(PLEASE RETURN TO JOHN RIELLY ROOM 173 E.O.B.) Mike Rashish

RICH NATIONS AND POOR: WORLD SOCIETY AT THE CROSSROADS

The poet has said that there is an ebb and flow - a tide - in the affairs of man; periods of relative tranquility followed by periods of stress and turbulence. We have enjoyed very little tranquility in the affairs of man for nearly as long as I can remember. And what tranquility we think we have enjoyed is, I suspect, the product of a mental quirk which all men are prey to -- regarding what is past and familiar with nostalgia, and what is new and uncertain with apprehension. By any measure, the times we are living through are times of profound and rapid change, uncertainty and indecision, and of rearrangement of the old and familiar order of things.

The postwar period in which the U.S. enjoyed an almost unique position of affluence and power is long since past. We see a renascent and vital Europe in the process of formation. The old arrangements

of the Atlantic world are being called into question and subject to test. The Communist world has shown itself to be many worlds and has displayed a remarkable degree of diversity and even deep schisms. And less developed countries have become more articulate about their needs and their problems as their needs grow and their problems multiply. ~~become acerbated~~.

Periods of rapid change are also periods which call for the exercise of creative diplomacy. The power and strength of the U. S. impose on us a burden of responsibility in world affairs commensurate with our power. But it is a burden which is, by no means, ours alone. The very changes which have marked the world scene have resulted in greater diffusion of power throughout the free world. The issue of peace is no longer one to be disposed of between the U S. and the Soviet Union. The demands for economic growth and progress on the part of the less-developed countries are no longer being addressed to us alone, but represent a problem which faces all the affluent countries of the world.

For the outstanding fact of life in the world today and, even more tomorrow, is the fact of interdependence. If isolationism is dead, it is not because the isolationists have had a change of heart, but because the hard facts of life in this world of ours has made isolationism untenable and unreal. These same facts require that the free world pursue a diplomacy of cooperation. The world is not only getting more complicated, but interconnected. If we are to bring some order to the affairs of man, it will be increasingly necessary to develop and refine institutions and techniques of cooperation. For unless we in the free world can bring some harmony into our affairs, we will waste our resources, abort our noble plans and ambitions, breed disillusionment and despair.

~~and suffer frustration.~~

Nowhere is this more clear than in the relations between the developed and underdeveloped nations of the world -- between the rich nations and the poor. While we in the western world have had a measure of success in bringing order into our own affairs, we have not as

brought order
yet successfully ~~extended our experience~~ to our relations with the underdeveloped countries.

To be sure the world of advanced countries -- the Atlantic world -- is still in the process of evolution. The structure of our relationships with other advanced countries must continue to undergo adaptation and change in response to new circumstances and new needs. The agenda for action is full: from trade matters to monetary affairs, from problems of military organization to relations with the Eastern European countries. But, on the whole, we have succeeded in maintaining substantial economic stability and economic progress and in avoiding the disasterous policies which brought depression and chaos in the inter-war period.

But this is clearly not enough. We who live in relative abundance and wealth, enjoying the fruits of technical progress and political stability, must address ourselves more coherently and effectively to one of the major problems we face in common -- and that is our

relationship with the poorer nations of this world. For this is nothing less than a problem of peace and world security. It is, ~~if you please~~, a problem of our own survival; it is a problem, if you please, of conscience for all of us in the Atlantic world.

Peace, world security and survival may strike you as cliches but they are no less true if they are so familiar. We in the developed world can neglect these truths only at our own peril. In a very real and immediate sense the condition of life, the opportunities for development and progress in the less developed countries of the world will determine our peace, security and survival.

Secretary McNamara put it well in his Montreal speech in May, "(A) purely military posture is not the central element in our security. The decisive factor for a powerful nation....is the character of its relationships with the world." "The irreducible fact remains that our security is related directly to the security of the newly developing world" and, "security is development. Without development there

can be no security." These are the words of a man who is perhaps the greatest expert on security that we have.

In short, we cannot have security at home unless there is security abroad. We endanger our own economic progress at home if there is no economic progress in the world community at large. We cannot pursue a Great Society at home unless the poorer nations of the world have reason to believe that they will achieve a better society for themselves.

This is a task to which the advanced countries in the free world must address themselves with new force, new commitment and new imagination. If we do -- and I do not see that we have any option in the matter -- we may well find, in the process, that the effort will help heal some of the wounds which have marked the relationship of the rich nations one to another.

The problem is immense; there is no easy solution and certainly not a quick one. There exists today immense disparities between the

rich countries and the poor and, if anything, they threaten to grow even wider.

Today, 20% of the world's population disposes of 75% of the world's income.

In 1965, the rich countries of the West added $60-70 billion to their income -- more than the total GNP of all of Latin America, and two times the GNP of India.

For 1965, the U.S., with 190 million people, increased its GNP by $45 billion; in the same year Africa, with a population of 300 million, had a total GNP of only $30 billion.

As a percentage of the GNP of the U.S., foreign aid has in fact been declining. A decade ago we gave 2% of our GNP; today only 0.3%. We spend three times as much on cigarettes and six times as much on liquor as we do on foreign development assistance.

All the while, the needs for external capital on the part of the less-developed countries has grown. The World Bank has said that these

countries need, and can use effectively, $3-4 billion in external assistance.

The U. N. Development Decade, inaugurated in 1961, has as its goal a 5% annual growth rate for the less-developed countries. In order to achieve this rate -- and, believe me, such a rate of increase will still leave the less-developed countries in a position of poverty -- there would have to be a very substantial increase in external financial assistance or in the export earnings of these countries. The gap between their prospective earnings on the one hand, and the imports and debt service payments on the other, has been estimated by the U. N. Secretariat to be $20 billion a year by the end of the decade, if these countries are to grow at 5% per year. Contrast that with the total aid by all countries which the less-developed countries are currently receiving: $10 billion. Unless aid is substantially increased or the less-developed countries can dramatically increase their export earnings, they will fall far short of even the 5% per year growth target.

The question of debt service charges alone is a serious one. These involve the interest and principal repayment on past loans. The total external debt of the less-developed countries has risen in the past ten years from $10 to $33 billion. The annual debt service charges have risen even faster over this period: from $800 million to $3.5 billion. With such a burden of external debt, there is a very real possibility that a number of the underdeveloped countries will find themselves in the preverse situation of paying out more to the rich countries in debt service than they are receiving in aid.

These few statistics offer a glimpse of the magnitude of the problem that we face. What must be done?

Clearly what we are doing is not enough either in terms of quantities involved or the way in which we, the rich countries, are going about the job. ~~The problem is, of course, basically and fundamentally a problem of how the developing countries can acquire sufficient external resources to promote their economic development and growth.~~ It is not only a problem of capital, as important and critical as outside

capital is. The problem involves the whole spectrum of policies both on the part of the rich countries as well as on the part of the poor. For economic development is nothing less than a process involving the transformation of the societies and economies of the developing world both internally and in their relationships with the rest of the world. And it is true that this process cannot be successful unless the less-developed countries themselves are committed to this end and are willing to undertake the difficult and complicated decisions which will involve the very fabric of their society.

A special responsibility clearly devolves on the rich nations and it is the rich nations to whom the underdeveloped countries must look for financial assistance; it is the rich countries that have created in large measure the world economic, political, and social environment in which the underdeveloped countries must find their place.

One of the first requirements is that the advanced countries maintain high levels of economic activity and rapid economic growth. Clearly

they would do this in their own self-interest, but it is also vitally important to the less-developed countries. The advanced countries represent the principal markets for the products of the less-developed countries. As the less-developed countries develop their economies, they will need new and growing markets for their goods in order to make their own economic development viable and sustaining. They must find ready access to these markets. High levels of demand will mean higher prices for the basic products which the less-developed countries export and which constitute a major source of their foreign exchange income. We can hope further, that the richer the rich nations become the more generous they will be in providing development capital.

~~On this count the~~ record of the advanced countries has been good. And the performance of the U.S. in recent years has been even better.

From 1953 to 1960 the economic growth rate in the U S. averaged 2.4% per year, half of that recorded in Western Europe. Since 1961 it has averaged 5%, better than the European performance. And our GNP

over this brief span has risen by 35%.

The Western world has, I have noted, succeeded in learning the lessons of its own experience. They have avoided the economic crises, the disarray, the disorganization of the world market place which characterized so much of the interwar period. There has been an important measure of constructive cooperation and intelligent planning in the postwar period. Important strides have been taken in trade liberalization and tariff reduction, and the liberalization of financial and monetary affairs.

A good deal of the credit for the reconstruction of the economies of the advanced countries is, of course, attributable to the Marshall Plan which Winston Churchill characterized as "the most unsordid act in human history." An important contributing factor was the ability and willingness of the aid-recipient countries to organize their affairs and cooperate in the most effective use of this aid.

There is a lesson that we can learn from this experience of the

Marshall Plan as it bears on the less-developed countries. There is also a lesson that we are too willing to learn -- but which is basically invalid. The lesson not to be learned is that we can duplicate the experience of the Marshall Plan and its success in the case of the less-developed countries. This cannot be accomplished because the basic elements of the situation are dramatically different. The less-developed countries did not have a history of once being rich and then made poor by catastrophe of war. Their history is one of grinding poverty. They lack the human resources, the skills, the knowledge and technical or institutional apparatus which, next to capital, are the most important factors in economic development and growth.

The lesson to be learned from the Marshall Plan experience is one cooperation -- cooperation between donor and recipient and between recipients. Of building institutions through which cooperative activity and responsible behavior could be assured. Of recognizing the elemental fact that the problem of development or reconstruction was not simply one

of a flow of aid, but involved a whole spectrum of economic, financial, trade and other activities and interrelationships.

We need to learn this lesson well if the long process of economic development of the poor countries is to produce durable results. And the rich nations, in particular, must each recognize that each has responsibility; each must carry his share of the burden as a member of this world community. And all must respect the autonomy and integrity of the poor nations, for a durable relation between the rich and poor cannot be built on the dominion or hegemony of the rich. The rich must not seek to make the poor client states or satellites, but partners in progress and freedom.

There are many things that the rich countries must do --

-- increase the flow of capital. The rich countries should levy, as it were, a tax on themselves in proportion to their income, such as any civilized community does internally. There should, in short, be a system for guaranteeing an equitable sharing of the burden

of financial assistance.

-- in view of the debt service burden, aid should be given on the most liberal terms possible: grants, whenever possible, and loans at low interest rates and with long maturities.

-- aid should be untied, that is, recipients should be free to spend it wherever they want in order to get the most for the money. Today, tying of aid is virtually universal owing to balance of payments problems. But this means that aid buys about 20% less than it would if untied. If the rich countries would improve the workings of the international monetary system, the need for tying would be reduced.

-- financial assistance should be channeled increasingly through multilateral channels. The relations between donor and recipient is never an easy one and the use of international channels would reduce the tensions that can arise. Multilateral aid-giving also makes it easier to apply more rigorous standards of performance on the recipient countries. At the same time, the

recipient countries would be able to receive longer-term commitments of assistance than are now possible.

-- aid-giving, whether loans and grants, should be more flexible and geared to the total development needs and performance of the recipient countries. ~~There should be less tying of aid to specific projects~~. Assistance should be given, for example, to offset fluctuations in foreign exchange income of the developing countries attributable to the volatility of the prices of the basic materials they export.

-- increasing emphasis must be put on developing markets in the ~~markets of the~~ advanced countries for the products of the developing countries. This means that trade must be liberalized and that tariff and other barriers be reduced and eliminated. A successful Kennedy Round would help immensely; not only does it mean a massive reduction in trade barriers on the part of the major trading countries, but also, for the first time in international trade negotiations, the less-developed countries are

not being asked to reciprocate the tariff reductions made in the interest of their trade. But even a successful Kennedy Round is only a beginning, vital as that beginning is. There must be a growing awareness of the importance of trade expansion for economic development and that awareness must be matched by action. Investment in economic development will not bear fruit unless the less-developed countries can increasingly earn their way through expanded trade. And trade is the only durable way they can acquire external resources for their development while reducing dependence on aid.

Protectionism in the developed countries tends to hit at the exports of the developing countries with particular severity. The light manufactures which the new industries of the developing countries must increasingly export represent the weakest and most protected industries in the advanced countries. One direction we can move to a solution is by wider and more imaginative use of direct adjustment assistance to the industries which

are affected -- a policy pioneered in the Trade Expansion Act of 1962.

These are some of the steps which I believe we, the rich countries, must take. The steps will be easier if we all walk together. For the arithmetic of politics is such that the whole of our effort and performance will be greater than the sum of the individual parts. It will be easier to liberalize trade, increase and liberalize aid, if we all do it together.

The task is infinitely more difficult for the poor nations themselves; what the rich do is marginal to the efforts of the less-developed countries themselves. Make no mistake about it. Economic development is a long and hard process. It is a disturbing one, fraught with difficulties and with challenges to the existing order, to the social structure, to age-old customs and habits, and to prevailing institutions. Not all governments of the less-developed countries want economic development and not all are capable of it.

Even those committed to progress act in ways that are inimical to their own growth and development. They often suffer a surfeit of

nationalism, although this understandable for new nations. They often pursue policies of autarchy and protection which results in the waste of precious resources and makes more difficult the inevitable adaptation to living in the world economy. They neglect agricultural development in favor of the will-of-the-wisp of flashy and uneconomical industrialization. They often resist change in land tenure practices and other social arrangements which are the enemies of social progress and democratization. They too often display a suspicion of the motives of the advanced countries and of capitalistic enterprise, which can be a formidable barrier to working out patterns of constructive cooperation.

But though there are many difficulties and the road will not be smooth, we must get on with the job. We delude ourselves if we expect quick and easy returns or instant tranquility. Nor can we expect popularity and acclaim for our efforts.

We must look rather for results and these over the long term. Results in terms of greater commitment on the part of the less-developed countries to their own economic and social progress, to nation-building,

to a better and fuller life, to becoming contributing members of a society of free nations.

We will need staying power. We face a political and diplomatic challenge of the highest order. This is the "new diplomacy." To conduct it in the years ahead will call on our best talents, for it is a diplomacy of expertise -- for professionals, the trained and the dedicated. As President Johnson reminded us at Princeton, the line between the scholar and statesman is becoming vaguer and less relevant and nowhere is this more true than with regard to the requirements of the new diplomacy.

Neither peace nor progress are goals of which it can be said that, once achieved, they will endure forever. No, neither can be achieved unless each is striven for continuously. It is a quest that will never end so long as civilized man holds these goals dear. They will challenge each generation and the challenge will take new forms and new guises taxing the imagination of each generation afresh. But what worthier goals can we have? For in seeking them, we not only gain something

precious and rare, but we also challenge ourselves to do our best. We are spurred to accomplishment and to the use of those talents and resources which are the hallmarks of civilized men.

2/5
Human Rights

ASSISTANT SECRETARY OF STATE
WASHINGTON

February 4, 1965

Dear John:

Here is my file copy of the speech draft of last October. The proposals on pages 11-20 may be worth considering in connection with the February 18 speech.

The proposal for a United Nations High Commissioner for Human Rights is described on pages 260-262 of my book. You might also have a look at the call for cooperation in the management of world resources on pages 138-39.

Please let me know if there is anything further I can do to help.

Sincerely,

Dick

Richard N. Gardner
Deputy Assistant Secretary of State
for International Organization Affairs

Mr. John E. Rielly,
Foreign Policy Assistant to
Vice President Humphrey,
United States Senate.

SPEECH ON THE UNITED NATIONS FOR SENATOR HUMPHREY

Drafted by: Richard N. Gardner

The central question in this campaign is which party can supply the responsible, experienced, mature leadership which the United States needs to meet the difficult issues facing it at home and abroad.

The best way to answer this question is to look at the record of the candidates on these fundamental issues -- and there is no more fundamental issue than the issue of peace and how we can work for peace by strengthening the United Nations.

Where does the Republican candidate for President stand on the peace issue?

He has been telling us for weeks that the way to make peace is to spend more money for war -- and to threaten our adversaries with nuclear annihilation if they don't do things our way.

He hasn't had one single constructive thing to say about how to build a just and lasting peace through cooperation with ohher nations.

Now let me make one thing absolutely clear; There is no issue in this campaign about the need to maintain the military

strength

strength of the United States and the determination to use it in the face of Communist aggression.

The strengthening of our national defense has been a major accomplishment of the Administration of John F. Kennedy and Lyndon B. Johnson. We have remedied the grave deficiencies which we found in 1960: we have built an invunerable nuclear deterrent, greatly expanded our capacity for limited war, and accelerated research to help insure that we are the first to obtain the weapons of the future.

We have also demonstrated our determination to use our armed strength to defend freedom. We have done so in Berlin, in the Cuban missile crisis, and in the Gulf of Tonkin. We shall do so elsewhere if need be.

So there is <u>no</u> issue in this campaign on the need for an adequate military defense and the will to use it. There <u>is</u> an issue about whether peace can be won by arms alone. On this issue the ideas of the Republican candidate are dangerously incomplete. He thinks that peace can be won by arms alone. This was a benighted view at any time in history; it is the height of folly in the nuclear age.

It is time that Senator Goldwater faced up to facts that every informed American understands:

-- That

-- That both the Soviet Union and the United States now possess individual nuclear weapons which can cause more destruction than was wrought by all the wars in previous history.

-- That no matter how many weapons we or the Russians may build both sides would be devastated in a nuclear exchange.

-- And that the danger of war by accident or miscalculation is going to grow as nuclear stockpiles grow -- particularly if nothing is done to prevent the spread of these stockpiles to the independent national control of additional countries.

In these circumstances, the indefinite continuation of the arms race without effective efforts to build the foundations of peace is a recipe for oblivion.

In these circumstances, the only rational course for civilized man is to build some civilized system of collective security through practical forms of international cooperation.

This is why the United Nations is so important. We know the UN is not perfect. But it is the best instrument man has yet devised to help assure the survival and freedom and welfare of nations in this dangerous age.

The UN has demonstrated its value in many ways -- in containing bush-fire wars which would escalate into a nuclear

holocaust

holocaust, in encouraging peaceful settlement and peaceful change, in providing a channel of negotiation with Communist and other countries, in assisting less developed countries in their efforts toward higher living standards, and in promoting cooperation in technical areas of direct benefit to all nations.

I.

It should therefore be ovious that the strengthening of the United Nations as an instrument for peace and welfare should be a central purpose of United States foreign policy.

It is obvious to almost everyone -- except Senator Goldwater. His views on the United Nations vary with his audience, with the time of the year, and with the political cycle.

I have looked carefully at the record of what the Republican candidate has to say on the United Nations. I submit that no one can look at this record and know where Senator Goldwater really stands.

Sometimes Senator Goldwater says that the United States should get out of the United Nations:

-- In December 1961 he said, "the United States no longer has a place in the United Nations."

-- In March 1962 he said, "I just can't see any sense in keeping on in it."

-- In

-- In May of this year, he said, "Frankly, I think the fact that it's proven to be this unworkable is grounds enough for us to quit wasting our money on it."

-- On this same occasion he was asked whether he favored withdrawing from the United Nations. He answered: "I would, at this bet, having seen what the United Nations cannot do, I would have to suggest it."

At other times, Senator Goldwater says it may be all right for us to stay in the United Nations -- but we should realize that the UN is only a debating society.

In January of this year he said: "The UN is a discussion forum. Attempts to make more of it at this juncture actually weaken whatever good purposes it can serve."

This, of course, is exactly Premier Khrushchev's position -- that the United Nations should be kept as a place for discussion but do as little as possible in peacekeeping and nation-building.

Perhaps someone pointed this out to the Republican candidate, because in a recent campaign document he is quoted as saying: "The United Nations today is not all it should be. Even so, it is a useful forum. It can still provide machinery for valuable conciliation among nations. But I want to see the UN do more."

Well,

Well, my friends, just to confuse matters further, Senator Goldwater has now come up with still another position on the United Nations. Believe it or not, he now says this Administration has treated the UN as a "sacred cow" and is not doing enough to strengthen it!

Well, Senator Goldwater is not only inconsistent -- he is also just plain wrong.

He was wrong in saying the United States should withdraw from the United Nations. We all know the UN is not perfect -- but it is playing an important part in promoting the peace and welfare of nations in this dangerous age. The American people understand this, and it is time that Senator Goldwater did too.

He was wrong in saying the UN is only a debating society. I fail to understand how any informed person can say this when the UN has played a major part in dealing with 13 different threats to international peace in the last 19 years -- when at this very moment UN troops are struggling to prevent a war between Greece and Turkey over the island of Cyprus -- and when more than four-fifths of the men and money of the United Nations system is working for economic and social progress around the world. In these instances the role played by the UN served the national interests of the United States and the cause of peace.

He was

He was also wrong in ignoring the unprecedented efforts made by this Administration to strengthen the United Nations as an instrument of American foreign policy.

Under the leadership of Lyndon B. Johnson and John F. Kennedy our country has developed more creative ideas for promoting the welfare of our citizens and the citizens of other countries through the United Nations system than in any comparable period in our history:

-- We have developed concrete proposals for building up UN peacekeeping machinery as an essential part of progress toward disarmament.

-- We have proposed the advance earmarking and training of national military contingents to enable the UN to deal more effectively with peacekeeping emergencies.

-- We have supported new procedures for the initiation and financing of peacekeeping operations giviing a greater voice to the large and middle powers.

-- We have pressed for collective responsibility in UN financing and theapplication of the rule providing for loss of vote to countries more than two years in arrears in payment of their assessed contributions.

-- We have made proposals for the peaceful settlement of disputes through mediation, conciliation and adjudication.

-- We have

-- We have launched a new program to recruit able Americans for key posts in international organizations.

-- And we have increased our efforts to assure the efficiency and integrity of the international secretariats.

But our initiatives have not only been directed at strengthening UN peacekeeping and UN administration. We have also taken leadership in the UN and elsewhere in establishing new programs of economic cooperation to promote the welfare of our own people and the people of other countries:

-- We have sponsored the World Food Program to help use the food abundance of the industrialized countries to stimulate economic development in less developed areas.

-- We have helped launch a world weather watch through the World Meteorological Organization to bring better weather forecasts to the people of the world.

-- We have undertaken international arrangements to establish a global satellite system for telephone, television, and data transmission which will promote world commerce and understanding.

-- We have joined with other nations in extending the safeguards of the International Atomic Energy Agency against the diversion of nuclear fuels from peaceful reactors to military purposes.

-- We have

-- We have helped organize a worldwide warning system through the World Health Organization to protect people everywhere against the use of dangerous drugs such as thalidomide.

-- We have initiated through the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade the most ambitious effort ever undertaken to clear the channels of international commerce.

-- We have ~~mm~~ expanded the role of international agencies such as the International Bank and the International Development Association in supplying capital for sound projects in less developed countries.

-- And we have inaugurated steps to improve the world monetary system and strengthen international cooperation in defense of the dollar and other key currencies.

II.

But this Administration does not intend to rest upon the record of the past. The challenges facing the nations of the world are so serious -- so urgent -- so complex -- that we cannot afford to be satisfied with previous accomplishments.

We must do still more in the future to strengthen the United Nations and the whole structure of international cooperation.

cooperation. Our national interest requires it -- and so does the enlightened self-interest of every nation.

The United Nations has designated 1965 -- its twentieth anniversary -- as International Cooperation Year. President Johnson has asked that this great occasion be dedicated to new efforts at practical international cooperation. "I propose," he said, "to dedicate this year to finding new techniques for making man's knowledge serve man's welfare...to call upon all the resources of this nation -- public and private -- to work with other nations to find new methods of improving the life of man."

On Friday of this past week, the President called two hundred distinguished Americans to the White House to launch our participation in the International Cooperation Year. And he directed the Executive departments to work with the leading private organizations of our country in developing new proposlas to advance the peace and welfare of nations.

Under the leadership of the Democratic party, the Executive Branch and the Congress will intensify their study of new ways to strengthen international cooperation.

Under the leadership of the Democratic party, the Executive Branch will call upon every interested citizen to help. No

idea will

idea will be too new, too bold, too courageous, to receive a fair hearing. Every idea will be considered on its practical merits.

I do not want to anticipate the outcome of this great national re-dedication to the cause of peace among men. But I do believe that there are certain essential steps which the United States should propose in the councils of nations if the International Cooperation Year is to be what it should be -- a year in which the United Nations and other international organizations move on to new responsibility and new strength:

First, we should reach agreement promptly on improved procedures for the initiation and financing of peacekeeping operations.

The United Nations cannot fulfill its peacekeeping responsibilities if it can be frustrated by a Soviet veto. We must therefore preserve the authority of the General Assembly to launch peacekeeping operations in the event that the Security Council is unable to act. We must also preserve the power of the Assembly to assess the members to pay for such operations.

At the same time, U.N. procedures for initiating and financing peacekeeping operations should be adapted in the

light of

light of the expanding membership of the General Assembly and the need to insure that decisions governing these operations take due account of the different responsibilities which members have for supporting them.

The solution to this problem will not be found -- as the Republican platform suggests -- by amending the U.N. Charter to provide for weighted voting to take account of population disparities. The principle consequence would be to increase the relative influence of the Communist countries in the U.N.

The establishment of any weighted voting system would require Charter amendment -- and therefore approval not only by the Soviet Union and other permanent members of the Security Council but also by two-thirds of the members of the General Assembly. So there is little possibility of getting the necessary agreement for a weighted voting formula -- certainly not for one which would adequately serve United States interests.

The only practical consequence of calling the Charter review conference proposed in the Republican platform to negotiate a weighted voting formula would be to privide a golden opportunity for the Communist countries and others to

press

press for Charter amendments diminishing the powers the U.N. has developed under its existing Charter during the last twenty years -- powers which have generally promoted our foreign policy objectives.

The practical way to improve U.N. peacekeeping procedures does not lie in Charter amendment. It lies in the adopting of proposals along the lines of those which the United States has now submitted to a working group of twenty-one countries at U.N. headquarters.

These proposals provide that the General Assembly would initiate a major peacekeeping operation involving military forces only after it had been discussed in the Security Council and the Council had been unable to act upon it.

They would also provide that financial assessments for peacekeeping operations would have to be recommended to the Assembly by a special committee in which the large and middle powers would have a greater proportionate representation than they have in the Assembly as a whole.

I believe the United States should press for agreement along these lines at the forthcoming General Assembly. For this approach

this approach takes reasonable account of the legitimate interests of all members -- large and small, East and West -- in strengthening the U.N.'s capacity to keep the peace.

Of course, our efforts to reach agreement on these procedures must be accompanied by efforts to deal with the U.N.'s present financial crisis.

Certainly the United States and other members of the United Nations cannot regard any agreement on future arrangements as satisfactory unless past obligations are discharged in accordance with the Charter. But if we can agree on improved procedures for the future, we should be able to settle our disputes about the past.

Second, we should complete arrangements to give the United Nations a flexible call-up system for future peacekeeping emergencies.

The U.N. cannot do its peacekeeping job if there are long delays in getting U.N. forces to world trouble spots. The U.N. cannot do its job if the national forces sent to these trouble spots lack the necessary training in international peacekeeping assignments.

I am

I am pleased that the Secretary-General of the U.N. has called upon members to train and maintain in readiness special forces for use in future emergencies. I am pleased that our Delegation to the United Nations has supported this initiative, and I congratulate those countries that have responded by agreeing to earmark and train units for U.N. use -- Canada, Denmark, Norway, Sweden, Finland, the Netherlands, and Iran.

During International Cooperation Year I hope that many more U.N. members will follow the example of these countries. To make the U.N.'s call-up system fully effective, it should have units available from Latin America, Africa, and Asia.

I believe the United States should respond to requests to support this strengthening of the U.N.'s peacekeeping capacity by helping to train and equip contingents of other nations earmarked for U.N. use -- by transporting these units when necessary -- and by paying our fair share of the cost of peacekeeping operations.

Third, we should take steps not to develop an effective United Nations mediation and conciliation service.

We have learned the value here at home of having a panel of distinguished citizens available at a moment's notice to deal with

deal with labor disputes which threaten our economy. Why should the United Nations not have a similar panel to deal with disputes that threaten world peace?

I believe the Secretary-General should have a panel of distinguished statesmen at his disposal to deal with disputes before they break out into international violence.

The experience of the U.N. has demonstrated the value of mediation and conciliation by the Secretary-General and those acting upon his behalf. We recall with gratitude the heroic efforts of men like Ralph Bunche in the Holy Land, of Ellsworth Bunker in West New Guinea, and of the late Sakari Tuomioja in Cyprus.

We need more such men in the service of the United Nations. Men of this kind exist -- but only too often they are not known to the U.N. -- or are not sufficiently experienced in U.N. diplomacy.

Fourth,

Fourth, the UN should be given better resources for fact-finding and observation.

For years I have urged the use of observers who could serve as the "eyes and ears" of the United Nations.

In many of today's trouble spots, the members of the United Nations lack authoritative and up-to-date information about the real situation. They have before them only the conflicting claims of the interested parties.

It would be a great service to the cause of peace if the UN had better facilities for information and fact-finding. The potentiality of such services has been clearly demonstrated on numerous occasions, as in the UN mission which verified that the new state of Malaysia had the support of the inhabitants of its various territories.

Of course, UN observers should not be sent to any country without its consent -- except in the rare case of enforcement action by the Security Council.

But the mere existence of adequate arrangements which could bring UN observers at a moment's notice to verify the facts at any place in the world would make it harder for members to cover up the truth. Any nation that denied access to such a group would be inviting the members of the United Nations to draw the logical conclusions.

Fifth,

Fifth, the United Nations should streamline and expand its economic development programs.

International Cooperation Year is a fitting occasion to merge the UN's principal programs of technical cooperation -- the Special Fund and the Expanded Program of Technical Assistance. These are now sufficiently similar that they should be carried forward under unified administration and management.

International Cooperation Year is a fitting occasion to enlarge the size of these programs beyond the $150 million established at the beginning of the Development Decade.

International Cooperation Year is also a fitting occasion to begin consideration of increasing the capital of the International Development Association -- the World Bank affiliate which makes loans on easy terms to less developed countries.

I believe that we should be able to move in the years ahead toward the increased use of multilateral aid. For the foreseeable future we must continue our bilateral program. But we should channel an increased proportion of our aid through international agencies whenever it is desirable -- and in support of programs and projects drawn up under international auspices.

Through increased use of multilateral aid we can:

-- help

-- help increase the contributions from other developed countries that can and should be doing more.

-- draw on a worldwide pool of technical personnel which is not available in the United States or in any single donor country.

-- facilitate self-help and reforms by those countries who prefer to receive aid through multilateral channels.

-- and strengthen the UN by binding its members more closely to it through ties of economic interest.

Sixth, we should focus the United Nations system more directly on the management of world réeources.

It is time that the members of the United Nations fully recognize and act upon their common interest in husbanding the resources of their common planet.

Effective measures to husband some resources can be taken by individual nations alone.

But other resources belong to no nation -- the air, the sea, international rivers, migratory animals. Their effective management requires international cooperation.

Moreover, even the management of resources within the territories of a single nation can benefit from the sharing of national experience.

Let us

Let us turn the United Nations system in International Cooperation Year to the unfinished business of world resource management -- to realizing the dramatic possibilities of desalting water through nuclear power -- to increasing the marine harvest to feed growing populations -- to avoiding the contamination of air and water with industrial wastes -- and to preserving disappearing wild life and natural areas.

In this way we can help to build the Great Society both at home and abroad. In our interdependent world we will not achieve the one without the other.

Seventh -- and last -- we should redouble our efforts to strengthen international machinery for the promotion of fundamental human rights.

The United Nations has been increasingly successful in dealing with two of its major purposes -- the promotion of peace and the promotion of economic development. But we must admit that it has been less successful in promoting its third purpose -- the promotion of individual human rights.

We must find some way to remedy this growing imbalance in United Nations activity. We must never forget that the ultimate objective we are seeking to promote is not just peace -- and not just higher living standards -- but justice and dignity and self-fulfillment for the individual human being.

And let

And let us remember also that the problem of freedom has not been solved by ending the colonial era. In many newly independent states individual rights are less secure than they were under colonial rule.

I believe that violations of basic human rights should be brought to the attention of the UN, whether in the form of anti-semitism in the Soviet Union, apartheid in South Africa, or the general deprivation of liberty in Communist or other societies.

Our own record in the United States is far from perfect. But -- unlike many members of the United Nations -- our national government is exerting every effort to fulfill its Charter obligations "to promote universal respect for, and observance of, human rights and fundamental freedoms for all without distinction as to race, sex, language, or religion."

III.

My friends, I pledge the Democratic Party to take these and other steps to strengthen the United Nations as a force for peace and welfare and human rights in the years ahead.

I pledge the Democratic Party to redouble our national efforts toward a decent world order for ourselves and our children.

The Democratic

The Democratic Party has supported the United Nations for 19 years. We have the leadership, the ideas, the experience to make the UN better than it is now.

This is not a job that can be entrusted to someone who is a Johnny-come-lately to support of the United Nations. It is not a job to be given someone who is ignorant of the facts, careless of details, and uncertain of his positions.

This Administration has a program for strengthening the United Nations. I think it is time that Senator Goldwater told the American people what his program is.

# # # #

OFFICE OF THE VICE PRESIDENT
WASHINGTON, D.C.

Dec. 9, 1966

Dear John:

Over to you, as per telephone conversation.

DCW

David C. Williams

Ad Hoc Committee on the Human Rights and Genocide Treaties

CHAIRMAN: THE REV. HERSCHEL HALBERT
VICE CHAIRMAN: DR. VERNON L. FERWERDA
SECRETARY: BETTY KAYE TAYLOR

25 EAST 78TH STREET • NEW YORK, N. Y. 10021 • LE 5-3700

November 28, 1966

Mr. David Williams
USIA/IOP
1750 Pennsylvania Avenue, N. W.
Washington, D. C.

Dear Mr. Williams:

I am pleased to send you the enclosed articles, fact sheets and booklets on the Human Rights and Genocide Treaties. I hope you will find these useful.

As you may know the Ad Hoc Committee, through its 50 national affiliates and 4 local committees, has been working for the past three years to build public support for U.S. ratification of the U.N. Conventions on Slavery, Forced Labor, Political Rights of Women, and Genocide. Within the next few weeks, our member organizations will decide if the Ad Hoc Committee is to broaden its purpose to include support of the new U.N. Convention on the Elimination of Racial Discrimination and others recommended for early ratification by the National Citizens Commission on Human Rights.

We are eager to keep in touch with the Vice-President's office, especially to receive advice and counsel as to what steps we might take to secure more active support from the administration. Your suggestions will be most welcome.

I look forward to receiving the text of the Vice-President's speech soon after its release date. If it will not place too much of a burden on your office, I would appreciate receiving 150 copies so that I may send these to our Executive Board and Advisory Committee.

Sincerely,

Betty Kaye Taylor

Betty Kaye Taylor
Executive Secretary

BKT:lm
Encs.

Bob Hess

Mike Cowles

Leonard Glass

Marshall Shulman

Fred Sparks
general policy

Reischauer - articles
Reischauer - Science
Harvard alumni

Minnesota
Historical Society

www.mnhs.org