

DEPARTMENT OF STATE

SEPTEMBER 8, 1966

FOR THE PRESS

NO. 203

CAUTION - FUTURE RELEASE

FOR RELEASE AT 6:30 P.M., E.D.T., THURSDAY, SEPTEMBER 8, 1966. NOT TO BE PREVIOUSLY PUBLISHED, QUOTED FROM OR USED IN ANY WAY.

ADDRESS BY

THE HONORABLE JOSEPH J. SISCO
ASSISTANT SECRETARY OF STATE FOR INTERNATIONAL ORGANIZATION AFFAIRS
BEFORE THE
ANNUAL MEETING OF THE MANUFACTURERS ASSOCIATION OF CONNECTICUT, INC.
YALE UNIVERSITY, NEW HAVEN, CONNECTICUT
THURSDAY, SEPTEMBER 8, 1966, 8:00 P.M., E.D.T.

OBLIGATIONS OF POWER

It is a privilege to be at this great University and to address this distinguished audience. My pleasure at being here is diminished only by the fact that Secretary Rusk is unable to fulfill his engagement with you this evening. As you know, he is recovering from the flu. I am sure that he would be the first to say that while it has put him out of commission temporarily, this is a minor battle compared with some of the other struggles of a policy character which he takes on every day.

I must confess, when I was asked at the last minute to come here and take the Secretary's place, I was reminded very much of a story going back to President Wilson's days. Some of you may know this one. It appears that Wilson was awakened about 4:00 a.m. one morning by a call from a very aggressive and very eager young office seeker who said the Commissioner of Highways had just died. Wilson wondered what he was supposed to do about it at that hour of the morning and merely said: "Well, I am very sorry to hear this." This young man went on, "I know that he will be a hard man to replace, Mr. President, and I thought I would be a good man to take his place." Wilson responded with his well-known acid humor: "Well, I think that sounds all right. It is certainly all right by me, if it is all right by the undertaker."

In thinking about the sort of things we might discuss this evening, I concluded that you gentlemen, as businessmen, would be more interested in hearing about reality than theory.

The reality with which we in the government must deal day after day is the application and obligations of American power. The central object of our foreign policy, and therefore of the application of our power, is the same as it has been since this Republic was founded "to secure the blessings of liberty to ourselves and our posterity". And to this should be added our determination, expressed so eloquently in the United Nations Charter, "to save succeeding generations from the scourge of war".

Translating

Translating these objectives into practice means coping with a myriad of problems with a host of countries in countless ways. As comforting as it might be to think that we could retreat to a Fortress America concept -- and there are such murmurings of isolationism in the United States -- the world is just not made that way today.

Science has brought us closer -- and made us inter-dependent. We are no longer distant relatives of the Nigerians and Micronesians. The frontier is becoming crowded, and there is nowhere to move or to hide. When we vault into outer space we need rules to govern traffic. When we communicate by satellite, we need to allocate frequencies. When there is disease and famine in any part of the world, we cannot draw our cloaks around us and expect epidemics to pass by. The sparks touched off by hunger, overpopulation, and poverty can be fanned into a fire threatening our own homes.

As the world becomes smaller, the problems of achieving our aims become more complicated and more pressing.

In assuming the obligations of power we have become involved with the world in many ways. While we have no desire to be the world's policeman, the interdependence of mankind today leaves us no escape from involvement in most of the major troubles of our times.

We are involved in a complicated network of international relationships. To begin with, we have direct bilateral relations with some 120 different states. Many of these bilateral relations involve provision of American economic or military assistance. Moving beyond this direct relationship, we find a series of multilateral or regional arrangements, such as the Organization of American States and the North Atlantic Treaty Organization, which connect us with some forty different states in five continents. And, on a more universal basis, we conduct our policy through the United Nations. Since this is my particular field of responsibility, I would like to talk to you tonight primarily about current subjects of interest as they appear in the UN context.

The 21st UN General Assembly will open in two weeks. It will begin its work under the clouds of the Secretary General's reluctance to continue in office, continuation of the war in Viet-Nam, the persistent militancy of Communist China, and fevered emotions arising from the denial of human rights in Southern Africa. Moreover, the UN General Assembly gets back to business with a shaky financial structure and a lack of clarity as to where it is going in the peace-keeping field.

A list

A list of the unfinished business of the UN, and indeed the world, is enough to turn any observer into a pessimist. But I am not a pessimist. Looking ahead, I believe we can take some comfort in the lessons we have learned from 21 years experience since World War II. This is so particularly if we recall where we stand today and where we stood twenty-one years after World War I. At that time, you will remember, the League of Nations was dead and Hitler was unleashing the bloodiest conflict the world has known.

So while we are not yet where we want to be, things could be worse. Moreover, our optimism is tempered by the hard facts which we have learned about the intractability of problems and the limitations of international institutions to deal with them. We have learned that there are no panaceas for world problems, that the UN has both capacities and limitations, and the ways in which it can help promote peace depends on the members who make it up. It has no mysterious power of its own. Nevertheless, the UN continues to be a useful vehicle to achieve our aims.

UN machinery has already proved its worth in such diverse situations as Indonesia, Greece, Palestine, Kashmir, Korea, Suez, Lebanon, Laos, the Congo, West New Guinea, the Yemen, and Cyprus. You and I can sleep more soundly tonight because the UN Emergency Force is helping to keep the lid on the situation in the Gaza Strip and the UN Force in Cyprus is keeping warring factions apart.

Yet the United Nations has not been able to deal effectively with all threats to the peace.

For example, the United Nations has not been able to do much about the one conflict which I assume is most on your mind -- Viet-Nam. But that is not because the UN wasn't given a chance. We brought the issue before the Security Council, but it got nowhere at all because of the attitude of some of the members of the United Nations, and I might add the attitude of some nations who are not members.

Now there are those who charge that our policy in Viet-Nam is an abandonment of Charter principles and a confession of lack of faith in the UN. This is simply a distorted notion of what the UN and the Charter are all about. The basic purposes of American policy in the Western Pacific as elsewhere is -- and I am quoting the Secretary of State -- "to establish peace by deterring or repelling aggression". Our goal in Viet-Nam is that of the UN Charter, to safeguard the right of the peoples of Southeast Asia to settle their affairs peacefully and to select their form of government by principles of self-determination.

President

President Johnson has repeatedly made clear and reaffirmed again and again that our policy is totally compatible with our obligations to the UN. Let me remind you of the fundamentals of our policy:

"We are not trying to wipe out North Viet-Nam.

"We are not trying to change their Government.

"We are not trying to establish permanent bases in South Viet-Nam.

"We are not trying to gain one inch of new territory for America.

"And we are prepared to withdraw our forces from South Viet-Nam as soon as the people there are enabled to determine their own future without external interference."

As President Johnson said in Lancaster, Ohio, just three days ago: "If anyone will show me the time schedule when aggression and infiltration and 'might makes right' will be halted, then I, as President of this country, will lay on the table the schedule for the withdrawal of all of our forces from Viet-Nam."

We could, of course, take the easy way out by abandoning our commitment and by turning a blind eye to aggression against South Viet-Nam. But this we cannot do without encouraging the forces of violence and aggression everywhere.

We want a peaceful solution -- there can be no doubt of President Johnson's resolve in this regard.

If this desire and determination of the United States is matched by others, peace can be quickly restored in Southeast Asia. Unfortunately, there has so far been no sign that North Viet-Nam is prepared to settle the war unless South Viet-Nam is delivered into communist control.

Behind North Viet-Nam, of course, stands a militant and restless Communist China. China's self-isolation in world affairs and the question of Communist China's representation in the United Nations will come up again this year. It is a subject to which we have given detailed consideration. The real question is Red China's conduct in world affairs. It has talked and acted in ways that are contrary to the purposes and aims of the Organization. Under any and all circumstances we will keep our commitment to the Republic of China on Taiwan. We oppose any proposal to replace the Republic of China with Red China.

The exclusion

The exclusion of Red China from the United Nations during the past sixteen years has largely been self-exclusion. Whether and when their attitude will change remains to be seen. Marshal Lin Piao, whose star is evidently on the rise in Peking, is author of the theory that it is China's unlimited right and duty to foment revolutionary wars against established governments. The developing nations do not welcome this kind of help, and the offer of it has not advanced Peking's cause in the UN.

Within the past forty-eight hours the newspapers have been full of fierce Red Chinese words from Warsaw and moderate words from Peking. If the moderate words prove authentic we will welcome them -- but in the end the only words that count are those backed up by deeds.

Another focus of danger to which the United Nations will be giving a lot of attention this fall is the southern part of Africa. Nearly a third of the 117 members of the United Nations are African. They show understandable frustration with UN inability to accelerate progress to self-determination and full human dignity in many areas of Southern Africa.

Our history and traditions place us firmly with those seeking human dignity, equality and self-determination. We share their abhorrence of apartheid and impatience with white-supremacy, and obstacles to self-determination. President Johnson told the African Ambassadors in his speech on the anniversary of the Organization of African Unity in May:

"The United States has learned from lamentable personal experience the waste and injustice that result from the domination of one race by another. Just as we are determined to remove the remnants of inequality from our own midst, we are also with you -- heart and soul -- as you try to do the same.

"We believe, as you do, that denial of a whole people's right to shape their national future is morally wrong."

We know from our own history that these problems are not met overnight, and that they are never solved except by the patient, practical exercise of man's growing wisdom about himself. Certainly they are never solved by recourse to violence and coercion which belie the very aspects of human dignity, equality and self-determination which the international community seeks. It would be unreasonable to expect the 21st session of the General Assembly to produce dramatic cures for the ills of southern Africa. It can take only limited

measures

measures to help move along the slow but sure progress toward self-determination and to expand the area in which human dignity is protected. What we can and must expect is for the world community to search out the ways to convince the authorities in Southern Africa that the strength of their future must be built on the talents and dignity of all of their people and on the respect of their neighbors.

I have mentioned some of the important political issues facing the United Nations. Let me now mention a side of its work that should be of particular interest to you as businessmen -- the economic. It is in this area that the organization, quietly and with little fanfare, has perhaps achieved its most substantial accomplishments. Yet despite the important initiatives taken under the UN's Decade of Development, the gap between aspiration and achievement remains wide.

The food problem alone is staggering. Between the mid-1930's and the mid-1960's, for instance, the developing countries shifted from being exporters of eleven million metric tons of food grains a year to being importers of thirty million tons. At this rate, by 1985 the food deficit will be too large to be met by the entire food exporting capacities of all the food surplus countries in the world.

In other words, in twenty years much of the world's population will face starvation again unless something now not foreseen or contemplated is done.

Or take another statistical example. The per capita income in the less developed countries as a group now averages only \$120 a year. If we limit ourselves to present efforts the per capita income in these countries will grow only to \$170 by the turn of the century.

It is not hard to see, then, why economic problems are high on the list of "action" matters among the UN members from the underdeveloped parts of the globe. These nations feel that unless they can master the technological skills and obtain access to capital necessary for economic growth their independence will have little meaning. They are aware that while investment from the advanced countries in their areas in 1965 totalled about \$9 billion, this figure was well under one percent of the Gross National Product of the investing countries.

The "rich-poor gap" is no simple matter. It is not a mere matter of the rich getting richer and the poor getting poorer. Paradoxically both are getting wealthier, but the poor are not getting wealthier rapidly enough. The "gap" between the two is getting wider.

The United

The United Nations is trying to respond to this problem. The Special Fund under Paul Hoffman attracted capital totalling more than one billion dollars at a cost to the UN of about \$32 million. The Expanded Program of Technical Assistance (EPTA), now merged administratively with the Special Fund, has invested about \$500 million in projects such as manpower training, agricultural development, and health education. These projects are particularly vital because they provide needed skills and training to local technicians.

That is not all. The great financial institutions such as the World Bank and the International Development Association, as well as such agencies as the Food and Agricultural Organization, World Health Organization, and the International Labor Organization are all United Nations agencies. Their contributions to economic and social development add significantly to what is being accomplished by the United Nations itself.

Aid through international channels has been an increasingly important supplement to our own bilateral aid programs.

In the past fifteen years we have moved in the right direction -- but very slowly -- in advancing the concept that responsibilities for economic decisions must be shared among donors and recipients. More resources and a new impulse are needed. This is a task for the international community that will certainly continue in our lifetime. It is one version of the moral and political substitute for violent change.

An essential part of the emerging world order if we are to assure stability is to get away from the concept of the handout to that of the handclasp -- as we have in our own domestic community. It not only means that we must do more but also that the developing countries must take more vigorous measures of self-help.

The ending of the colonial era poses the need to find politically acceptable substitutes for the administrative and economic aid formerly furnished by the mother countries. The new countries have a special attachment to the UN because they can trust it to give aid without substituting one master for another. It is in our interest as well as theirs to realize that the UN can furnish such help without compromising their independence and without raising the specter of hostile take-over of their lands. Our interests are served because these programs are helping the developing countries to stand on their own feet.

Looking at the world and at the UN from the vantage point of the United States -- with our awesome responsibilities and the obligations of the greatest power in the world -- we must be clear where our true interests lie. They lie not in the direction of isolation and the withdrawal of our power -- but in widening the areas in which our responsibilities can be shared.

If we are

If we are to pursue our abiding national interest, we must take to heart what President Johnson recently said, in the context of Asia, but it has universal application:

"The peace we seek...is a peace of conciliation between Communist states and their non-Communist neighbors, between rich nations and poor, between small nations and large, between men whose skins are brown and black and yellow and white, between Hindus and Moslems, and Buddhists and Christians.

"It is a peace that can only be sustained through the durable bonds of peace: through international trade, through the free flow of people and ideas, through full participation by all nations in an international community under law, and through a common dedication to the great task of human progress and economic development."

* * * * *