue to exist.

The burning issue today is this battle for the minds of men, and here we have the phenomenon that each of the major ideologies is convinced not only that it represents the true philosophy of peace, but that the other system is bound to fail. As a result of this preoccupation with ideology and dogma, and on the general assumption that history repeats itself, we have mistrust and fear which is the source of all our problems and the basic fact behind the cold war.

Historians have concluded that many wars in the past were inevitable, and from this they proceed to infer that, given a similar set of circumstances, wars in the future will similarly be inevitable. But nothing is more fallacious than the generally accepted assumption that history repeats itself. The plain fact is that history does not repeat itself.

It seems to me that historical developments are conditioned by a peculiar set of circumstances prevailing at a particular time and place. At Munich, British Prime Minister Chamberlain tried, with extraordinary patience and almost in desperation, not to repeat the events of 1914, with results which were worse. Disillusioned by the tragic failure of Mr. Chamberlain's policy of appeasement, another British Prime Minister, Sir Anthony Eden, eighteen years later, embarked on a tough Suez policy which ended in failure. There was a considerable body of opinion in Britain in 1956 that history would repeat itself and that a policy of appeasement would be disastrous. The thesis turned out to be false, with unfortunate consequences.

The same obsession with the past seems to me to govern the thinking of the Big Powers today. Russia's obsessive fear of encirclement probably has its roots in her memories of 1919, and leads her to think in terms which are no longer valid.
in this thermonuclear age. The United States of America, too, seems to me to be a prisoner of her past. She was rudely dragged into the center of the world stage, much against her will, by the unprovoked attack on Pearl Harbor. It seems to me that the fear that such a catastrophic surprise attack will be repeated dominates the thinking in Washington, and a surprise attack is seen in the United States as the supreme risk. This fear stems from the same assumption that history will repeat itself.

It is therefore our first task to allay, if not to remove, this fear and mistrust, and to do so we need two things. First we need to try and understand each other's point of view. We also need to realize that it is no longer true to say that there are two sides to every question; in fact, there are many sides. It is accordingly meaningless to present the problems of our complicated existence in simple terms of black and white and to overlook the infinite gradations in between, or the whole spectrum of colors outside of these two basic hues.

This need for mutual understanding is reinforced by the amazing technological progress of our time. We live in an age when men are not content to circle the globe in a matter of minutes, but are aiming literally at the stars. The fantastic developments in the methods of transportation and communication have reduced the universe to the size of a simple county. In such a world it is essential that we realize the identity of interest that binds us together and not exaggerate the issues that divide us, however big the issues and however deep the divisions. We have to think of the world as a unit in the same way that we think of a city or county as a unit whose inhabitants, as I said, have a complete identity of interest, and especially the interest of survival.

And that brings me to the next point, that the same technological progress which has shrunk the world is also responsible for the development and perfection of inventions with a capacity for destruction which no one could have dreamed possible a generation ago. Today the major powers have the power literally to extinguish all life on this planet. It is perhaps true that over any period of history, notwithstanding its catalogue of wars, nations have never waged war lightly but only when there seemed no other way out of national danger. Today the chapter of wars in the pages of history may have to be closed, not by the exercise of moral judgment that war is bad, but by sheer necessity -- the imperative of self-preservation. Surely there can be no material stake so important as to lead one to undertake the total destruction of his enemy, especially if, at the same time and in the same process, his own destruction is involved.
I have said elsewhere, and I repeat, that the great danger to our world today is that peace is preserved by the precarious balance of terror, with the ever-present possibility of global nuclear war by accident.

The development of nuclear weapons, it seems fairly obvious, has added a new dimension to the concept of war. War itself loses its utility as a consequence of uncertainty. War is not just violence. It is the controlled use of violence for attainable ends. But how can anyone control a war when he has no means of knowing whether his first nuclear strike has been effective or not? The whole conduct of military operations, whether by land, sea or air, is based on getting back information on what has been achieved in the first stage of operations. All that one can be certain of with a nuclear strike is that it has killed a lot of people and destroyed a number of installations over a wide area.

But you cannot be certain that you have killed the right people and destroyed the right buildings or installations. All that is certain is that the object of the war -- the defense of your own country or territory -- will be foiled by the very operations undertaken to achieve it. What is called strategy will be a kind of chess game played blindfold. Quite literally, the players do not know what they are doing, for they have no previous experience of their moves. Disarmament, therefore, is not only a very desirable alternative to war, but it is the only possible alternative if the human race itself is to survive.

It is for this reason that I advocate that we discontinue the piling up of armaments, and the mistrust and fear which is as much a cause as a consequence thereof. In fact, if war is no longer desirable, one might well ask: why armaments? Why this astronomical expenditure on weapons of such terrible destruction that they are in fact stillborn because they can never be used? Let us hope that this is only a passing phase and a temporary paradox, and that before long we might see the first steps toward the halting of the arms race, beginning perhaps with nuclear disarmament.

I referred earlier to the fact that men are now aiming at the stars. I do believe that, while disarmament may come about in our time and nuclear engines of destruction may be dismantled, the exploration of space will proceed with increased momentum. Indeed, we may be on the threshold of adventures in the universe which go far beyond the navigation of uncharted seas and the discovery of new lands that our ancestors undertook only a few centuries ago. Let us hope, however, that the kind of national claims and counterclaims, colonialism and imperial wars which
characterized the discovery of the earth will not mark the exploration of outer space. For this reason I attach great significance to the coordination of work in the development of outer space which is taking place within the aegis of the United Nations.

There is one other area where a better understanding of each other’s point of view can mean increased prosperity for all. This is also the result of the same technological progress to which I referred earlier. I said in Copenhagen the other day that the basic fact of our time is the fact of abundance. This abundance, this embarrassment of riches in the advanced countries, exists side by side with deep unfulfilled needs elsewhere, so that the problem is not one of production, to use the language of the economists, so much as of distribution.

I am one of those who are distressed by the attempt of nations, as of human beings, to exploit each other because, truly, such exploitation is so unnecessary. I believe it is unnecessary because I do not think it is true any longer that one nation can become rich only by beggaring its neighbor. I believe that it is possible for the advanced countries, for example, to contribute to the economic development of the less advanced and in doing so to gain greater prosperity for themselves.

The concept of taxing the rich according to their capacity to pay, in order to cater to the poor according to their needs, is now well established as a simple canon of social justice in all democratic countries. It requires only a little imagination to lift this concept to a higher plane, namely the international plane, and to extend its scope from the country to the universe. Surely it is not too difficult for educated people to raise their sights a little in economic matters, as they do so easily when they turn their minds skywards into outer space.

This is the century of the common man and it is at the United Nations, through governments big and small, strong and weak, politically mature and inexperienced, that the common aspirations of mankind find a voice and an expression. Our task in the United Nations is thus to bring about a real international democracy so that the common man everywhere may live free from fear and want. But nations are made up of human beings and, as I said at the beginning, the real task is to build peace into their minds.

If this task is to be successful, then our young and educated men must have minds which are independent and objective, detached and inquiring. It quite often happens that an issue arises in a country, or even in a neighborhood, which is deemed vital to its security or prosperity, and at that point pressures develop which make

(more)
it doubly important for people to preserve an independent, objective, detached and inquiring attitude of mind.

One of the ways of preserving these attitudes is the search for the basic concepts and the underlying principles from which men of various races and creeds draw their inspiration in the pursuit of the higher life and the ultimate goal of human endeavor. Such a search is most likely to end in a sharing of our beliefs, in civilized conduct and generous behavior, the spirit of tolerance, of live and let live, and of understanding the other man's point of view. This is the essence of all great religions and I believe that it holds the key to the solution of the most pressing problems of our time.

The young men and women who are here with us today have the opportunity, and the responsibility, to help in developing and maintaining such an attitude of mind, so that we might have a world which is made up of societies whose doors are as open as their hearts and, most important of all, societies which are made up of people with open minds.

* *** *

* *** *
MESSAGE FROM ACTING SECRETARY-GENERAL U THANT TO THE OPENING SESSION OF THE CONFERENCE OF NONGOVERNMENTAL ORGANIZATIONS, 22 MAY

Read by Philippe de Seynes, UN Under-Secretary
Department of Economic and Social Affairs

Ladies and Gentlemen,

I feel very much among friends this morning. I have met many of you in recent months, but I have been familiar with the activities of your organizations for a much longer time and aware of your good works on behalf of the United Nations.

I have a strong inclination, therefore, to speak to you as members of one family. I realize however that, although you do belong to the UN family in a general sense, you belong first of all to your own organizations and owe a responsibility to their vast memberships. As their representatives, you bring to the UN a diversity of viewpoints and interests which enriches this Organization. In turn, I believe that each of you has found a particular area in the work of the United Nations in which you take special interest. Perhaps it is technical assistance... or trusteeship... or the peaceful uses of outer space... or the forthcoming conference on science and technology in relation to economic development.

In these few moments, I would like to concentrate, not on the diversity of your interests, but on the common concern which brings you together in this room. That is your concern for the well-being of the UN as a whole. You have weathered crises with us year after year and have come to know, perhaps better than most, that crisis is endemic to this Organization. At each critical point, the non-governmental organizations have demonstrated a unique ability to reach into every corner of public opinion, and to illuminate and clarify the issues involved, be they political, economic, social or -- as now -- financial. We hope that your membership will associate themselves as energetically with the crucial issues we now face as they have in the past.

(more)

* Background appears in Press Release M/1411.
At the same time, I am not asking you to be friends only in need, as I believe that the direction of most UN activities is eminently healthy. To name only one example, the Development Decade is one of the most exciting and promising enterprises upon which we have embarked. Behind this massive program is the realization that one of the most important problems facing the world today is how the rich and poor nations are going to live together in peace and harmony.

This is a division of the world which is presently more real, and may ultimately be more explosive, even than that between societies with different political ideologies. Yet it is unfortunately true that the issue has rarely been approached in a comprehensive manner, leading to a coherent and really helpful policy formulated by world statesmen. Mmmeous attempts have been made by prosperous nations to launch economic aid programs for underdeveloped countries. We are now witnessing a major international effort to strengthen a partnership between the rich and poor nations of the world so that humanity may enjoy increasing freedom from want in our generation, and the gap between the rich and the poor may be bridged.

I hope, accordingly, that nongovernmental organizations in every part of the world will identify themselves as closely with the promises as they have with the problems of the UN.

* *** *
Mr. Christian Wirther, Mr. Secretary-General, my colleagues who represent the foreign correspondents stationed in this country and the Danish press have asked me to say a few words of welcome to you. We first of all thank you because you have found time -- I know your schedule has been pressed -- to meet the press, but what is more important to us is that you have given us this occasion to join in the very many manifestations of welcome and good will and confidence in you and in the future of the United Nations and your leadership which I am sure you have met in plenty during your short stay on Scandinavian soil. We find it is almost an act of feeling of devotion to the memory of your late predecessor that your first journey abroad went to his country -- your first journey since you became the Acting Secretary-General of the United Nations. But what is more is that it has impressed us greatly that you in your very remarkable speech at the Uppsala University found occasion to quote that memorable statement of Mr. Hammarskjold in the Security Council in one of the last days of October 1956 -- this statement which I remember very well was the departure of the most important development in the history of the United Nations. It formulated, if not in words then in the following deeds, a wholly new concept of the office of the Secretary-General. We know that this concept led to great early successes but also to the events of Mr. Hammarskjold's last year and to the tragic conclusion at Ndola. It is in our opinion an act of courage that you have thought it not only possible but appropriate at this moment to repeat the words of your predecessor.

May I start with two questions to you. The one is: Whether this rather close identification with some of the most important views of your predecessor concerning the duties and the powers of the office of Secretary-General does mean that you expect no difficulties concerning your re-election as Secretary-General of the United Nations on the basis of a political and executive programme so close to that of Mr. Hammarskjold. And my second question is -- and I take my point of departure from your speech at Uppsala -- whether you in the present state of the world find any signs that any of the two super powers of the United Nations is
ready to give the United Nations those powers of decision and of enforcement which are necessary -- to quote you -- if the United Nations is to grow into a really effective instrument for maintaining the rule of law.

The Acting Secretary-General: First of all I wish to thank our friend for his very kind words of welcome and expressions of appreciation of my speeches in Uppsala as well as in Copenhagen. Of course I am very glad to be able to meet with you and to answer the questions which are put to me and I also want to take this opportunity of expressing my heartfelt thanks to Their Majesties the King and Queen of Denmark and the Government and people of Denmark for the very warm reception accorded to me during my brief stay in this beautiful city.

I also want to take this opportunity of stating a fact which is very close to my heart. Denmark has been one of the countries which have consistently upheld the idea of a functional world organization. Denmark has been one of the countries which have consistently contributed very significantly to the successful operation of UN activities. The record of Denmark in the United Nations has been a very impressive one. And on behalf of the world organization I want to express my profound thanks to the Government and people of Denmark for this attitude.

Now coming back to these two questions, first of all I share the views and concepts of my distinguished predecessor regarding the functions of the Secretary-General. The functions of the Secretary-General, it seems to me, can be classified into four categories: Firstly, the administrative functions. Of course, the Secretary-General's primary function is to administer the Secretariat comprising over 3,000 men and women engaged in day-to-day operations and of course various branches, in Europe for instance. Secondly, the Secretary-General has to implement the decisions of the Security Council. And (the) Security Council, as you all know, is the major organ of the United Nations and the decisions of the Security Council are binding -- at least they should be regarded as binding -- on all member states. It is one of the very important functions of the Secretary-General to see that the Security Council resolutions are implemented effectively. And his third function is to comply with the decisions of other organs of the United Nations like the General Assembly resolutions which are of course not mandatory -- they are only advisory, that is a distinction between the Security Council resolutions and the General Assembly resolutions. And of course he has to comply with the decisions of the Trusteeship Council and Economic and Social Council and he has to correlate the various functions of the specialized agencies which are more or less members of the UN family like WHO, ILO, UNESCO, FAO and so on. He has to see that the units, the members of the UN family, work closely together to achieve the common objectives of the world organization. And lastly,
though not explicitly defined in the Charter, the Secretary-General has to take certain political and diplomatic initiatives to achieve the objective of the Charter. When I say political and diplomatic initiatives, I am thinking primarily in terms of some of the activities undertaken by Mr. Dag Hammarskjold.

Whenever there is, for instance, some indication of a threat to peace the Secretary-General should take the necessary initiative without infringing the provisions of the Charter. To give you one instance. In January when the situation in West Irian or Netherlands New Guinea was developing in a certain way which was likely to disturb peace, to threaten international security, I sent out an appeal to the governments of the Netherlands and of Indonesia to see that the situation did not develop into a serious one and precipitate some crisis. At my request, the two governments agreed to send their representatives to New York and since then of course, as you know, I have been conducting exploratory talks with them and at a later stage I deputized an American diplomat, Mr. Bunker, to conduct negotiations away from New York, and Mr. Bunker has been conducting informal and secret negotiations at a place near Washington. Of course I have been in close touch with him from time to time, and Mr. Bunker has offered his own formula to break the deadlock. And if this formula is acceptable to both governments then, after another round of informal and secret negotiations, the two governments' representatives will come to New York and negotiations will be carried on in my presence, under my auspices. This procedure has been agreed to.

This is the type of activity which I had in mind when I say that the Secretary-General should take the necessary political and diplomatic initiatives. So as far as these concepts are concerned, on previous occasions too I have stated that I am in complete agreement with the stand taken by Mr. Dag Hammarskjold.

Regarding the second question about the desirability of the two giants, the United States and the Soviet Union, coming together to an agreement on the burning questions of the day like disarmament, let me repeat again that the small countries like Denmark have a very significant role to play. One of the roles is of course to build a bridge between the two super powers. Personally speaking, I do not for a moment believe that either the United States or the Soviet Union will deliberately launch a nuclear war. I am absolutely certain of this. Because as you all know atomic and hydrogen weapons are not weapons of war. They are weapons of indiscriminate destruction. So I am convinced that none of the nuclear powers will deliberately launch a nuclear war, because they know that a nuclear war will mean the end of all that humanity has built over thousands and thousands of years. But the risk of a war by accident is very great, is becoming greater and greater as days go by. As you all know, both the United States and the Soviet Union have (more)
their atomic and hydrogen rockets ready to be triggered in a few minutes. With a whole process of electronics and automation, the risk of a nuclear war head going off the launching base unintentionally is very great. That is my feeling.

So I feel rather strongly that small powers, small nations like Denmark, Sweden, Burma, Finland, should see that tensions are eased and the mood of frustration and desperation and bitterness is overtaken by a mood of greater understanding--among the big powers especially. That has been my endeavor since I was assigned to the United Nations and it will continue to be my endeavor in my new assignment. Regarding the supplementary question about the prospects of my appointment to the full term of Secretary-General in the coming session of the General Assembly, all I have to say is that I have not thought of this; such a prospect is still very far from my thoughts.

**Question:** Mr. Secretary-General, how is the financial position of the United Nations today? Is there a main fear in your mind that the United Nations will go bankrupt?

**Acting Secretary-General:** The financial position of the United Nations today depends on the result of the bond issue, which has been authorized by the sixteenth session of the General Assembly. As you know, I have been authorized by the General Assembly to make bonds available to member states to the amount of 200 million dollars, US dollars. For the moment the prospects seem to be bright. About thirty member states, including Denmark, have either pledged to buy bonds or even bought bonds actually, and Denmark of course has bought bonds. And up till the first of May about 64 million dollars worth of bonds have been sold. At least thirty member states have expressed their intention to buy bonds to the amount of 64 million dollars. That is apart from Washington. Of course, President Kennedy has recommended to the Senate and the House of Representatives to buy half the amount of bonds, that is to the tune of 100 million dollars, and the Senate Subcommittee only two weeks ago has decided to buy 25 million dollars worth of bonds plus matching basis, that means 25 million dollars plus whatever amount other member states buy. So, as it stands, Washington is likely to buy, of course provided the House of Representatives approves.

In this connection I think it is worth clarifying one aspect of the financial situation of the United Nations. We have to make a distinction between the normal expenses of the United Nations and the expenses for the peace-keeping operations of the UN, like our expenses in the Congo and the Middle East. As far as the normal operations of the UN are concerned the United Nations is solvent. Up till the end of last year, 31 December 1961, the member states had paid 95 per cent of their normal dues. I think it is a clear indication of the solvency of the UN as
far as the normal activities are concerned. As far as the UNEF, that is the Middle Eastern operations, are concerned, 73 per cent of the dues have been paid on the 31 December 1961. As far as the Congo operations are concerned, 65 per cent of the dues have been paid by the end of last year. So I think it is evident that the financial position of the UN is not as gloomy as one would believe.

**Question:** Sir, would you find it possible or even desirable to move the Headquarters of the United Nations or some of its under-organizations to Berlin?

**Acting Secretary-General:** Yes, the question of transferring some offices of the UN to Berlin is dependent on several factors. First of all, the big powers must agree (that is the big powers who are directly responsible for the administration of Berlin and the settlement of the Berlin issue, must agree) that the United Nations offices or some of the offices of the UN should be transferred to Berlin. That means, United States, United Kingdom, France and the Soviet Union must agree. That is the first requisite. Secondly, the General Assembly of the United Nations must agree that such a course of action is necessary or desirable. So if these two conditions are met the United Nations or part of the United Nations Secretariat or part of the specialized agencies now stationed in Geneva or Paris or Rome can be transferred to Berlin.

**Question:** There have been published the replies of the European nations to the proposal to establish a non-nuclear club and what is the next step you are planning to take in this direction?

**Acting Secretary-General:** Yes, you mean the resolution of Sweden? (Yes) Of course the sixteenth session of the General Assembly adopted a resolution proposed (drafted) by Sweden and other countries regarding the prevention of spread of nuclear weapons. On this, as I was authorized by the General Assembly, I addressed my question to all member states, and so far I think 55 or maybe 60 member states have answered my question. Of course, they had to be analyzed, and all the replies have to be submitted to the seventeenth session of the General Assembly. Before the General Assembly comes to any decision on the basis of these replies I don't think it will be proper for me to pass any judgment on the merits of this resolution.

All I want to say in this context is that neutralization of certain areas, that is the denuclearization of certain areas, personally speaking, is a welcome trend in international relations.

I think that this is a trend which is very desirable in international relations, because neutralization of certain areas, including the denuclearization of certain areas, is in essence a kind of territorial disarmament. The thinking at the moment is increasingly in favor of such a step. Of course I am not saying
this on behalf of the UN or on behalf of the General Assembly or on behalf of the 104 members of the UN. As I have just said it is purely my personal feeling.

Question: Is the date for your visit to Finland fixed?

Acting Secretary-General: Yes, if nothing happens, I am proposing to visit Norway and Finland towards the end of June and the first week of July, on my way to Geneva to attend the session of the Economic and Social Council.

Mr. Christian Winther: I gather that we have reached the limit of time available to you, Sir. Thank you Mr. Secretary-General.

Acting Secretary-General: Thank you very much.

* *** *

The Press Conference closed at 10:30 a.m.
THE DECADE OF DEVELOPMENT

Address by Acting Secretary-General U Thant

to the Students Association, Copenhagen, 8 May

I am very glad to be speaking to you on this occasion on the subject of the Development Decade. It is common experience that political news of any kind is reported fully by the news media while the most spectacular programs of economic development and social progress are hardly mentioned. While this is understandable, I feel at the same time that it should not be overlooked that such development and progress are one of the main purposes of the Charter of the United Nations. The Charter states that the peoples of the United Nations are determined "to promote social progress and better standards of life in larger freedom." The states members of the United Nations have accordingly pledged themselves, for these ends, "to employ international machinery for the promotion of the economic and social advancement of all peoples."

I also feel that it is particularly appropriate that I should be speaking on this subject from this forum. Denmark has been one of the advanced countries which has consistently taken great interest in the economic development of the less developed countries of the world. Within your own shores you have established a pattern of life with the conscious goal that few should have too much and none should have too little. I believe that social justice is one of the great stabilizing forces of the world today, and that it is a good thing if this concept of social justice can be enlarged in scope so that it is no longer national in character, but becomes a global concept.

This year we are beginning a wholly new experiment in human cooperation. Over the next ten years, the United Nations and its specialized and associated agencies are pledged to mobilize their past experiences and coordinate their present efforts in a sustained attack upon the ancient enemies of mankind -- disease, hunger, ignorance, poverty -- and to lay the foundations in all developing lands for a more
modern and productive economy. This is the broad purpose behind the Decade of Development -- a coordinated program on which the member governments of the United Nations have set their seal of approval and to which each of the United Nations agencies has pledged enthusiastic support.

Why is this experiment new? The enemies, we all know, are old enough. Throughout human history, men and women have toiled painfully and all too often vainly to give themselves and their children even the simplest elements of decent human living. The sad verdict of philosophers and historians on the general lot of mankind echoes in our ears -- Hobbes' definition of the human condition as "nasty, brutish and short," Thoreau's picture of innumerable, anonymous lives lived "in quiet desperation." And in the past, the degree to which the basic sources of human want and misery could be alleviated did in fact remain strictly limited. The resources needed to counter suffering were desperately scarce. And men had not the technological means to expand them or use them better. How could famine be relieved if the oxen who drew the grain carts ate half the food before it could reach the people who were starving? Such were the iron limits of human productivity. And in generation after generation, all but a fortunate few lived in permanent want -- undernourished, short-lived, victims of disease, watching their children die, ignorant, bound indeed to a "melancholy wheel" of incurable privation.

I wonder if we fully realize the immense revolution that has occurred in this regard -- a revolution that has begun to put an end to the old hopelessness? In the last century, at an accelerating pace, humanity has begun to break out of the old bondage. Science and technology, applied to a wider and wider range of human activities, have unlocked the doors of production. There is food enough to feed all mankind. There is speedy transport to deliver the food to any potential famine area. There are advances in fertilizers, in improved seed, in insecticides which make it certain that tomorrow -- or the day after tomorrow -- other economies will follow in the wake of the Danish farmer and produce more grain, more meat, more fruit, more fibers from the same acres under cultivation. In energy, in addition to conventional sources, a vast expansion of atomic power hopefully awaits us. And all the time technologies are changing and evolving so that minerals and metals can be substituted for each other and, if one wishes to be fanciful, who knows when we may not mine the planets or, by new chemical formulas, extract our needs out of sun and air?
But there is no need to be fanciful. In most of the developed societies, abundance is not a dream. It is a fact. Otherwise, how can we explain the astonishing phenomenon that the advanced nations can spend upwards to $120 billion a year on their weapons — and yet achieve rising standards of living for their people, and on top of all that still have surplus industrial capacity lying idle — and some of them still face problems of unemployment at home? Even after all that wealth has been poured into armaments, I repeat, some of the most powerful of the world's economies still have spare labor, idle capacity, vast stockpiles of metals and minerals, and surplus food which can be, and is being, made available to feed needy men elsewhere. I cite these astonishing facts above all to illustrate the degree to which sheer abundance of available resources and not a narrow scarcity is the hallmark of this crucial economy, proving that the breakthrough to abundance is the profoundest achievement of the new technology in our day.

A transformation on this scale was bound to have far-reaching repercussions. And I would suggest that one of the most significant political and social changes in the last decade is the realization among more and more people that the relative abundance achieved by more developed nations is not a gift of destiny but a goal which should be available for all. The contrast between rich and poor which used to be confined to domestic society is now impressing itself deeply upon the thinking of mankind as a whole. There are rich nations and poor nations. There is a gulf of poverty and affluence cutting right through the structure of world society. And beneath the surface-play of politics, it is possible that this gulf is the deepest and most vital fact with which we have to deal.

But can we achieve this goal? Is it perhaps determined by culture or climate, by the local endowment of resources, by profound causes — both material and historical — over which we have all too little control? Here I would like to point to another significant change which, almost unnoticed, has been overtaking our society since the Second World War. We have become steadily more interested in the processes of development and more and more of our trained minds have been devoting themselves to the problem of why development occurs, of what changes and social modifications are necessary to achieve it, of the techniques it requires, the blocks and difficulties it is likely to meet. A whole new field of theory and practice is opening up here and I suggest that although, clearly, we do not know all the answers to the problem of building up a nation's resources, we know more than we did — and I think we are beginning to know it in a more systematic way. Let me give you one or two illustrations of this point.

(more)
First of all, few governments now ignore the fact that growth toward greater abundance involves sustained investment. If societies aim at a 5 per cent rate of growth each year -- and when population grows by 2 per cent a year, they can hardly aim at less -- then they must be prepared to increase domestic saving and investment up to a level of at least 15 per cent of national income. But, of course, an investment ratio tells us nothing about the kind of investments that have to be made, the order in which they should be undertaken, the balance that should be given to this or that sector of the economy, nor any of the deeper social implications of seeking larger savings. However, in all these fields we are beginning to know more.

A country can hardly devote more savings to the development of its resources if it does not know where those resources are to be found. Careful surveys of mineral reserves, of agricultural endowment, of resources in river and territorial waters must precede the formulation of programs for expansion. A "pre-investment" phase in which something like a resource map of the economy is pieced together is a vital tool in the new armory of development; and where such surveys can cover not simply a country, but a group of countries naturally linked by some common regional interests -- such as a river valley -- the survey can itself make a direct contribution to growth on a wider basis.

Again, investment in resources is inseparable from investment in men. We are in the midst, I believe, of new, pioneering work in studying the development of education -- in the broadest sense -- in its relationship to growth and development in the economy as a whole. The standards and aims laid down at the various regional conferences on education organized by the United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization show, I think, a far more systematic grasp of the need to dovetail the training of human beings into the expanding needs of a developing society. The balance between primary and secondary education, the role of vocational and "on-the-job" training, the size and character of the university programs -- all these issues are being studied much more clearly in the light of our growing experience and we are perhaps on the brink of a breakthrough in the science of linking human and capital development in an orderly scheme of growth.

This is, in fact, one more example of a wider assertion we can make -- that a measure of balance between sectors is a pre-condition of successful growth. For instance, nearly all developing countries have to keep a careful eye on their systems of power and transport. Once an economy begins to grow, its demand for both is virtually insatiable and planners are all too often caught in a series of bottlenecks (more)
which have their origins in too many firms chasing too little electricity and too few railway wagons.

But perhaps the most dangerous imbalances occur when farming is neglected and allowed to lag behind growth in other sectors. Dynamic agriculture, producing more food for a growing urban world, releasing workers to the cities, providing markets for manufactured products, affects the cycle of growth at every turn and societies which neglect it find themselves limping along with the leg of agriculture disastrously shorter than the leg of industry.

And industry too has its pitfalls and imbalances. Nowhere are the implications of indiscriminate programming more intense. Nowhere is it easier to imagine that ten enterprises, all running below capacity and working at a loss, are in some magic way contributing to development. The wrong factory in the wrong place for the wrong product is the besetting danger of every period of growth.

All these 'facts of imbalance -- which our work in development is making steadily more clear -- point to a wider need -- the need to see developing economies as organic wholes, to devise their pattern of growth systematically through a series of country plans and to accept the disciplines of such a plan in all phases of the nation's economic and social life.

And I think it is at this point that the full significance of our proposed Decade of Development begins to become more clear. For in essence it is an application to our own work, here among the agencies of the United Nations, of the principle of balance, coordination and interdependence which I have been trying to describe. There is not a sector in the developing economies of our world which cannot call upon the work and experience of an international agency. The UN Special Fund, our technical assistance programs and our work directly under the Economic and Social Council are providing unique experience not only over the whole field of economic development but also specifically in such vital areas as pre-investment and the development of human resources. UNESCO is doing pioneering work in the central field of education and the World Health Organization is there to add the extra dimension of physical health. The Food and Agriculture Organization stands ready to fight hunger and to assist in all phases of a dynamic farming program. The World Bank has a magnificent record of supplying capital for power, transport, harbors and highway development in the modernizing countries. It is also building up a corps of professional advisors in the critical field of resource planning. The International Development Association has a growing record of achievement in providing capital for
the "infrastructure," for schools, hospitals and communication systems. In addition
to its traditional work in various fields the International Labor Organization has
expanded its operations and now has numerous training projects in the industrial and
management fields. And since developing economies have wholly new problems in the
sphere of their relations with other economies, we have the General Agreement on
Tariffs and Trade to oversee their flow of trade and the International Monetary Fund
to care for the imbalance and capital shortages which can arise in trade relations of
such volume and complexity. I have already referred to the imminence of large scale
development of atomic power which is the special concern of the International Atomic
Energy Agency. And almost at the grass roots level, we have our UN regional
commissions -- in Asia, in Africa, in Europe, in Latin America -- whose special
responsibility it is to coordinate effort and correlate experience.

Clearly all these institutions represent a growing combination of immediate
practical experience and longer-term research and analysis. And it is essential that
their efforts should complement each other. Just as the developing economy itself
needs to coordinate its programs and its resources and channel them through a
rationally evolved country plan, so, too, it is our hope, during the Decade of
Development, to bring about a similar concentration of effort, close liaison and
sustained cooperative work among the agencies and thus to achieve our fundamental
goal -- a rate of growth among the millions of people who live in the developing
world which will put them, ten years from now, on or over the threshold of self-
sustaining growth.

I would like to remind you that such an effort has never been made before. The
United Nations family of organizations has not hitherto proposed to itself any such
broad set of goals, aiming, in a coordinated way, at human progress. And I believe
that this attempt, in itself, reflects both our growing knowledge of the development
process and the growing sense of urgency in dealing with the problems of development.
Ten years ago, we probably did not have the experience to make such an attempt. Now
the time is ripe, and by adding our efforts to each other's in a cumulative way, our
assistance will be more effective, our rate of advance -- in both growth and knowledge
-- will be speeded up, and all the while we shall be learning invaluable lessons on
the types of joint work and effort which mankind has to undertake if our human
experiment is to survive.

Shall we be able to make of this Decade of Development the achievement in
human solidarity we hope it will be? We must be realistic. Our agencies represent
member governments. In the last analysis, they can go no further and no faster than

(more)
the nations of the world wish them to go. So it is not enough for us in the United Nations to dedicate ourselves to a Decade of Development. We have to take with us the governments to whom we are responsible and through them we have to reach out to the peoples whom these governments represent. Our Decade of Development cannot ultimately succeed unless it is rooted in the wills and hearts of millions of citizens everywhere. It will not succeed unless it can win their sustained support. It will not succeed unless they see it as a great goal of human endeavor and one which they are prepared to make their own. What are our chances? What are the obstacles? How can we see to it that sustained development is among the aims upheld by "the decent opinion of mankind"?

I think our first task must be to come back to the point with which I opened my address -- the availability of resources. I question whether men and women among the wealthier nations of mankind quite realize what abundance is at their disposal or how radically science and technology are transforming and expanding the resources available to man. I have spoken of the spending on arms. Let me repeat it. Something like $120 billions a year goes into the arms effort. Were we sane enough and wise enough to make progress toward disarmament -- and I hope and pray we may be sooner or later -- much of this vast accumulation of capital would ultimately become available to us for human betterment. The tanks could be beaten into tractors, the missiles into rockets for air transport, the metals wasted in mortar and cannon into power plants and laboratories, while the men in uniform could become the instructors, the technicians, the social workers, the artists of a new and richer life of all mankind.

But I would stress with all the vigor at my command that we do not have to wait upon disarmament. Even with armaments, many economies now operate below capacity. Many have growth rates half as great as the big expanders -- who go ahead by 6 and 8 and 12 per cent a year. Even if we put the capital needed for the Decade of Development at twice the level normally proposed -- not at one per cent but at two per cent of annual national income among the richer states -- the transfer would still represent no great or unbearable sacrifice.

The truth, the central stupendous truth, about developed economies today is that they can have -- in anything but the shortest run -- the kind and scale of resources they decide to have. If defense gobbles up $120 billions, the resources
are provided and economies go on growing just the same. If it takes $40 billions to go to the moon, great nations will go to the moon, creating vast new electronics industries and millions of new jobs, products and opportunities as they go. It is no longer resources that limit decisions. It is the decision that makes the resources. This is the fundamental, revolutionary change -- perhaps the most revolutionary mankind has ever known.

For -- make no mistake about it -- the revolution brought by science and technology to the developed nations is a revolutionary extension in human freedom. Freedom is choice. Freedom is the ability to act. In the past, it has been wholly limited by the unavailability of so many of the means of action. I cannot feed my neighbor if there is no food and I cannot transport what food there is. Now those old and dreadful tyrannies of shortage are being overcome. A new freedom stares the wealthy nations in the face -- the freedom to help or not to help their neighbors who still lie on the far side of abundance and who do not yet command the means to help themselves.

And so, at its profoundest level, the challenge of the Decade of Development is a moral challenge. How is the new freedom of our resources to be used? Can our imagination match our abundance only when the ugly, destructive risks of war are at work? Is the only challenge we recognize the challenge of fear -- in weapons, in outer space, in international rivalry? Is there no way in which the great constructive and peaceful purposes of man can so grip our heart and conscience that the spending needed to end starvation, to prevent the death of little children, to shelter the homeless and clothe the naked comes to have first priority in the purposes of the human race?

I believe our enemy here is ignorance -- ignorance of the scale of our resources, ignorance of the new techniques of growth, ignorance of the possibility of a bold new crusade for humanity's physical liberation. And during this Decade of Development one of our great purposes must be to end the ignorance and liberate the generous and decent instincts of mankind.

This task cannot wait. It becomes more difficult, the longer it is postponed. The secret of getting the job done is to gain early momentum, not only to increase income but to build growth of a self-sustaining kind into the systems of the developing countries. This decade is a crucial time. If we cannot take a great step forward and bring down the number of human beings living in conditions of poverty, disease, hunger and illiteracy, the outlook for all of us is not a happy one.

(more)
But I must end with a profession of faith. I am one of those who believe that development assistance to poorer countries is in the ultimate self-interest of the advanced countries themselves. But I would not want to rest my case mainly on that. I believe that ordinary men and women, once convinced of the ability to feed and succour and cherish their fellow men, will not rest until the task is done. The record of the human race is not all of war and horror. It has been sustained through generations by quiet compassion and all-encompassing love. Only the love has been limited by poverty. Today it can be as unlimited as its instincts dictate. There is no greater liberation than this and it is with this fundamental moral imperative that I would end and say, with the poet Auden, "We must love each other or we must die."

* *** *
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Seventeen years ago, when the statesmen of the world gathered at San Francisco and tried to work out a world organization to establish peace on secure foundations, the international situation was very different from what it is today. The Conference was naturally dominated by the three greatest military powers, the United States, the Soviet Union and Britain. There was a wide-spread belief at that time that, if only these Big Three could be brought together in an international organization, there would be no fear of another world war, and even small brush-fire wars could be banished. In the wake of the most catastrophic war in the history of mankind, humanity had a new vision: it saw the glimmer of dawn of a warless world. The tragic history of the League of Nations was still fresh in the minds of these statesmen who realized that the League failed because it did not have sufficient authority to act. There were many in San Francisco who were familiar with the circumstances leading to the collapse of the League of Nations, and who realized that the League failed not only because it was lacking in authority but also because it was lacking in will. The psychological climate in the Spring of 1945 at San Francisco was one of hope and even optimism; there was general feeling that the statesmen had learned a bitter lesson of history; the Big Three had emerged victorious in the colossal war against the Fascist and Nazi dictatorships at tremendous cost; peace had been won, and that hard-won peace must endure with the continued cooperation of the allies.

(more)
That hope, that vision and that belief speedily vanished in the years following
the war. The causes of the deterioration in international relations which followed
World War II were mainly political and psychological. After an all-too-brief period
of harmony, the Big Three split among themselves. The United States and Britain
were suspicious of Russian intentions and Russia was suspicious of Western intentions.
In course of time, the West moved closer together and established "collective
defense pacts." For her part, Russia too established a cordon of friendly states
around herself and entered into similar "collective defense pacts." To ask which
side started this process would be unprofitable, since this would generate ceaseless
arguments. The relevant consideration in this context is that fear and suspicion
on both sides generated tensions which came to be reflected in the United Nations.
The Big Powers on the Security Council, which was originally designed as the chief
instrument for maintaining peace and preventing war, have made it an arena of
contention and conflict. The United Nations, like its predecessor the League of
Nations, has had several impressive successes to its credit, but it has not been an
unqualified success in its essential purpose to establish the rule of law everywhere.
One fact clearly emerges out of the debates and discussions on major political
questions in the United Nations: ordinarily the Security Council can take effective
action only if the United States and the Soviet Union are in agreement.

It is impossible to conceive in our times of a world authority that could
physically eclipse the giant states of the United States and the Soviet Union. All
that seems possible is to employ the strength of the two giants to support a system
of preventing war between other, weaker countries. But how is war to be prevented
in disputes between the two giants themselves? This is the paramount question of
today. In the last resort, there is only the so-called "balance of terror" between
them. No doubt there is also a tacit recognition between them that their interest
in world peace is greater than any of their other political interests. It is only
on this premise that serious negotiations can be based. Herein comes the role of
the smaller uncommitted countries like Sweden, which is to develop every means of
strengthening this implicit understanding between the Americans and the Russians,
thus making "the last resort" increasingly remote.

As far as the United States and the Soviet Union are concerned, the aim for
the time being should be to stabilize and, if possible, to reduce arms stockpiles
without disturbing the existing "balance of terror"; to eliminate as far as possible
the risks of surprise attack or of war by accident; to check the development of new
weapons, and the continuous stockpiling of existing ones. In short, the most hopeful

(more)
approach is through disarmament, starting with the banning of tests under appropriate and effective control and an agreed system of inspection, as the United Nations General Assembly has repeatedly favored.

As far as all other powers are concerned, the aim should be to develop the peace-keeping authority of the United Nations. A member state such as Sweden could greatly increase the usefulness of the United Nations -- and I am indeed very glad to have this opportunity of stating from this forum that Sweden has been playing a very significant role in this direction. Although the moral authority of the United Nations could be built up by channelling international activities through this instrument, its efficacy will always require, ultimately, the supporting enforcement of both the United States and the Soviet Union. In the last analysis it must be a system in which the two giants must be increasingly involved. Such a development of the United Nations would also serve to add another brake to the danger of war between the two giants themselves, and forge a permanent link between them.

I said earlier that the political climate today is very different from that of 1945 when the United Nations was founded. There are still other important differences between 1945 and 1962. The first of these is the increasing use and, indeed, diversion of scientific and technological progress for military purposes. The atom bomb and the hydrogen bomb were not generally known in the Spring of 1945. I do not know whether the scientists at that time who were engaged in this field of research realized that large-scale atomic warfare might so poison the world as to destroy our civilization. Certainly it did not enter into the minds of those planning a new order.

Looking back over the years one would have thought that by now these obvious risks in our present situation would have become apparent to everyone. The best hopes for peace are now placed in maintaining a "balance of terror" but this balance is beginning to look like an illusion. It is surely time to return to the common-sense conclusion that peace and security cannot be achieved without first reaching agreements between East and West to halt the arms race. The arms race not only feeds on itself but creates in every country an attitude of mind which makes agreements impossible. The time has come for statesmen to say firmly that they do not believe in an indefinite continuation of the delicate balance of terror. This balance seems to me to be purely a theoretical conception when considered in the light of political reality. The reality is that neither the United States nor the Soviet Union will deliberately seek a nuclear war, though they may be plunged into
one by accident, and the sensible course is to try to prevent accidents by limiting the arms race and reducing the areas of dispute.

Neutralization of certain areas seems to be a welcome trend in international negotiations. In 1955, the Great Powers, including the Soviet Union, signed a treaty which neutralized Austria. In 1960, they signed a treaty neutralizing Antarctica. A year later, they were prepared to guarantee the neutralization of Laos.

The importance of neutralization does not lie solely in the creation of buffer states, valuable though that is. Neutralization is a form of territorial disarmament, a partial dismantling of the great military machines whose destructive powers have now become so terrifying. Each act of neutralization, therefore, is a kind of pilot project for the comprehensive disarmament that alone can rid the world of fear and suspicion.

These are among the great issues of the 1960's which were never thought of when the United Nations was founded. Nor had the world's statesmen contemplated the tremendous advance in national self-consciousness first in Asia and then in Africa, the ending of colonialism and the long-existing hegemony of Europe. The world of 1945, like the world of the League of Nations, was essentially the world of Europe, and of the Americas. Asia and Africa were just mere appendages of Europe. Apparently no thought was given at that time to the prospect of emerging nations of these two continents. Today half of the members of the United Nations are from Asia and Africa. One observes a growing nervousness in the West about the rise in membership of the Asian-Africans in the world organization. But surely the best interests of the West are ill served by sour comments about newly independent countries in Asia and Africa. Such an attitude is a poor tribute to the generations of dedicated and idealistic Westerners who worked precisely toward the ultimate goal of independence, even if they did not know it was going to be reached so early. Nor is it fair to expect those countries at their present stage to express frequently and vociferously their gratitude for what the West did for them. Many newly independent countries still retain bitter memories of the past. In some cases independence was too long postponed, causing a mood of frustration and desperation among freedom fighters. If a country has to fight too long and too hard to win an independence which comes too late, then some extreme forces more hostile to their old masters come to the surface and become more dominant. But by and large these new states which now constitute half the membership of the United Nations generally share democratic ideas, including the liberal concepts of objectivity, tolerance and
the rule of law, and are rarely attracted by dogmas alien to their way of life. With just a little imagination both the East and the West could find in the building up of the United Nations authority a common platform with these newly-emerging nations, for many of whom this would be the best guarantee of their independence. For the Western powers it would be the rational sequel in world politics to their renunciation of control over their far-flung empires. It would, moreover, pave the way for new techniques of international relationship within the framework of a growing United Nations.

A mature sense of responsibility was first demonstrated by the Asian-African countries in the historic Bandung Conference seven years ago. Nearly half of the 29 countries attending that conference were not members of the United Nations at that time. Surprisingly enough, support for the United Nations was one of the first principles endorsed. The keynote of the Bandung Conference was moderation and a surprising degree of unanimity was achieved in the final declarations. Countries with different ideological and social systems went on record as favoring closer and friendlier relations.

I believe that all small countries everywhere have the same interest in the maintenance of peace and the development of a more effective international instrument for that purpose. The record of Sweden in the United Nations is an unmistakable demonstration of this attitude. Most of the small countries care passionately about peace. Many of them are aroused to furious protest against, say, racial discrimination as against all explosions of atomic and hydrogen bombs. For it is all part of the same compassion for humanity and the same commitment to a belief in the future of man. This philosophy which is increasingly in evidence all over the world is an affirmation of community of interest, a mass declaration that human beings must learn to understand one another even if they cannot agree with one another or like one another. It is a challenge to the conscience of the present society—a society characterized by fear, suspicion, frustration and bitterness.

I am in complete agreement with my distinguished predecessor Mr. Dag Hammarskjold when he said that it is the small nations, rather than the Great Powers, which need the protection the United Nations can give. If the West were to set about strengthening the United Nations authority upon the basis of this widely shared common interest, the possibility of effective United Nations intervention for the peaceful resolution of dangerous situations will be greatly increased. Disarmament provides an additional reason why the West should try to prepare the United Nations (more)
for a more positive role. Agreed disarmament, which all the major governments profess to want, requires as its inescapable condition the establishment of an international authority with substantial powers. To do so, the first requisite is mutual confidence. The build-up of confidence can be successful only if the United Nations is made to reflect adequately the interests and aspirations of all members large and small. In this context the role of the small nations is still more significant. One of their functions in the United Nations should be to build bridges between East and West -- to interpret the East to the West and the West to the East, and thus strengthen the very foundation on which this world organization is built.

Based on these premises let us consider the future of the United Nations.

First we must realize that the world is facing a situation which is entirely unprecedented. The situation of mutual deterrence which has preserved an uneasy peace during the past few years is not in itself likely to produce continuing stability. The more the two Great Powers struggle to perfect their deterrents, the less likely it is that they will dare to use them to deal with anything except a direct attack on themselves. Tension and the dangers of an accidental calamity will rise higher and higher. Lasting security cannot be produced by this policy.

Therefore, the development of the United Nations as a really effective instrument of preventing war is of primary importance to every one of us. Every man or woman should not only ask himself or herself what he or she is going to do in the world, but also ask, "Will there be a world in which I can live?"

The second great fact of our times is that the whole world is closely linked as never before in the history of mankind. It is not true to say that Russia and the West have no interest in common. Both have the one great overriding interest in preserving peace and avoiding total war. Once that fact is recognized, it may be possible to begin the slow, painful and extremely difficult task of constructing some agreed system of disarmament, inspection and control to replace the present international anarchy. It is not too much to hope that the small uncommitted nations will take the lead in this very necessary historic enterprise within the framework of the United Nations.

Another great fact of our times is the myth of the absolute sovereign state. Up to the First World War, Britannia ruled the waves with a very powerful navy. She was, in fact, more than an absolute sovereign state: she was also the nerve-
center of a great empire. The United States, separated from possible aggressors by
great oceans, was safe and could afford to be sovereign and isolationist. The same
could be said of many other countries with varying degrees of strength and stability.

In San Francisco, seventeen years ago, the assembled statesmen of the world
clung to this myth. They still conceived it possible to have a peaceful world
consisting of a number of armed sovereign states clinging to their sovereign status
without any thought of abandoning an iota of this sovereignty. If the United Nations
is to grow into a really effective instrument for maintaining the rule of law, the
first step must be the willingness of the member states to give up the concept of
the absolute sovereign state in the same manner as we individuals give up our
absolute right to do just what we please, as an essential condition of living in an
organized society. The individual has to submit to the rules laid down by the
authorities, and every one of us has to pay this price as a condition of living.
While the sovereignty of each of us is limited to what is necessary in the interest
of the community, one retains the domestic rights for the purpose of regulating
one's home life.

Similarly, in the community of nations it is increasingly important to restrict
the sovereignty of states, even in a small way to start with. This restriction may
involve the renunciation of the threat or the use of force as an instrument of
policy, the reduction of armed forces and the undertaking to submit disputes to the
arbitration of an international judiciary. Even where member states of the United
Nations have voluntarily agreed to such restrictions on their absolute freedom of
action, the United Nations has no authority at present to enforce them. It seems
to me that the United Nations must develop in the same manner as every sovereign
state has done. If the United Nations is to have a future, it must assume some of
the attributes of a state. It must have the right, the power and the means to keep
the peace. In this historic task the small countries have a significant role to play.

In fact, the small nations have more than one role to play in this regard.
First of all, as I have already noted, they are to play the part of a bridge between
the Big Powers, especially in issues which are of global interest. For example,
the Disarmament Conference could not get going for many years, so long as its membership was confined to the principal protagonists in the armaments race. It will be generally agreed that the issue of disarmament is of interest not only to the major military powers but to the entire world; in fact, it is one of the central responsibilities of the United Nations under the Charter. This responsibility was ultimately
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For that he must stand. A Secretary-General cannot serve on any other assumption than that -- within the necessary limits of human frailty and honest differences of opinion -- all member nations honor their pledge to observe all articles of the Charter. He should also be able to assume that those organs which are charged with the task of upholding the Charter, will be in a position to fulfill their task."

But this was not the only occasion. Increasingly during the last two years of his tenure, which was so cruelly cut short by a tragic fate, he spoke out on major issues and was listened to with respect, even by those who, by implication, disagreed with him. I wish, at this place where he studied and grew to manhood, to place on record this tribute to him and to his memory, and to his great contribution to the international community.

* *** *