



The Secretary of State

Speech

September 30, 1976
United Nations, N.Y.

Bureau of Public Affairs
Office of Media Services

TOWARD A NEW UNDERSTANDING OF COMMUNITY

Secretary Henry A. Kissinger before the 31st Session of the U.N. General Assembly.

Mr. President, Mr. Secretary General, Foreign Ministers, distinguished delegates:

Let me first congratulate this body for electing Ambassador [Hamilton Shirley] Amerasinghe of Sri Lanka to preside over this 31st Session of the General Assembly. He is a diplomat of great international stature who, among his many distinctions, has provided indispensable leadership to the crucial negotiations on the Law of the Sea.

I would also like to pay tribute to the Secretary General [Kurt Waldheim] for his tireless efforts on behalf of the world community. He successfully embodies the charter's principles of fairness, impartiality, and dedication to the causes of global peace and human dignity.

The United Nations was born of the conviction that peace is both indivisible and more than mere stability; that for peace to be lasting it must fulfill mankind's aspirations for justice, freedom, economic well-being, the rule of law, and the promotion of human rights. But the history of this organization has been in considerable measure the gradual awareness that humanity would not inevitably share a single approach to these goals.

The United Nations has survived—and helped to manage—30 years of vast change in the international system. It has come through the bitterness of the cold war. It has played a vital role in the dismantling of the colonial empires. It has helped moderate conflicts and is manning truce lines in critical parts of the world. It has carried out unprecedented efforts in such areas as public health, development assistance, and technical cooperation.

But the most important challenge of this organization lies still ahead: To vindicate mankind's positive and nobler goals and help nations achieve a new understanding of community.

With modern communications, human endeavor has become a single experience for peoples in every part of the planet. We share the wonders of science and technology, the trials of industrialization and social change, and a constant awareness of the fate and dreams of our fellow men.

The world has shrunk, but the nations of the world have not come closer together. Paradoxically nationalism has been on the rise at the precise time when the most serious issues we all face can only be resolved through a recognition of our interdependence. The moral and political cohesion of our world may be eroding just when a sense of community has become indispensable.

Fragmentation has affected even this body. Nations have taken decisions on a bloc or regional basis by rigid ideologies, before even listening to the debate in these halls; on many issues positions have been predetermined by prior conferences containing more than half the membership of the United Nations. The tendency is widespread to come here for battle rather than negotiation. If these trends continue, the hope for world community will dissipate and the moral influence of this organization will progressively diminish.

This would be a tragedy. Members of this organization are today engaged in a multiplicity of endeavors to find just solutions for complex and explosive problems. There is a fragile tranquility, but beneath the surface it is challenged by fundamental forces of change—technological, economic, social. More than ever this is a time for statecraft

and restraint, for persistence but also daring in the pursuit of peace and justice. The dogmas of perpetual strife produce only bloodshed and bitterness: They unleash the forces of destruction and repression and plant the seeds of future conflict. Appeals to hatred—whether on the basis of race or class or color or nationality or ideology—will, in the end, rebound against those who launch them and will not advance the cause of freedom and justice in the world.

Let us never forget that the United Nations benefits the smaller and weaker nations most of all. It is they that would suffer most from its failure. For without the rule of law, disputes will be settled as they have been all too frequently and painfully in history—by test of strength, it is not the weak that will prevail in the world of chaos.

The United States believes that this 31st General Assembly must free itself of the ideological and confrontational tactics that marked some of its predecessors and dedicate itself to a program of common action.

The United States comes to the General Assembly prepared to work on programs of common action. We will offer concrete proposals. We will listen to the ideas of others. We will resist pressure and seek cooperation.

Let me now discuss the three principal challenges we face—the problem of peace, the challenge of economic well-being, and the agenda of global interdependence.

The Problem of Peace

The age of the United Nations has also been an age of frequent conflict. We have been spared a third world war but cannot assume that this condition will prevail forever, or without exertion. An era of thermonuclear weapons and persistent national rivalries requires our utmost effort to keep at bay the scourge of war. Our generation must build out of the multitude of nations a structure of relations that frees the energies of nations and peoples for the positive endeavors of mankind, without the fear or threat of war.

Central to American foreign policy are our sister democracies—the industrial nations of North America, Western Europe, the southern Pacific and Japan, and our traditional friends in the Western Hemisphere. We are bound to these nations by the ties of history, civilization, culture, shared principles, and a generation of common endeavors.

Our alliances, founded on the bedrock of mutual security, now reach beyond the common defense to a range of new issues: The social challenges shared by advanced technological societies, common approaches to easing tensions with our adversaries, and shaping positive relations with the developing world. The common efforts of the industrial democracies are not directed at exclusive ends but as a bridge to a broader, more secure, and cooperative international system and to increasing freedom and prosperity for all nations.

The United States is proud of its historical friendships in the Western Hemisphere. In the modern era they must be—and are—based on equality and mutual benefit. We have a unique advantage: The great dialogue between the developed and developing nations can find its most creative solution in the hemisphere where modern democracy was born and where cooperation between developed and developing, large and small, is a longstanding tradition.

Throughout history, ideology and power have tempted nations to seek unilateral advantage. But the inescapable lesson of the nuclear age is that the politics of tests of strength has become incompatible with the survival of humanity. Traditional power politics becomes irrational when war can destroy civilized life and neither side can gain a decisive strategic advantage.

Accordingly the great nuclear powers have particular responsibilities for restraint and vision. They are in a position to know the full extent of the catastrophe which could overwhelm mankind. They must take care not to fuel disputes if they conduct their rivalries by traditional methods. If they turn local conflicts into aspects of a global competition, sooner or later their competition will get out of control.

The United States believes that the future of mankind requires coexistence with the Soviet Union. Tired slogans cannot obscure the necessity for a more constructive relationship. We will insist that restraint be reciprocal, not just in bilateral relations but around the globe. There can be no selective detente. We will maintain our defenses and our vigilance. But we know that tough rhetoric is not strength; that we owe future generations more hopeful prospects than a delicate equilibrium of awesome forces.

Peace requires a balance of strategic power. This the United States will maintain. But the Unit-

ed States is convinced that the goal of strategic balance is achievable more safely by agreement than through an arms race. The negotiations on the limitation of armaments are, therefore, at the heart of U.S.-Soviet relations.

Unprecedented agreements limiting and controlling nuclear weapons have been reached. An historical effort is being made to place a ceiling on the strategic arsenals of both sides in accordance with the Vladivostok accord. And once this is achieved we are ready to seek immediately to lower the levels of strategic arms.

The United States welcomes the recent progress that has been made in further curtailing nuclear weapons testing and in establishing a regime for peaceful nuclear explosions for the first time. The two treaties now signed and awaiting ratification should be the basis for further progress in this field.

Together with several of our European allies, we are continuing efforts to achieve a balanced reduction in the military forces facing each other in central Europe. In some respects this is the most complex negotiation on arms limitation yet undertaken. It is our hope that, through patient effort, reciprocal reductions will soon be achieved that enhance the security of all countries involved.

The United States remains committed to the work of the Geneva Disarmament Committee. We welcome the progress there on banning environmental modification for destructive purposes. We will seriously examine all ideas—of whatever origin—to reduce the burdens of armaments. We will advance our own initiatives not for purposes of propaganda or unilateral advantage but to promote peace and security for all.

But coexistence and negotiations on the control of arms do not take place in a vacuum. We have been disturbed by the continuing accumulation of armaments and by recent instances of military intervention to tip the scales in local conflicts on distant continents. We have noted crude attempts to distort the purposes of diplomacy and to impede hopeful progress toward peaceful solutions to complex issues. These efforts only foster tensions; they cannot be reconciled with the policy of improving relations.

And they will inevitably be resisted. For coexistence to be something better than an uneasy armistice, both sides must recognize that ideology and power politics today confront the realities of

the nuclear age and that a striving for unilateral advantages will not be accepted.

In recent years the new relationship between the United States and the People's Republic of China has held great significance for global security.

We came together out of necessity and a mutual belief that the world should remain free of military blackmail and the will to hegemony. We have set out a new path—in wide-ranging consultations, bilateral exchanges, the opening of offices in our respective capitals, and an accelerating movement toward normalization. And we have derived reciprocal benefits—a clear understanding of the aspirations of our peoples, better prospects for international equilibrium, reduced tensions in Asia, and increased opportunities for parallel actions on global issues.

These elements form the basis for a growing and lasting relationship founded on objective common interests. The United States is committed to strengthen the bonds between us and to proceed toward the normalization of our relations in strict conformity with the principles of the Shanghai Communique. As this process moves forward each side must display restraint and respect for the interests and convictions of the other. We will keep Chinese interests in mind on all international issues and will do our utmost to take account of them. But if the relationship is to prosper, there must be similar sensitivity to our views and concerns.

On this basis the progressive development of our relations with the world's most populous nation will be a key element of the foreign policy of the United States.

The world today is witness to continuing regional crises. Any one of them could blossom into larger conflict. Each one commands our most diligent efforts of conciliation and cooperation. The United States has played, and is prepared to continue to play, an active role in the search for peace in many areas—southern Africa, the Middle East, Korea, and Cyprus.

Racial injustice and the grudging retreat of colonial power have conspired to make southern Africa an acid test of the world's hope for peace and justice under the charter. A host of voices has been heard in this chamber warning that if we failed quickly to find solutions to the crises of Namibia and Rhodesia, that part of the globe could

become a vicious battleground with consequences for every part of the world.

I have just been to Africa at President Ford's request to see what we could do to help the peoples of that continent achieve their aspirations to freedom and justice.

An opportunity to pull back from the brink now exists. I believe that Africa has before it the prize for which it has struggled for so long—the opportunity for Africans to shape a future of peace, justice, racial harmony, and progress.

The United Nations, since its inception, has been concerned with the issue of Namibia. For 30 years that territory has been a test of this institution's ability to make its decisions effective.

In recent months the United States has vigorously sought to help the parties concerned speed up the process toward Namibian independence. The United States favors the following elements: The independence of Namibia with a fixed, short, time limit; the calling of a constitutional conference at a neutral location under U.N. aegis; and the participation in that conference of all authentic national forces including specifically SWAPO [South-West Africa People's Organization]. Progress has been made in achieving all of these goals. We will exert our efforts to remove the remaining obstacles and bring into being a conference which can then fashion, with good will and wisdom, a design for the new state of Namibia and its relationship with its neighbors. We pledge our continued solicitude for the independence of Namibia so that it may, in the end, be a proud achievement of this organization and a symbol of international cooperation.

Less than a week ago the Rhodesian authorities announced that they are prepared to meet with the nationalist leaders of Zimbabwe to form an interim government to bring about majority rule within two years. This is in itself an historical break from the past. The African Presidents, in calling for immediate negotiations, have shown that they are prepared to seize this opportunity for a settlement. And the Government of the United Kingdom, in expressing its willingness to assemble a conference, has shown its high sense of responsibility and concern for the rapid and just independence of Rhodesia.

Inevitably after a decade of strife, suspicions run deep. Many obstacles remain. Magnanimity is never easy and less so after a generation of bitter-

ness and racial conflict. But let us not lose sight of what has been achieved: A commitment to majority rule within two years; a commitment to form immediately a transitional government with an African majority in the cabinet and an African prime minister; a readiness to follow this with a constitutional conference to define the legal framework of an independent Zimbabwe.

The United States, together with other countries, has made major efforts, and we will continue to do what we can to support the hopeful process that is now possible. But it is those in Africa who must shape the future. The people of Rhodesia, and the neighboring states, now face a supreme challenge. Their ability to work together, their capacity to unify, will be tested in the months ahead as never before.

There may be some countries who see a chance for advantage in fueling the flames of war and racial hatred. But they are not motivated by concern for the peoples of Africa, or for peace. And if they succeed they could doom opportunities that might never return.

In South Africa itself, the pace of change accelerates. The system of apartheid, by whatever name, is a denial of our common humanity and a challenge to the conscience of mankind. Change is inevitable. The leaders of South Africa have shown wisdom in facilitating a peaceful solution in Rhodesia. The world community takes note of it and urges the same wisdom—while there is still time—to bring racial justice to South Africa.

As for the United States, we have become convinced that our values and our interests are best served by an Africa seeking its own destiny free of outside intervention. Therefore, we will back no faction whether in Rhodesia or elsewhere. We will not seek to impose solutions anywhere. The leadership and the future of an independent Zimbabwe, as for the rest of Africa, are for Africans to decide. The United States will abide by their decision. We call on all other non-African states to do likewise.

The United States wants no special position or sphere of influence. We respect African unity. The rivalry and interference of non-African powers would make a mockery of Africa's hard-won struggle for independence from foreign domination. It will inevitably be resisted. And it is a direct challenge to the most fundamental principles upon which the United Nations is founded.

Every nation that has signed the charter is

pledged to allow the nations of Africa—whose peoples have suffered so much—to fulfill at long last their dreams of independence, peace, unity, and human dignity in their own way and by their own decisions.

The United Nations, since its birth, has been involved in the chronic conflict in the Middle East. Each successive war has brought greater perils, an increased danger of great power confrontation, and more severe global economic dislocations.

At the request of the parties, the United States has been actively engaged in the search for peace in the Middle East. Since the 1973 war, statesmanship on all sides has produced unprecedented steps toward a resolution of this bitter conflict. There have been three agreements that lessen the danger of war; and mutual commitments have been made to pursue the negotiating process with urgency until a final peace is achieved. As a result, we are closer to the goal of peace than at any time in a generation.

The role of the United Nations has been crucial. The Geneva conference met in 1973 under its aegis, and the implementation of subsequent agreements has been negotiated in its working groups. Security Council resolutions form the only agreed framework for negotiations. The U.N. Emergency Force, Disengagement Observer Force, and Truce Supervision Organization are even now helping maintain peace on the truce lines. I want to compliment the Secretary General and his colleagues in New York, Geneva, and on the ground in the Middle East for their vigorous support of the peace process at critical moments.

The United States remains committed to help the parties reach a settlement. The step-by-step negotiations of the past three years have now brought us to a point where comprehensive solutions seem possible. The decision before us now is how the next phase of negotiations should be launched.

The United States is prepared to participate in an early resumption of the work of the Geneva conference. We think a preparatory conference might be useful for a discussion of the structure of future negotiations, but we are open to other suggestions. Whatever steps are taken must be carefully prepared so that once the process begins the nations concerned will advance steadily toward agreement.

The groundwork that has been laid represents

an historic opportunity. The United States will do all it can to assure that by the time this Assembly meets next year it will be possible to report significant further progress toward a just and lasting peace in the Middle East.

Since the General Assembly last met, overwhelming tragedy has befallen the people of Lebanon. The United States strongly supports the sovereignty, unity, and territorial integrity of that troubled country. We oppose partition. We hope that Lebanese affairs will soon be returned to the hands of the people of Lebanon. All members of the United Nations, and all the conflicting parties in Lebanon, have an obligation to support the efforts of the new President of Lebanon to restore peace and to turn energies to rebuilding the nation. And the agencies of the U.N. system can play an important role in the reconstruction effort.

The confrontation between North and South Korea remains a threat to international peace and stability. The vital interests of world powers intersect in Korea; conflict there inevitably threatens wider war.

We and many other U.N. members welcome the fact that a contentious and sterile debate on Korea will be avoided this fall. Let this opportunity be used, then, to address the central problem of how the Korean people can determine their future and achieve their ultimate goal of peaceful reunification without a renewal of armed conflict.

Our own views on the problem of Korea are well known. We have called for a resumption of a serious dialogue between North and South Korea. We have urged wider negotiations to promote security and reduce tensions. We are prepared to have the U.N. Command dissolved so long as the armistice agreement—which is the only existing legal arrangement committing the parties to keep the peace—is either preserved or replaced by more durable arrangements. We are willing to improve relations with North Korea, provided that its allies are ready to take similar steps toward the Republic of Korea. We are ready to talk with North Korea about the peninsula's future, but we will not do so without the participation of the Republic of Korea.

Last fall the United States proposed a conference including all the parties most directly concerned—North and South Korea, the United States, and the People's Republic of China—to discuss ways of adapting the armistice agreement to new

conditions and replacing it with more permanent arrangements. On July 22, I stated our readiness to meet immediately with these parties to consider the appropriate venue for such a conference. I reaffirm that readiness here today.

If such a conference proves impracticable right now, the United States would support a phased approach. Preliminary talks between North and South Korea, including discussions on the venue and scope of the conferences, could start immediately. In this phase the United States and the People's Republic of China could participate as observers or in an advisory role. If such discussions yielded concrete results, the United States and China could join the talks formally. This, in turn, could set the stage for a wider conference in which other countries could associate themselves with arrangements that guarantee a durable peace on the peninsula.

We hope that North Korea and other concerned parties will respond affirmatively to this proposed procedure or offer a constructive alternative suggestion.

The world community is deeply concerned over the continuing stalemate on the Cyprus problem.

Domestic pressures, nationalistic objectives, and international rivalries have combined to block the parties from taking even the most elementary steps toward a solution. On those few occasions when representatives of the two Cypriot communities have come together, they have fallen into inconclusive procedural disputes. The passage of time has served only to complicate domestic difficulties and to diminish the possibilities for constructive conciliation. The danger of conflict between Greece and Turkey has spread to other issues, as we have recently seen in the Aegean.

All concerned need to focus on committing themselves to achieve the overriding objectives—assuring the well-being of the suffering Cypriot people and peace in the eastern Mediterranean.

A settlement must come from the Cypriot communities themselves. It is they who must decide how their island's economy, society, and government shall be reconstructed. It is they who must decide the ultimate relationship of the two communities and the territorial extent of each area.

The United States is ready to assist in restoring momentum to the negotiating process. We believe that agreeing to a set of principles might

help the parties to resume negotiations. We would suggest some concepts along the following lines:

- A settlement should preserve the independence, sovereignty, and territorial integrity of Cyprus;
- The present dividing lines on Cyprus must be adjusted to reduce the area currently controlled by the Turkish side;
- The territorial arrangement should take into account the economic requirements and humanitarian concerns of the two Cypriot communities, including the plight of those who remain refugees;
- A constitutional arrangement should provide conditions under which the two Cypriot communities can live in freedom and have a large voice in their own affairs; and
- Security arrangements should be agreed to that permit the withdrawal of foreign military forces other than those present under international agreement.

I have discussed this approach with the Secretary General and with several Western European leaders. In the days ahead the United States will consult along these lines with all interested parties. In the meantime we urge the Secretary General to continue his dedicated efforts.

Economic Development and Progress

The economic division of our planet between the Northern and Southern Hemispheres, between the industrial and developing nations, is a dominant issue of our time. Our mutual dependence for our prosperity is a reality, not a slogan. It should summon our best efforts to make common progress. We must commit ourselves to bring mankind's dreams of a better life to closer reality in our lifetime.

There are many reasons why cooperation has not made greater strides.

- The industrial democracies have sometimes been more willing to pay lip service to the challenge of development than to match rhetoric with real resources.

- The oil-producing nations command great wealth, and some have been generous in their contribution to international development. But the overall performance in putting that wealth to positive uses has been inadequate to the challenge.

- The countries with nonmarket economies are quite prepared to undertake verbal assaults, but their performance is in inverse ratio to their rhetoric. Their real contribution to development assistance has been minimal. Last year, for example, the nonmarket economies provided only about four percent of the public aid flowing to the developing nations.

- The developing nations are understandably frustrated and impatient with poverty, illiteracy, and disease. But too often they have made demands for change that are as confrontational as they are unrealistic. They sometimes speak of new economic orders as if growth were a quick fix requiring only that the world's wealth be properly redistributed through tests of strength instead of a process of self-help over generations. Ultimately such tactics lose more than they gain, for they undermine the popular support in the industrial democracies which is imperative to provide the resources and market access—available nowhere else—to sustain development.

The objectives of the developing nations are clear—a rapid rise in the incomes of their people; a greater role in the international decisions which affect them; and fair access to the world's economic opportunities.

The objectives of the industrial nations are equally plain—an efficient and open system of world trade and investment; expanding opportunities and production for both North and South; the reliable and equitable development of the world's resources of food, energy, and raw materials; a world economy in which prosperity is as close to universal as our imagination and our energies allow.

These goals are complementary. Indeed they must be, for neither side can achieve its aims at the expense of the other. They can be realized only through cooperation.

We took a major step forward together a year ago, at the Seventh Special Session of this Assembly. And we have since followed through on many fronts.

- We have taken steps to protect the economic security of developing nations against cyclical financial disaster. The newly expanded compensatory finance facility of the International Monetary Fund has disbursed over \$2 billion to developing nations this year alone.

- An IMF Trust Fund, financed by gold sales, has been established for the benefit of the low-income countries.

- Replenishments for the World Bank, the Inter-American Development Bank, and the Asian Development Bank will provide additional resources for development.

- Worldwide food aid has expanded. We have committed ourselves to expand the world supply of food. With a U.S. contribution of \$200 million, we have brought the International Fund for Agricultural Development close to operation.

- The major industrial nations have moved to expand trade opportunities for the developing world. We have joined in a solemn pledge to complete by next year the liberalization of world trade through the Tokyo round of multilateral trade negotiations. For its part, the United States has established a system of generalized preferences which has stimulated billions in exports from developing nations to the United States in 1975.

The United States continued this process by putting forward a number of new proposals at the Fourth Ministerial U.N. Conference on Trade and Development in May 1976. We proposed a comprehensive plan to improve the capacity of the developing countries to select, adapt, improve, and manage technology for development. We committed ourselves to improvements in the quality of aid, proposing that a greater proportion of aid to poor countries be on a grant basis and united to purchases from donor nations. We agreed to a serious effort to improve markets of 18 basic commodities.

These measures undertaken since we met here just a year ago assist—not with rhetoric and promises but in practical and concrete ways—the peoples of the world who are struggling to throw off the chains of poverty. Much remains to be done.

First, the application of science and technology is at the very heart of the development process. The United States, conscious of its pioneering role in technology, has put forward three basic principles, which we will support with funds and talent:

- To train individuals who can identify, select, and manage the future technology of the developing world;

- To build both national and international institutions to create indigenous technology, as well as adapt foreign designs and inventions; and

- To spur the private sector to make its maximum contribution to the development and transfer of technological progress.

To achieve these goals, we are today extending an invitation to the World Conference on Science and Technology for Development, now scheduled for 1979, to meet in this country. In preparation for that meeting, we have asked members of the industrial, academic, and professional scientific communities throughout the United States to meet in Washington in November. They will review the important initiatives this country can take to expand the technological base for development, and they will strive to develop new approaches.

Second, the ministerial meeting of the Conference on International Economic Cooperation in Paris should be given new impetus. We are making several new proposals:

- We will seek to help nations facing severe debt burdens. For acute cases we will propose guidelines for debt renegotiation. For countries facing longer term problems, we will propose systematic examination of remedial measures, including increased aid.
- We will advance new ideas for expanded cooperation in energy, including a regular process of information exchange among energy producers and users and an expanded transfer of energy-related technology to energy-poor developing nations.

Third, the industrial democracies have been far too willing to wait for the demands of the developing countries rather than to advance their own proposals. Now, however, the OECD [Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development] countries, at the suggestion of the United States, have agreed to examine long-range development planning and to develop a more coherent and comprehensive approach to global growth and economic justice.

Fourth, natural disaster each year takes thousands of lives and costs billions of dollars. It strikes most those who can afford it the least—the poorest peoples of the world. Its toll is magnified by a large array of global issues—overpopulation, food scarcity, damage to the ecology, and economic underdevelopment. The United Nations has a unique capacity to address these global concerns and thus

improve man's odds against nature. We urge this body to take the lead in strengthening international cooperation to prevent and alleviate natural calamity.

Our dream is that all the children of the world can live with hope and widening opportunity. No nation can accomplish this alone; no group of nations can achieve it through confrontation. But together there is a chance for major progress—and in our generation.

Interdependence and Community

It is an irony of our time that an age of ideological and nationalistic rivalry has spawned as well a host of challenges that no nation can possibly solve by itself.

- The proliferation of nuclear weapons capacities adds a new dimension of danger to political conflicts, regionally and globally.
- As technology opens up the oceans, conflicting national claims and interests threaten chaos.
- Man's inventiveness has developed the horrible new tool of terror that claims innocent victims on every continent.
- Human and civil rights are widely abused and have now become an accepted concern of the world community.

Let me set forth the U.S. position on these topics.

The growing danger of the proliferation of nuclear weapons raises stark questions about man's ability to insure his very existence.

We have lived through three perilous decades in which the catastrophe of nuclear war has been avoided despite a strategic rivalry between a relatively few nations.

But now, a wholly new situation impends. Many nations have the potential to build nuclear weapons. If this potential were to materialize, threats to use nuclear weapons, fed by mutually reinforcing misconceptions, could become a recurrent feature of local conflicts in every quarter of the globe. And there will be growing dangers of accidents, blackmail, theft, and nuclear terrorism.

Unless current trends are altered rapidly, the likelihood of nuclear devastation could grow steadily in the years to come.

We must look first to the roots of the problem;

- Since the 1973 energy crisis and drastic rise in oil prices, both developed and developing nations have seen in nuclear energy a means both of lowering the cost of electricity and of reducing reliance upon imported petroleum.

- In an age of growing nationalism some see the acquisition and expansion of nuclear power as symbols of enhanced national prestige. And it is also clear that some nations, in attaining this peaceful technology, may wish to provide for themselves a future option to acquire nuclear weapons.

A nation that acquires the potential for a nuclear weapons capability must accept the consequences of its action. It is bound to trigger offsetting actions by its neighbors and stimulate broader proliferation, thereby accelerating a process that ultimately will undermine its own security. And it is disingenuous to label as "peaceful" nuclear devices which palpably are capable of massive military destruction. The spread of nuclear reactor and fuel cycle capabilities, especially in the absence of evident economic need and combined with ambiguous political and military motives, threatens to proliferate nuclear weapons with all their dangers.

Time is of the essence. In no area of international concern does the future of this planet depend more directly upon what this generation elects to do—or fails to do. We must move on three broad fronts.

First, international safeguards must be strengthened and strictly enforced. The supply and use of nuclear materials associated with civilian nuclear energy programs must be carefully safeguarded so that they will not be diverted. Nuclear suppliers must impose the utmost restraint upon themselves and not permit the temptations of commercial advantage to override the risks of proliferation. The physical security of nuclear materials—whether in use, storage, or transfer—must be increased. The International Atomic Energy Agency [IAEA] must receive the full support of all nations in making its safeguards effective, reliable, and universally applicable. Any violator of the IAEA safeguards must face immediate and drastic penalties.

Second, adherence to safeguards, while of prime importance, is no guarantee against future proliferation. We must continue our efforts to forge international restraints against the acquisition

or transfer of reprocessing facilities which produce separated plutonium and of enrichment facilities which produce highly enriched uranium—both of which are useable for the construction of nuclear weapons.

Third, we must recognize that one of the principal incentives for seeking sensitive reprocessing and enrichment technology is the fear that essential nonsensitive materials—notably reactor-grade uranium fuel—will not be made available on a reliable basis. Nations that show their sense of international responsibility by accepting effective restraints have a right to expect reliable and economical supply of peaceful nuclear reactors and associated nonsensitive fuel. The United States, as a principal supplier of these items, is prepared to be responsible in this regard.

In the near future, President Ford will announce a comprehensive American program for international action on nonproliferation that reconciles global aspirations for assured nuclear supply with global requirements for nuclear control.

We continue to approach the proliferation problem in full recognition of the responsibility that we and other nuclear powers have—both in limiting our weapons arsenals and in insuring that the benefits of peaceful nuclear energy can be made available to all states within a shared framework of effective international safeguards. In this way the atom can be seen once again as a boon and not a menace to mankind.

Another issue of vast global consequence is the Law of the Sea. The negotiations which have just recessed in New York represent one of the most important, complex, and ambitious diplomatic undertakings in history. Consider what is at stake.

- Mankind is attempting to devise an international regime for nearly three-quarters of the Earth's surface.

- Some 150 nations are participating, reflecting all the globe's diverse national perspectives, ideologies, and practical concerns.

- A broad sweep of vital issues is involved—economic development, military security, freedom of navigation, crucial and dwindling living resources, the ocean's fragile ecology, marine scientific research, and vast potential mineral

• The world community is aspiring to shape major new international legal principles—the extension of the long established territorial sea, the creation of a completely new concept of an economic zone extending 200 miles, and the designation of the deep seabed as the “common heritage of mankind.”

We have traveled an extraordinary distance in these negotiations in recent years—thanks in no small part to the skill and dedication of the distinguished President of this Assembly. Agreement exists on key concepts—a 12-mile territorial sea, free passage over and through straits, a 200-mile economic zone, and important pollution controls. In many fields we have replaced ideological debates with serious efforts to find concrete solutions. And there is growing consensus that the outstanding problems must be solved at the next session.

But there is hardly room for complacency. Important issues remain which, if not settled, could cause us to forfeit all our hard-won progress. The conference has yet to agree on the balance between coastal state and international rights in the economic zone; on the freedom of marine scientific research; on arrangements for dispute settlement; and, most crucially, on the regime for exploitation of the deep seabeds.

The United States has made major proposals to resolve the deep seabed issue. We have agreed that the seabeds are the common heritage of all mankind. We have proposed a dual system for the exploitation of seabed minerals by which half of the mining sites would be reserved for the international authority and half could be developed by individual nations and their nationals on the basis of their technical capacity. We have offered to find financing and to transfer the technology needed to make international mining a practical reality. And in light of the many uncertainties that lie ahead, we have proposed that there be a review—for example, in 25 years—to determine whether the provisions on seabed mining are working equitably.

In response some nations have escalated both their demands and the stridency with which they advocate them.

I must say candidly that there are limits beyond which no American Administration can, or will, go. If attempts are made to compel concessions which exceed those limits, unilateralism will become inevitable.

technological capacity for mining the seabeds in the foreseeable future should not seek to impose a doctrine of total internationalization on nations which alone have this capacity and which have voluntarily offered to share it. The United States has an interest in the progressive development of international law, stable order, and global cooperation. We are prepared to make sacrifices for this—but they cannot go beyond equitable bounds.

Let us, therefore, put aside delaying tactics and pressures and take the path of cooperation. If we have the vision to conclude a treaty considered fair and just by mankind, our labors will have profound meaning not only for the regimen of the oceans but for all efforts to build a peaceful, cooperative, and prosperous international community. The United States will spend the interval between sessions of the conference reviewing its positions and will approach other nations well in advance of the next session at the political level to establish the best possible conditions for its success.

A generation that dreams of world peace and economic progress is plagued by a new, brutal, cowardly, and indiscriminate form of violence—international terrorism. Small groups have rejected the norms of civilized behavior and wantonly taken the lives of defenseless men, women, and children—innocent victims with no power to affect the course of events. In the year since I last addressed this body, there have been 11 hijackings, 19 kidnappings, 42 armed attacks, and 112 bombings perpetrated by international terrorists. Over 70 people have lost their lives and over 200 have been injured.

It is time this organization said to the world that the vicious murder and abuse of innocents cannot be absolved or excused by the invocation of lofty motives. Criminal acts against humanity, whatever the professed objective, cannot be excused by any civilized nation.

The threat of terrorism should be dealt with through the cooperative efforts of all countries. More stringent steps must be taken now to deny skyjackers and terrorists a safe haven.

Additional measures are required to protect passengers in both transit and terminal areas, as well as in flight.

The United States will work within the International Civil Aviation Organization [ICAO] to expand its present technical assistance to include

the security of air carriers and terminal facilities. We urge the universal implementation of aviation security standards adopted by ICAO. We are prepared to assist the efforts of other governments to implement those standards.

The United States will support new initiatives which will insure the safety of the innocent. The proposal of the distinguished Foreign Minister of the Federal Republic of Germany, against the taking of hostages, deserves the most serious and sympathetic consideration of this Assembly.

The United States will do everything within its power to work cooperatively in the United Nations and in other international bodies to put an end to the scourge of terrorism. But we have an obligation to protect the lives of our citizens as they travel at home or abroad, and we intend to meet that obligation. Therefore, if multilateral efforts are blocked by those determined to pursue their ends without regard for suffering or death, then the United States will act through its own legislative processes and in conjunction with others willing to join us.

Terrorism is an international problem. It is inconceivable that an organization of the world's nations would fail to take effective action against it.

The final measure of all we do together, of course, is man himself. Our common efforts to define, preserve, and enhance respect for the rights of man thus represent an ultimate test of international cooperation.

We Americans, in the year of our Bicentennial, are conscious—and proud—of our own traditions. Our founders wrote 200 years ago of the equality and inalienable rights of all men. Since then the ideals of liberty and democracy have become the universal and indestructible goals of mankind.

But the plain truth—of tragic proportions—is that human rights are in jeopardy over most of the globe. Arbitrary arrest, denial of fundamental procedural rights, slave labor, stifling of freedom of religion, racial injustice, political repression, the use of torture, and restraints on communications and expression—these abuses are too prevalent.

The performance of the U.N. system in protecting human rights has fallen far short of what was envisaged when this organization was founded. The principles of the Universal Declaration are clear enough. But their invocation and application,

in general debates of this body and in the forums of the Human Rights Commission, have been marred by hypocrisy, double standards, and discrimination. Flagrant and consistent deprivation of human rights is no less heinous in one country or one social system than in another. Nor is it more acceptable when practiced upon members of the same race than when inflicted by one race upon another.

The international community has a unique role to play. The application of the standards of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights should be entrusted to fair and capable international bodies. But at the same time let us insure that these bodies do not become platforms from which nations which are the worst transgressors pass hypocritical judgment on the alleged shortcomings.

Let us together pursue practical approaches:

- To build on the foundations already laid at previous assemblies and at the Human Rights Commission to lessen the abominable practice of officially sanctioned torture;
- To promote acceptance of procedures for protecting the rights of people subject to detention, such as access to courts, counsel, and families; prompt release or fair and public trial;
- To improve the working procedures of international bodies concerned with human rights so that they may function fairly and effectively; and
- To strengthen the capability of the United Nations to meet the tragic problems of the ever growing number of refugees whose human rights have been stripped away by conflict in almost every continent.

The United States pledges its firm support to these efforts.

Conclusion

The challenge to statesmanship in this generation is to advance from the management of crises to the building of a more stable and just international order—an order resting not on power but on restraint of power, not on the strength of arms but on the strength of the human spirit.

Global forces of change now shape our future. Order will come in one of two ways: Through its imposition by the strong and the ruthless or by the wise and farsighted use of international institutions

12

through which we enlarge the sphere of common interests and enhance the sense of community.

It is easy and tempting to press relentlessly for national advantage. It is infinitely more difficult to act in recognition of the rights of others. Throughout history, the greatness of men and nations has been measured by their actions in times of acute peril. Today there is no single crisis to conquer. There is instead a persisting challenge of

staggering complexity—the need to create a universal community based on cooperation, peace, and justice.

If we falter future generations will pay for our failure. If we succeed it will have been worthy of the hopes of mankind. I am confident that we can succeed.

And it is here, in the assembly of nations, that we should begin.

DEPARTMENT OF STATE, U.S.A.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20520

POSTAGE AND FEES PAID
DEPARTMENT OF STATE
STA-501

