

TRANSCRIPTION TAPE N-14

Track I Feb. 13, 1970 AM (Friday)

Ambassadors' Conference: UN and
the Third World

Guests: W.O. Douglas, R.M. Akwei,
S. Astrom, C. Bogdan, J.A. Castro,
P.M. Henry, M. Jakobson, L. Mojsov,
C.V. Narasimhan, S. Sen, E.L.F.
Seneviratne, Nsanze Terence.

Cys: EMB, FM, JC, Files (2)

At this opening meeting, Mr. Mojsov ^{commented on} ~~read~~ Dr. Anton Vratuša's
paper (it had no title). Then Mr. Sen read his paper entitled
"Non-Alignment and Neutralism". Following is the discussion
that resulted from these two papers.

(However, Mr. Mojsov read some opening remarks that were not
contained in Mr. Vratuša's paper, so I transcribed them in
case they are needed.)

MOJSOV: As the first speaker of the agenda I would like first
of all to express my deep gratitude to the Associates
of the Center for the Study of Democratic Institutions,
and especially to Mrs. Borgese for all they have
done to make it possible for us to meet here today,
and to spend the next few days exchanging views and
discussing a topic of such major significance for the
present phase of international relations. In my
opinion the organizers of this conference could not
have selected a better time and location for our
discussions, nor a topic than the one on our agenda,
especially since we are on the threshold of the 25th

anniversary of the United Nations. By selecting the theme "United Nations and The Third World" they have thus provided us with an opportunity to exchange views and opinions on the place and the role of the United Nations and on the outlook of the majority member states of this world organization as well as on their efforts and hopes in having the United Nations perform as an effective world organization which shall continue to extend constant and decisive contributions to the resolving of the key issues and problems facing the international community.

I wish in particular to express also my sincere thanks to the organizers of the conference for having extended the invitation to Dr. Anton Vratusa Deputy Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs, and to me personally to attend this conference. We are indeed representatives of a country which has been for the past quarter of a century of the existence of the United Nations doing its utmost toward

the strengthening of the role of this world organization, championing a more active and substantive contribution to the objectives of the United Nations by the countries of the Third World.

Before giving some comments on the paper of Dr.

Anton Vratusa, I wish to point out, although this stands to reason, that Dr. Vratusa and his paper forwarded to the conference and I, in my statement, are expressing only our personal views and opinions in a desire to contribute to a more active consideration of the topic on our agenda. Dr. Vratusa has prepared a paper for this conference in which he has described in a concise manner this complex and subtle subject matter in four separate chapters, The World Today, first; second, Specific Interests of The Third World; third, The Role of The Third World in the United Nations, and fourth, the Twenty-Fifth Anniversary of the United Nations. Dr. Vratusa has endeavored to outline in a comprehensive manner some of his views and

considerations of the problems facing the international community today. I would like only to advance my personal remarks and observations in order to accentuate certain aspects of these problems, and to make my modest contribution to the examination and discussion of this important issue.

First, identification of the concept The Third World.

In this modern world which is being torn apart by countless divisions, there is increasingly emerging the tendency to overcome and resist this rift. Some of these divisions are of an objective nature or else a reflection of inherited institutions in political, ideological, and cultural domains. Others depict the differences in the level of development and in the retarding of industrial and technological revolution which is increasingly being recognized as a general trend in the development of human civilization as such. Some of these divisions have emerged in the process of development of contemporary

mankind constituted into separate states and nations and those peoples who are still fighting for their place under the sun. This development is a part and parcel of the evolution of the human society. Consequently, differences of this nature require the engagement and organized action for their overcoming of the ^{inter} national community as a whole. But other divisions of different origin, namely, those that have occurred owing to specific historical reasons in the development of mutual relations between individual states, constitute the major obstacle to positive growth of international relations in general. In addition to these, divisions into military and political and ideological blocs, alliances, and closed associations, tend to be retained artificially and to petrify. The recent history of international relations demonstrates that such divisions inevitably go from exclusiveness to confrontation. They ended in wars or short-lived

international truce or peace to flare up in wars
anew. Contemporary bloc divisions also follow
this logic course and lead to cold or hot confront-
ations which would have ~~now~~ already brought us to a new
war of world dimensions if it were not for the
existence of atomic weapons. An ever increasing
number of states and nations is resisting this
division of bloc-like nature. They feel the
consequences of such rifts in international relations
which demand the engagement of military and
political resources, and impose block discipline
which frequently calls for the subjugation of one's
own national interests to those of the protagonists
and leaders of such blocks. Around the two super-
powers, the United States of America and the Union
of Soviet Socialist Republic, in the ~~existing~~
~~existing~~ constellation in international
relations which emerged as a consequence of the
second World War, and immediately after it, the

grouping of other nations into rigid military and ideological alliances took place. This, in turn, was followed by constant confrontations. This divided the world and blocs are being counterposed by the Third World, a world that has different and specific ends. This Third World is continuing to embrace an increasing number of states. In spite of their own differences and divisions, the Third World is not restricted to geographic regions nor to ideological or socio-political leanings and considerations. For this reason the term Third World has a specific connotation in order to represent the broadest common denominator for all these countries and nations, trends and viewpoints, orientations and concrete actions for those countries that are ready to overcome and challenge the bloc division of the world, more specifically ~~only~~ its ^{only} division/into two simple worlds. The concept Third World can best be identified as a grouping of non-bloc

states, states not associated with any bloc, as a grouping of nations and movements resisting a sharp division of the world into two sections, a chasm which inevitably leads to confrontation with all its inherent and uncontrolled consequences. It is for this reason that we accept the term Third World as implying a very flexible concept representing countries espousing such a policy. These countries are often described in terms of neutral, non-committed unaligned, non-bloc countries. The notion of the Third World in the opinion of the most knowledgeable people represents the broadest common denominator for their aspirations, their goals and their policies in the international relations. The Third World by opposing the blocs does not thereby constitute a third bloc. Countries of the Third World by pursuing anti-bloc policies cannot possibly aspire towards forming their own bloc. This being the case, the Third World is not a third bloc but clearly an

anti-bloc. Second, Ends and Objectives of the Third World. By challenging and resisting the division of the world into military and political ideological blocs crystallized around the two superpowers, the countries of the Third World are combatting all attempts in imposing in whatever form the condominium of those two superpowers in world relations. In international relations as a matter of tradition, attempts have been made ~~to~~ in the remote and most recent past to have individual countries because of their exceptional circumstances in the constellation of power ~~and~~ economic, and more advanced/technological and military development to assume the right to decide the fate of others, so to say, of inferior countries. Having ~~once~~ once assumed such a role, then they proceed to transform this right into a monopoly and proclaim the inviolability of the sacredness of the status quo. Such a monopoly in international

relations in general and between relations of individual states gives rise to subjugation, enslavement and exploitation, ^{accompanied} ~~a companionate~~ (???) with an ⁱⁿ _^evitable instrumentarium of pressure and coercion. The countries of the Third World in contrast to such relations which in the overall positive development of the world's civilization constitute more and more a remnant of the past and an anachronism. The countries of the Third World aspire towards relations of equality and mutual cooperation resting upon full respect of their serenity and their specific individuality in the international relations. They are fighting for the democratization of international relations against tendencies of every monopoly, condominium or domination in international relations. They are determined to become the subject in international relations in spite of their inferiority in this or that sphere. They are not reconciled to the position

of being the object and having the status of tutelage which is being imposed upon them.

Contrary to the bloc discipline, which very often ~~xxxxxx~~ imposes higher ends shrouded in demagogical phrases primarily of ideological and quasi-religious nature, the countries of the Third World are demanding right solutions to many major and hard core problems besetting not only them but the entire international community. Decolonization, the right of each nation to decide its own fate and to choose freely without outside interference its own course of internal development, abolition of all forms of ~~xxxxxx~~ national and racial discrimination, the legacy of the human pre-history, economic development the overcoming of the gap between the developed and the developing countries, the struggle against poverty, ignorance, and sickness, the development of science and technology and their application for the wellbeing of all mankind, human environment, the fight against

all hazards which in spite of the general progress are being created by the industrialization and organization and increasingly uncontrolled exploitation of natural resources, disarmament control over the devastating of all arsenals in possession of the superpowers and the gradual elimination of the destructive power of the existing hardware which could not only totally destroy the potential enemy but the entire human civilization; the foregoing constitute more significant and more tangible problems weighing upon the consciousness of ~~the~~ contemporary than various upstart slogans of anti-communism, anti-imperialism, and the scores of any other anti-isms.

Third, the Problem of Coexistence. In order to have the outline objectives become a reality, without harboring any illusions that the entire picture of the obtaining international relations can be changed over night, it is vital to establish

suitable and workable relations among all states and peoples. Instead of ~~the~~ domination, pressure interference in the internal affairs, attempts to exploit differences among the countries for the purpose of being subjected to the interests of bigger and more powerful nations, it is necessary to respect the equality and serenity of all states, to tolerate the existing differences and to solve with patience and through mutual understanding the present and the future conflicts between individual states. The countries of the Third World are opposed to all forms of discrimination in the international relations and instead of domination and interference they are searching for the establishment of coexistence among all states and nations whether they be big or small, powerful or weak, rich or poor, developed or underdeveloped, the principle of coexistence should become, then, a generally recognized and acceptable norm of behavior in the international

relations and no sacred or higher ~~xx~~ aims can or should serve as a pretext for violating these norms in the relations between states. Not coexistence between blocs, nor coexistence among partners, but coexistence between all and among all. Only in this way, in an era of atomic weapons, which doesn't have many alternatives, will it be possible to bring about a gradual evolution of the international relations and the transformation of the world into a single whole in spite of the prevailing differences. Fourth, The Equidistance. The aspiration of the Third World to evolve a progressive evolution of international relations presupposes the transformation of the existing status quo and the gradual resolving of countless world problems and conflicting situations. This evolution is being opposed by those powers that have already acquired privileged positions in world relations.

In their relations toward the blocs which are inherent in the present status quo, the countries of the Third World may utilize temporary or long-term interests of the blocs, or of some bloc countries, for the purpose of undertaking in specific areas of international relations steps or measures as would best serve the interests of individual Third World countries or the Third World as a whole. Moreover, the interests of bloc protagonists change also and their attitude towards individual problems in world relations as well. For this reason it would be erroneous to conceive of the Third World as something that mechanically and automatically opposes blocs, or that each Third World country should keep equidistance from both blocs in order constantly to demonstrate its neutrality or impartiality towards the two bloc partners. Moreover, individual Third World

countries are inter-related with individual bloc countries through most of the world's links of mutual ties, traditions and emotions. Therefore, the theory of equidistance towards blocs cannot be applied in practice as it stands for a tactical approach and balancing between the blocs. Although the blocs constitute a recognized fact in the contemporary world, the Third World countries cannot reconcile themselves to having blocs remain as an eternal and intangible factor. Fifth, Era of Negotiation. The blocs themselves are prone to changes. Let us examine, for example, what has happened within individual blocs and in relations between blocs during the past decade. Blocs are sensitive to erosions of the most diverse origins. The area of direct confrontations between them is constantly decreasing. In spite of the divergent interests the blocs also share a common outlooks and interests. In fact, we are witnessing ever

attempts at building bridges between the blocs.

The bloc protagonists, the two superpowers, have their own specific interests and their role in the international relations is of primordial importance.

One cannot deny the fact that the two superpowers because of their military and economic power bear specific responsibilities in the world of today.

Therefore, it is ~~not~~ in the interest of the Third

World countries not only to narrow the areas of

direct confrontation between the two superpowers,

but to ^{have} ~~have~~ these two superpowers through the

process of mutual negotiation also find solutions

to mutual outstanding issues and problems in those

areas that are a source of the existing confrontations.

In addition to this, in view of the role they are

playing in world events, the two superpowers can

make a decisive contribution in the process of

mutual relaxation of tensions towards the settlement

of other conflict-laden nations in the world. The

Third World countries, because of their special interests and objectives in international relations, are vitally interested in having the two superpowers ~~in~~ render their substantive contribution also to the resolution of all pressing and long-term problems facing the Third World and the international community as a whole. One of the essential principles of coexistence is the settlement of disputes by peaceful means through negotiations and mutual respect of genuine rights and interests of every part in the dispute. It is not possible to visualize the future development of international relations and the overcoming of all obstacles and difficulties burdening the present day relations without resorting to peaceful solutions and negotiations, Since the era of negotiation represents the only alternative of the era of nuclear confrontation.

Sixth, the Third World in the United Nations. From the very outset the Third World in formulating and

realizing its objectives and aims in international relations was encouraged by the existence of the United Nations and guided by its Charter. The United Nations, after the horrors of the second World War, was an embodiment of great hopes and expectations which all mankind had for the future development of international relations based upon peace, justice and progress. For this very reason the platform of political aims and actions of the Third World countries began to take shape within the framework of the United Nations with their active engagement in the implementation of the principles of the Charter. Figuratively speaking, it can be rightly said that the Third World was born in the United Nations. When the United Nations, owing to sharp bloc confrontations, became the arena of cold war and bloc competition, the Third World countries which in increasing numbers were joining the United Nations already then began

to play their positive role. In doing so, they constantly worked towards having the fundamental postulates of the Charter implemented in the international relations and to have the United Nations become an effective instrument in the progressive transformation of international relations. They have always had the view that the United Nations, in spite of its weaknesses, constitutes the main pillar of a new and more just order in the world. By the same token, all the documents relating to the principles of the non-aligned policy always contained ~~important~~ important references and devoted much space to the United Nations. The United Nations, in the course of its development, has experienced indeed many temptations. In spite of the aspirations and efforts of the Third World, it was able to find effective solutions to many problems directly affecting international relations. The world

public which often expects too much from the United Nations and believes that it can find ways and means to solve all the existing crises in the world, is increasingly becoming disappointed with the concrete results of the performance of the United Nations and its impact on the present day situation in the world. Many critical words are once again being heard about the inadequacy and inefficiency of the United Nations. However, the actual world in which we live, with all its contradictions and conflicting situations, which often lead us to the brink of the catastrophe, the real scope and role of the United Nations and its potentialities must not be overestimated. It is true that the United Nations is able to make an important contribution to solving acute international crises and to cooling off various hot beds in international relations, provided that conditions for this are favorable and that there is a positive approach and attitude of at

~~at~~ least some of the major international factors.

During the past years for very wellknown reasons all the major crises in international relations, primarily the war in Vietnam and the explosive situation in the Middle East, were virtually out of the hands of the United Nations. This perhaps is the basis cause of the UN weaknesses. Under these circumstances the United Nations unfortunately cannot be expected to take any resolute and effective steps in the direction of a just solution of these problems which continue to beset the international relations as a whole. The very out (???) of this situation for the United Nations lies in an accelerated activity of the Third World countries within the United Nations in their dedicated struggle to strengthen the role of the United Nations and have to ~~make~~ this organization make a more substantive contribution toward the resolving of the outstanding problems in the present day world. From platform to

action, the Third World with its policy and aspirations has already been identified and recognized as such.

It has formulated its aims concerning the vital issues affecting not only its own development and role but

the development and progress of the international

community. This identification constitutes the basis

upon which there is evolving the activity of the

Third World countries within the United Nations, and

which, in turn, they exercise a vital influence

upon the change of relations in the United Nations.

In one organization in which the Third World countries

by their numerical strength represent an imposing

complement, this very fact should be more and more

taken into account. The composition of the United

Nations in comparison with the situation in the

1950's has actually brought about considerable

changes in the organization itself, just because

of this activity of the Third World countries.

However, the fact remains and it is worthy of

attention and indicative of the further trends which are becoming ever more manifest within the circles of the United Nations. Actually, that was very evident during the last session of the General Assembly, that it is very difficult now and impossible for the great powers to impose their will upon the United Nations and to rally to their cause the one-time voting machine for the purpose of implementing decisions that are not in the vital interests of the great majority of the member states. The United Nations has grown into an institution which is difficult to manipulate and thus decision-making cannot be directed simply by counting one's own and other states' votes. In other words, the United Nations is becoming a very unyielding institution. With the joining of many new independent countries, ~~their~~ ^{their} concerted efforts to protect the vital interests of both newly independent and developing countries, primarily of small and medium-

sized, not aligned to the blocs, the United Nations is becoming hot for the great powers which formerly could more easily line up states and thus hold an exercise (???) position of power. Under the then circumstances it was not difficult, in the past, to foresee the outcome of certain confrontations in the United Nations by following the lineup and attitudes of the great powers. The 24 sessions of the General Assembly this last year marked the turning point in this respect. The small, medium-sized and non-aligned countries demonstrated on several occasions that they were able to obtain a majority in the United Nations in spite of the opposition of the great powers sometimes of all the great powers together on issues of major importance for ~~the~~ development, disarmament, decolonization, and on issues relating to the safeguarding of the sovereign role of the United Nations of its important body, the General Assembly.

Of course, all these developments should not be overestimated and should not be taken as a cause to look upon the alignment of forces and influences in the United Nations too optimistically. But it is essential, that is the experience of the last sessions of the General Assembly to find the broadest possible denominator in areas of action of the small, medium-sized, non-aligned, non-bloc countries and thus to exercise direct influence upon decision-making, and exert moral pressure upon the great powers to take into consideration the vital interests of the international community as a whole. Thank you for your attention, thank you.

DOUNGLAS Thank you Ambassador Mojsov. Ambassador Sen would you proceed next with your paper?

M ~~XXM~~ Your paper is being typed? We thought that if you could say, take twenty minutes or so and summarize it for the group, it will be around today.

RMH Perhaps you would like to change places with Mr. Mojsov.

SEN Well, my paper really deals with the theme "Non-Alignment and Neutrality". But before I discuss my approach to this problem, perhaps it would be right to ^{Take}~~thank~~ this opportunity to thank the organization.

RMH Perhaps you would like to change places....

SEN First, I should like to thank the organizers for this opportunity to come here and discuss this important subject in this rather attractive place. And secondly, to appreciate that this meeting has been held at the right time for the reasons given by Mr. Mojsov, but there are other reasons, too. We have immediately after the General Assembly had an opportunity to take stock of the situation, and as you all know, the Preparatory Committee of the Non-Aligned Countries is going to be held in Tanzania fairly soon. So all these circumstances

make me feel that we have timed our conference very well indeed. In my paper I have tried to deal with the subject in rather a popular way and this for very good reasons. I have felt that the non-aligned concept~~x~~ because of these dissertations, seminars and discussions tends to lose its popular base and become somewhat sophisticated. So I've felt it necessary to bring back the exact motivation of this approach. Then secondly, there is the prevailing theory that because of the great powers, the superpowers getting near each other, non-alignment has become somewhat irrelevant if not ineffective. I have tried to prove that, first, the assumption is wrong, and secondly, the conclusions are naturally doubly wrong. In other words, I do accept that the superpowers have really got near each other, neither in ideology nor in tactics nor in interests nor in power politics. They are near in the sense we

understand in the non-aligned countries. Their technique has changed. Science and technology has made it almost impossible to indulge in the kind of confrontation which we witnessed in the '50's, but I do not believe the time has yet come when their interests have changed or their ideologies have changed or the ancient shibboleths like balance of power, spheres of influence, all these doctrines have been discarded. In fact, although this is not put so bluntly in my paper, in fact I would say that these very ideas have been pursued with greater vigor, greater intelligence and subtler methods. Then, the other aspect which has come up recently is the question of the economic development of the development decade. Here, again, is a field where the great powers may try, and I'm almost certain will try, and ^{if} the past is any guide, has tried, to play a role in which their specific interests are tied up with the development decade. That is not ^{to}

say that they are not sensitive to the interests or the ambitions or the needs of the developing countries. But in order to give expression or to determine what should or should not be done, they have been very conscious of their own self interests, probably more than the interests of the developing countries. If that analysis is correct, it is obvious that the non-aligned countries who generally form the bulk of the developing countries will find yet another platform where they can cooperate and make sure that, on the ground of the development decade, they are not put in a position where the price they have to pay for development can be transverted (???) in political terms in a manner which would, rather than reduce the disparities between the super powers, will increase it. The third aspect which I have tried to point out, not at any great length, because after going through the papers I found much of ^{it is} ~~a~~ ~~this~~ common ground,

the third point is that the phenomenon of China has to be taken into account. What does China represent? The absence of China in the United Nations, the proper representation of China in the United Nations, that is, has of course been commented on again and again. And I did think it was necessary to go over the same ground again. But if the definition of non-alignment is that the countries of that group do not belong to either of the superpowers blocs, then the question can legitimately be asked, that why is China not non-aligned? Why don't you consider China as non-aligned? China is neither with the Soviet Union nor with the USA, doesn't form a part of any block, why then does China have to be considered as something outside the non-aligned. And I have tried to answer that question. Briefly, it is not a question of being aligned or non-aligned, or belong to a bloc which really makes China the odd-man-out, but it's the Chinese attitude which is totally in contradiction

of the attitude of a large number of the non-aligned countries. The Chinese attitude to my mind is that we shall go through a process of continuous revolution without knowing its final end and we shall do that for two reasons: one, by the very fact of going through many revolutions, whatever might be the future, whatever might be the dangers, we shall *be* tough ^{ened} enough to face them bravely. But if the *theory only started,* only stopped there, perhaps one could consider it a little more fully, but it has a very basic power context. All this revolutionary process must be under the guidance and leadership of China. And since China believes ~~in~~ that _____ leadership and guidance, it is to be done through force, to that extent at least China is in the same category as the USA or the USSR. You, too, believe that fundamentally the only things that matter are force or money or both. If that be correct, then I

would have thought, and Mr. Terence has already hinted at it , that the Third World would really apply more to China than to the, what we call the non-aligned blocs. Mr. Mojsov has quite rightly pointed out the Third World is rather an misnomer, it's not her military strength, but it has, by using the word Third, given some kind of wrong interpretation. First, second and third. I don't know who the first is nor who ~~is~~ the second is, but we who together are. Now, so if the Third World is attached to China, or a third party is attached to China in the force contest, then I think we will get a proper prospective of the reasons why we do not and cannot consider China as a non-aligned country. I have made ^{that} ~~xxx~~ diversion in my paper, but as I said not very elaborately, but in a page or so. The last point I have tried to indicate in my paper is that the kind of price non-aligned countries are continually asked to pay in order

what
to get ~~from~~ the superpowers or the great powers
consider as favors are quid pro quo. I have in that
context gone into the past a bit, and indicated how
positively and negatively it is taken out of the
non-aligned countries whenever they can. Then
the analytical part has two other elements.
One is to indicate that non-alignment does not
mean neutrality. In fact, it is the very opposite
of neutrality. Neutrality in the classical sense
or in the traditional sense may be applied to
countries who remain outside the armed conflict.
This is the concept which is very prevalent in Europe.
Sicily is a classical case of neutrality and there
are others. In any particular situation when
countries go to war and some other countries maintain
neutrality, then the laws of war, as they are understood
in the international law, apply to that country and
she is treated as a neutral state. There are all
kinds of consequences to that. So neutrality is not

a neutrality between armed warriors actually in battle, because there has been fortunately no battle of that kind, and secondly, if that is not to be accepted then it cannot be a moral neutrality in the sense I have nothing to say whether something is right or something is wrong or what should be done or what should not be done. I have illustrated this point from the Indian experience and given a short list of various important subjects which have come up before the United Nations. Next ~~point~~ analytical point is that, as Mr. Mojsov has already pointed out, that more and more the important issues are being kept out of any forum where powers other than the great powers and sometimes other than superpowers can have any say. Whether this forum is the United Nations or some other way, it really doesn't matter. The trend is that more and more problems will be in the lap of the gods. And this is a very unhealthy development. First, unless you

involve other people and associate them with any decision-making, first, it's not democratic, second, there's no guarantee that it will be accepted by the ~~xxx~~ others, and thirdly, if you do that then the danger is or if the past danger is one of commission, the next danger may be one of collusion. And this is the kind of danger once it is accepted there will be nothing for us to do, and we will get back to the doctrine of spheres of influence. Because then the world may well be divided up between the spheres of ~~fix~~ ^{influence of} A, B, and C, and A, B, and C will then be given the chance of policing these states. Keep them in order which of course would mean increased interference in internal affairs, reducing them to secondary _____ states and altogether upsetting the entire concept of civilized international relations. After having done that, I have tried to indicate the enormous amount of work that still

remains to be done and how we shall have to be
~~gix~~ vigilant and not in the least consider that
non-alignment is either irrelevant or ineffective,
In fact, it has got enormous possibilities now
and if we cannot make it more effective, more
relevant and more applicable, then of ~~xxxx~~ course
we are in a very bad shape. Even the ancient
or the traditional values of non-alignment
have still got a long way to go before they are
fulfilled. Now, for instance, the simple case of
colonial independence. Large areas of the world
still remain subject to colonial powers. The
worst example of course, examples are to be found
in Africa. Angola, Mozambique, and so forth,
the Portugese territories. Then there is the
question of South Africa and Southwest Africa.
Then the question of racial ~~discrimination~~ discrimination
and policies. Now it no good, far off the bar
coming up and saying that we cannot do any more,

because the United Nations hasn't asked us to do any more. If you scratch this kind of argument a little you find that those countries who say that the United Nations has not asked us to do any more are precisely the countries who make sureⁱⁿ/the United Nations ~~is~~ that they are not asked to do any more. So this is a kind of old values which have still to be fulfilled and if we give up or relax our efforts on these old values, obviously we shall have done a great deal of wrong. If on the other hand, the new problems because of economic development because of technology because of frustration or stalemate or nuclear warfare, if these things are allowed to be managed and organized only by the ~~is~~ super powers, then of course the other dangers are of being reduced in human values ^{of} ~~for~~ most of us will come about. Then there is the question of being presented with the fait accompli. I think Ambassador Astrom has mentioned

it at great length in his paper. Whether it is a limitation of armaments or outer space or increase in the composition of the disarmament committee, and various other things which have happened over the last three or four months, all indicate that more and more we are being presented with fait accompli, and take it or leave it. Fortunately, as pointed out Mr. Mojsov, we leave it. You take it. And then of course there have been second thoughts, in this matter. But the purpose of my saying all this is not to show, is not ^{to} say that the great powers should not cooperate or combine. We do want them to cooperate or combine but they must in their combination not come to decisions without the full consultation of all powers, big and small, In other words, they must associate us non-aligned countries, big powers, small powers, middle powers, all of them must be responsible in taking part in decisions. If we are not

responsible, we shall have no response, and therefore we shall do what we like, which will not bring about the kind of world we are all striving for. And lastly, in that analytical part, it is also true, unfortunately, or I should have mentioned perhaps, but I didn't elaborate it, that many of the non-aligned countries themselves for a variety of reasons cannot pursue even the decisions they have voted for in the United Nations fully. One of the main reasons is economics. Many of them are so economically dependent one way or another on powers whose policies they do not accept and from ~~whom they~~ ^{their dislike that} ~~and~~ when it comes to carrying out these decisions they drag their feet. Therefore, on the economic front, not only there must be this escape from the incubus of great powers sitting on us, superpowers sitting on us, there should be alternatives or possibilities offered to us that we do not have only one possibility of economic progress in any particular line. We must have several

options of interests, and this option^{is} to many countries including perhaps medium-sized countries like India, become^{ing} less and less effective. Therefore, if we are to look after ~~the~~ world interests, not, as I said, not in a god-like fashion, but as brotherly cooperative fashion, we must see that the little countries, weaker countries or countries with one production and so on and so forth have other options^{open} ~~given~~ to them in the economic field. If that is not brought about then there will be acute difficulty of implementing the various resolutions which they themselves have voted. That is roughly what I have said in my paper. I have not, as I said, gone over the same grounds or picked up arguments with A, B, or C because there are plenty of points on which we can argue and differ and dispute. But that is the sort of thing we should do here, but I have thought it necessary to emphasize, to repeat emphasis two points that the non-alignment has neither been

re
reduced ~~to~~ its importance nor its effectiveness

diminished or deflected. Secondly, we have to be on our guard and with the new forces which socalled bring coming together the great powers has brought out and which in turn threaten non-alignment from various unsuspected quarters. These are the two main points I've tried to make. But I have, by introductory brought, tried to bring out the popular basis of non-alignment and not make it the intellectual issue. Thank you.

DOUNGLAS Thank you, Mr. Ambassador. We have about an hour before we rise to lunch, and we thought of turning that over discussion and perhaps Ambassador Brucan would lead off, and start the ball.

BRUCAN Well, Mr. Chairman, since I am not a diplomat I would like to~~z~~ throw some Molotov cocktails on this table. Rather speculating about the future of both the Third World and the ~~X~~ United Nations. Not concentrating on the present situation because

the
I think that/projection into the future, into the
immediate future, let's say, might help better to
understand what's going on now in the world and to
charter a better course of action in the present.

I would start, I would like to start from a rather
general theoretical assumption, from the international
system and I wish to say that I see this international
system as a system whose laws and behavior are
determined by the interplay of four major forces,
four major variables, that are at ~~work~~ work on the
international arena. The first one comprises the
rivalry between big powers in which world hegemony
is at stake. That is the present version of power
politics. The second variable is the thrust of
nations to self-assertion, having as its main driving
force today the Thrid World. The third variable is
the interdependence ~~of~~ pressure forces which
are usually described by the small world nuclear
extinction threat, ecological pressures, economic

and technological interdependence, population explosion, food, communication. In other words, driving forces which require worldwide solutions and work for supra-national integration. The fourth variable is social change, which, although internal in nature and scope, might strike the working source international system, particularly when affecting the balance of forces.

Now, the four variables which I have very summarily defined, either come into conflict with each other or combine forces in various ways, one of them taking precedence over the other at certain junctures. And I would like to illustrate this thesis, with reference to the first one, the bid for world hegemony. It seems obvious to me that the role played now by the two superpowers, the USA and the USSR, makes China to assert her claim as the third superpower in the '70's. And China is going to ride on the Third World self-assertion drive and on social change tendencies,

using both of them as instruments to ~~ex~~ achieve a superpower position directed against the USA and the USSR. At the same time, the struggle for world hegemony, in my opinion, will create a strong drive in Western Europe to unite and form a fourth superpower, in order to have a say in world politics. Now this trend combines with the interdependence pressure forces which in the same direction; the drive towards an integrated Western Europe conflicts, however, with the national self-assertion drive, which is still in French and West German ~~politi~~ politics overriding at times even Common Market rules. At last, the social change factor is at work, too, in Western Europe, both from the inside and from the outside, which is embodied in the North Atlantic Treaty and the ~~ex~~ anti-Communist strategy. This is one example of how these four variables are at work on the international arena. Now, I shall predict that if superpower rivalry will dominate the scene

in the '70's, Western Europe will unite and form a superpower. Now let us assume that the social change variable gets stronger and stronger as a result of radical structural overturn in a number of countries. In that case, the social change variable will take precedence over the others, As it happened in the aftermath of World War II. The immediate consequence will be the restoration of the class ideological factor as the predominant one in international politics. And thus the policies of the superpowers will be again determined primarily by global anti-Communist strategy and respectively by global anti-capitalist strategy. The conflict between the two social economic systems, capitalism and socialism, will become again paramount in international politics. What about the Third World in such a hypothetical situation? Since I assume that revolutionary upheavals will take place in Third World countries, like in America, for instance, I can only draw the logical conclusion that

the realignment, the general realignment within the Third World will become inevitable. In other words, some developing nations might then join forces either with the socialist world, while others might stay with the West. Now, let me sum up now the alternatives. First alternative, superpower rivalry predominant in world affairs, China becoming the third superpower and Western Europe the fourth. The chief opponents, the Third World and the national self-assertion drive. The second alternative, social change becomes predominant, general realignment on ideological lines, revival of Cold War in new form. In the first alternative, the interdependence pressure forces will combine with the opposing variables, will combine with the superpowers which will use them as an instrument of integrating larger units under their command, and will combine with the Third World which will use them to promote their own cause. In the second alternative, the social change alternative,

the interdependence forces will adjust to the general realignment on ideological lines and will work for supranational units on such lines. In other words, I do not foresee in the '70's the prospect that the interdependence pressure forces, however strong they may be, take precedence over the other forces at work in international politics. They might gain priority in the '80's or later on, the interdependence forces. Now I hope that what I have said will not be held unduly contentious. I just want to throw these projections into the discussion and it will be particularly interesting to speculate about the United Nations in such new circumstances. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

DOUGLAS Thank you, sir. The subject is open to discussion.

TUGWELL I've been very interested in what Ambassador Brucan has said. It does seem to me, however, that he left out one possibility. And this indeed seems to be the assumption behind all he says which is that the

superpowers simply cannot every get together. I cannot agree. If they did I think that all of his variables would very possibly be changed. Now I ~~wxx~~ don't know whether it would be agreed that this is a possibility ~~xxxxx~~ in the future. It hasn't seemed to be for the last twenty years, but that twenty years may not be the same as the coming twenty years in this respect. And if the superpowers did get together, I think, it seems to me that all of this might be changed into a kind of agreement on how these matters should be developed in the future.

NEAL

Following up what Dr. Tugwell has said, there is one aspect I would like to comment on, ^{the full discussion of} about/the Third World and the United Nations growing out of both. Dr. Vratusa's paper and Ambassador Mojsov's comments and Ambassador Sen's remarks. Ambassador Sen pointed out, and I think it's quite significant, as I think that Ambassador Brucan, that the superpowers in fact have not gotten very much closer together. That is to say,

the forms perhaps in some ways of the Cold War have changed, and perhaps it's been muted, but it's still there and with it of course some very serious potentialities and very serious dangers of which thermonuclear destruction is the greatest and most dramatic. But also, of course, from this flows the inhibition of the whole peaceful democratic development of international relations which Mr. Mojsov stressed as being so important and the inability of the United Nations really to function. I think a long time ago Walter Lippman said that the United Nations was the first casualty of the Cold War and I think he was correct. But if Ambassador Sen and Ambassador Brucan are correct on this point, that the superpowers, that the conflict between the superpowers in one form or another presently and in the future remains as they say, this puts the emphasis, I think, back primarily on great power coexistence. In terms of priorities, thermonuclear coexistence first, great power superagreement,

the freedom of the United Nations to operate as it was supposed to operate, which seems to me can only come after there is some greater understanding amongst the superpowers, some diminution of the basic elements of conflict than now exists, and then the whole development for which we all hope from coexistence on some sort of a narrow base to a much broader base which would lead to international cooperation of an active sort. Now in this, from this point of view, I think one has to realize that it would be highly desirable, if the superpowers would change in dramatic way, if they would abandon certain concepts and points, their contribution should quite obviously be made. And it's been repeated and repeated and repeated ~~xxx kxxx~~ without too much effect thus far. But on the other hand, I think in connection with the Third World powers, ^{will} will certainly play a terribly important role and I think increasingly will play a greater

role, one has to think perhaps that their potential contributions in terms other than lectures the superpowers can be important too. It seems to me that there may be, and I don't know about this, there may be some if not conflict at least contradiction between saying that the first essential point is for some more understanding and agreement among the superpowers and at the same time saying giving it equal priority to allout absolute opposition to what Ambassador Mojsov referred to as hegemonistic tendencies. The trouble with hegemonistic tendencies is that they exist. And hegemonistic tendencies in fact exist, it seems to me, because they are a reflection of certain realities in the world, the enormous disparities of power among certain of the states, the organization of the world as it is in the present stage into sovereign national states, and as long as these are realities, then I think something has got to precede a stage of international

relations in which hegemonistic tendencies would not be a factor. And what has got to precede, it seems to me, has to be some sort of agreement or understanding first among the superpowers which may, which may involve accepting some sort of hegemonistic tendency.

I think the opposition of the Third World powers to this is quite understandable. But at the same time, it seems to me that in the general demeanor in international affairs the Third World powers can make a real contribution to this think which seems to me to be a very high priority, a much greater understanding or agreement among the superpowers as a first step. I would not suggest for a moment that they give up the active part of what the Yugoslavs call active peaceful coexistence, that they not go along as Ambassador Sen suggested in expressing their ideas and taking strong positions regardless of what the positions of the various blocs are, on one side or the other, but that it be important to keep

relations in which hegemonistic tendencies would not be a factor. And what has got to precede, it seems to me, has to be some sort of agreement or understanding first among the superpowers which may, which may involve accepting some sort of hegemonistic tendency.

I think the opposition of the Third World powers to this is quite understandable. But at the same time, it seems to me that in the general demeanor in international affairs the Third World powers can make a real contribution to this think which seems to me to be a very high priority, a much greater understanding or agreement among the superpowers as a first step. I would not suggest for a moment that they give up the active part of what the Yugoslavs call active peaceful coexistence, that they not go along as Ambassador Sen suggested in expressing their ideas and taking strong positions regardless of what the positions of the various blocs are, on one side or the other, but that it be important to keep

relations in which hegemonistic tendencies would not be a factor. And what has got to precede, it seems to me, has to be some sort of agreement or understanding first among the superpowers which may, which may involve accepting some sort of hegemonistic tendency.

I think the opposition of the Third World powers to this is quite understandable. But at the same time, it seems to me that in the general demeanor in international affairs the Third World powers can make a real contribution to this think which seems to me to be a very high priority, a much greater understanding or agreement among the superpowers as a first step. I would not suggest for a moment that they give up the active part of what the Yugoslave call active peaceful coexistence, that they not go along as Ambassador Sen suggested in expressing their ideas and taking strong positions regardless of what the positions of the various blocs are, on one side or the other, but that it be important to keep

relations in which hegemonistic tendencies would not be a factor. And what has got to precede, it seems to me, has to be some sort of agreement or understanding first among the superpowers which may, which may involve accepting some sort of hegemonistic tendency.

I think the opposition of the Third World powers to this is quite understandable. But at the same time, it seems to me that in the general demeanor in international affairs the Third World powers can make a real contribution to this think which seems to me to be a very high priority, a much greater understanding or agreement among the superpowers as a first step. I would not suggest for a moment that they give up the active part of what the Yugoslavs call active peaceful coexistence, that they not go along as Ambassador Sen suggested in expressing their ideas and taking strong positions regardless of what the positions of the various blocs are, on one side or the other, but that it be important to keep

relations in which hegemonistic tendencies would not be a factor. And what has got to precede, it seems to me, has to be some sort of agreement or understanding first among the superpowers which may, which may involve accepting some sort of hegemonistic tendency.

I think the opposition of the Third World powers to this is quite understandable. But at the same time, it seems to me that in the general demeanor in international affairs the Third World powers can make a real contribution to this think which seems to me to be a very high priority, a much greater understanding or agreement among the superpowers as a first step. I would not suggest for a moment that they give up the active part of what the Yugoslavs call active peaceful coexistence, that they not go along as Ambassador Sen suggested in expressing their ideas and taking strong positions regardless of what the positions of the various blocs are, on one side or the other, but that it be important to keep

in mind that the kind of things that they want and the kind of things which we all want because I think the future of the world, if there is to be one, depends on ~~ix~~ them, cannot be achieved unless you have first of all some more firm basis for coexistence among the superpowers which may involve as I say, some acceptance of certainly what I have called in the past core interests or the primary interests of the superpowers, at very least contiguous areas. Certainly, as Ambassador Sen said, the problem of development is enormously important to the superpowers for their own national interests, for the fulfillment of humanistic ideas and also I think to the peaceful development of the world, because the disparities in development are an enormous important factor in international conflicts, and the disarray of international relations. I thoroughly agree that the approaches that have been taken up and from now are quite unsatisfactory from everybody's

point of view, and in my own opinion the only way

that ~~ix~~ this can be surmounted is to give enormously

increased authority and ability to the United Nations

itself to proceed to the development fund or ~~ixx~~

elsewhere in ~~the~~ development, in ~~the~~ assisting

the development, the economic development of the

underdeveloped countries, the Third World countries.

Without this, I frankly see no hope for ~~any~~,

in the development decade or some other decade of

any substantial improvement in this very important

aspect. But I think this can't come until the United

Nations is able to function more properly and it

can't function more properly it seems to me until

there is some clear basis for coexistence among

the superpowers than there is now and it seems to

me that in this regard the Third World countries

who are, because of a whole variety of actors, but

I think have at least the potentiality to rise above

the narrow and often blind ~~g~~ points of view of the

superpowers can play an important role. Thank you.

BORGESE

I would like to project yet another alternative.

What strikes me is that we look at present reality and project it as if it were determine (???) so we take it absolutely for granted that the superpowers will be with us forever. Now the alternative, theoretical, I agree, hypothetical, I would like to project is that in the '70's and more likely in the '80's the superpowers cease to be superpowers. Because they are so eroded by their internal problems, I don't have to name them, they're too well known, that they turn inward, that a vacuum is created on the international power constellation level and that very unforeseen things may occur in consequence of that. I don't think that the superpowers are there forever.

WILKIINSON

Well, what they may do in their death throes is of course interesting to us all.

AKWEI

I must say that I find the remarks of Ambassador

Brucan rather alarming, his projections for the future, but since he disclaimed to be a diplomat at the beginning, and presumably asserted his position as an academician, I suppose he would be entitled to making his models for the future.

DOUGLAS They say at this end of the table that he is only temporarily out of the business....

AKWEI (laughs) But I think as it has just been pointed out by the last two speakers, there may be a sense in which the superpower variable may not be so important for the future. Or if it is, at any rate not ~~as~~ for as long a time as Ambassador Brucan seems to think. I believe that we will have to live with the superpowers for some time and perhaps we may have to live with more than two superpowers. I believe it is necessary for us to help in the creation of more than two superpowers and this is where I would like to comment on some very important made by Ambassador Sen. Right now, we seem to be

leaving China out of the world equation. Almost subconsciously the United Nations, except for the usual motions, the power patterns, the models which we transpose into the future seem to exclude China.

~~A~~ Now here we are leaving out a very important element, which is the element of racism, of race. Now when we look

at the superpowers today, there are two, there are Europeans. Now almost every effort that has been

made to bring in China into the world forum has

failed. Now we are not quite sure if it is something

which is very strenuously desired by the existing

two superpowers. Of course, the Soviet Union has

traditionally been in favor of this, but if we are to

believe their analysts, they have been lukewarm and

cool to the idea for some time and one could very

well understand why this should be so. Because of

the present organization of the United Nations system.

They seem to think that for the next decade or so

~~they~~ *there* should not be too drastic an upset, not be too

drastic an upset to the structure of the United Nations which enables the two superpowers to set the pace, as it was were, to maneuver and manipulate many of things which take place in the United Nations. Now where this takes place you may have a development within the Third World which is largely colored, it is not European. You may have a very undesirable development of the injection of race, race consciousness in the whole structure of the world system in which it might be thought by some of the members of the Third World that perhaps this is simply something deliberately fostered by Europeans. Therefore, you might well have the possibility of a substantial part of the Third World deliberately aiming at the eventuation of this third superpower as a counterbalance of the superpower setup simply on racial grounds.

you are becoming
~~that's~~ alarming, too.

BRUCAN

AKWEI

(laughs, with others) Well as I said we'll have to live ~~xxx~~ with them for some time but my time scale

UN & 3RD WORLD 2/13/70 AM led

is not so long as yours. And perhaps it may not be such a bad thing if we were to work in this direction the Third World simply to break this heavy hand that the two superpowers presently have on the United Nations. Now here I would like to issue with the first variable the superpower world hegemony. I think the indications rather are that there is a movement away from this concept. Even the Soviet Union, I think they've abandoned their permanent revolution now. China, well what has been happening in China is a variant of this permanent revolution, except that in their case it is more limited to the national horizon, the revolution must be permanent inside China. Of course there is the extension that they would like to push it further. But I don't think that in a world where you ~~have~~ had, say, three superpowers, one of them was really going to engage in a very fruitless effort of containing the other superpowers. I think the direction would seem to indicate that

they would go into some kind of coexistential philosophy rather than hegemony. They would have to abandon it and I think the two superpowers ~~have~~ seem to have abandoned this idea today. Therefore I am not sure that the first variable is a realistic postulate. The fourth, too, social change, where Ambassador Brucan made some prophesy as to what might happen in Latin America, an outburst of revolutions, I'm not quite sure, well, I suppose he could have added Africa as well, in his purview, but I don't think that that is the indication of the present movement in this part of the Third World. I think there is rather/in ^{a move} the direction of having more democracy and more welfare. The class conscisousness in Africa is very interesting in studying the evolution of Africa in the past few years. On the attainment of independence most African countries went in to revolutionary gear, very very revolutionary. But so many ~~extraordinary~~ things have happened, military coups here and

now
there, and/the military coups are giving way to
academic governments or so. There is a sudden
disillusionment with revolution as such in the
sense that it is not delivering the goods. I think
rather that the social development, the social
fourth postulate would lead more in the direction
of the acquisition of wealth and the possession of
wealth and a certain desire for increased standards
of living. So that you would not have this kind of
situation or the development which might make some
of the Third World members side with this or that
superpower as Ambassador Brucan projected. In fact,
I think you might very well have rather a consolidation
of the members of the Third World, this on an economic
basis vis-a-vis the superpowers. But this is where
I think Mr. Neal made some very important points.
And here we really have to determine what role the
Third World could play in this kind of evolution.
And it is not an academic evolution but something

which we see happening in the United Nations and elsewhere that there is a growing harmonization of viewpoints and positions between members of the Third World simply because they want to get more of the good things of life. Well, apart from the other things like national sovereignty and so on and so forth. But the motivation now seems to be more "let's have more of the good things of life." And it is here where we must look to the forum where this force could be better harmonized more effectively, more honest. And it has to be the United Nations. And that is why the title of this seminar is so important, the Third World and the United Nations. Now here again we have a conjunction of superpower interests militating against the granting of the desires of the Third World, simply because of the structure of the United Nations which has become archaic, really. It has become archaic. Of course Ambassador Castro has gone into

that in greater detail than I could hope to do at this intervention. But it is here that I think a Third World should coordinate its forces better in the forum of the United Nations, to see if it could not have the restructuring of the Nations which would enable the United Nations to take a supranational kind of action which the superpowers could be subjected to. Of course now everybody knows that the superpowers are valiantly against touching the Charter. Everybody knows it. But the majority of the members of the United Nations, especially the Third World, hold the view, to a man, almost, that it is necessary to have a restructuring, a review of the Charter. And this is possibly one area where the Third World can concentrate itself, coordinate its forces, harmonise its forces, to see whether it could not have some changes eventually in the structure of the United Nations. But until this is possible, it's going

to take us maybe more than a lifetime because of the built-in barriers to a revision of the Charter and the structure of the United Nations, it's going to take us more than a lifetime. If we could hold this out as a long term objective and work in the immediate objective of, as we have been doing within the purview of the Second Development Decade, to articulate the minimum targets which we want from the developed world, or from the superpowers, and reorganize the working methods of the United Nations in such a way that if a resolution is adopted by a certain ~~xxxxxxx~~ procedure, it can be really respected and honored by all the members of the United Nations, perhaps that is an area which we could fruitfully look into.

NEAL

I think Ambassador Akwei this is very important but from my point of view it's also important to keep in mind where you have a real international conflict or an international dispute which involves a power

66

conflict, it's very dangerous to think of simply trying to resolve it by a majority vote ~~and~~ in the UN or anywhere else. Indeed, this oftentimes can give the illusion ~~that~~ of some settlement which doesn't obtain.

AKWEI

Well actually that's why I said "by some kind of acceptable procedure" because the voting system may have to be changed. And there are several ideas which are being put about now ~~which~~ as to whether or not we couldn't base it on a group system, more on a group system or a combination of the group system as well as a unilateral system. I think if something could be devised, we could get over that ~~hurdle~~ *difficulty*.

DOUGLAS

Mr. Castro.

CASTRO

Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I would like to comment very briefly to what has been said by Ambassador Akwei. *It was moderate* largely _____.

7

?

I just want to make to clear I think no one, no nation

in the United Nations really is alien, is indifferent to the desirability of the superpowers to get together to enlarge to ~~xxxx~~ some base agreements on their mutual survival and the survival of mankind. And whether they today the thing was to decrease or neutralize the most ominous aspects of the confrontation. And the agreements reached by the superpowers have been largely welcomed by the large majority of states. What sometimes is felt among the medium and small nations is that sometimes those agreements aim towards a freezing of power not necessarily military power, but economic or technological power that in some cases those agreements may be made not in keeping with the principles and purpose of the Charter. And may be made to a certain extent ~~xxxxxxx~~ at the expense of the interests of the smaller states. Some pessimists have said that when the superpowers disagree or are at odds at the United Nations, there is fear, but when they agree or are in agreement, there is panic.

rather
This is the/pessimist view, but I would like to say
that I don't want to get involved in a question of
semantics or the value of _____ non-alignment
or the Third World, but it's obvious that the world
situation has changed from 1962 with the start of
direct intensive negotiations between the Soviet
Union and the United States, and it is obvious that
the two poles of the confrontation have become less
rigid, the intermediary stem ^{of a} ~~new~~ nuclearism
or non-alignment became less strong because obviously
now there is no intermediary negotiators between
the United States and the Soviet Union. My impression
is that the confrontation will go on for years undoubtedly
but it's obvious that the rules of the game have
changed and ~~now~~ they will strive toward those
agreements which, for lack of a better name you might
call agreement for survival and towards the enlargement of
these agreements in certain areas where some identity
of interests is being found among the two despite the

will
confrontation of power which ~~ix~~ certainly
continue. If I could characterize the work and
the action of the smaller nations in the United
Nations I would say that their principal worry is
to have a say on international matters and this
would correspond^{, say,} with the right to vote, I mean
the right to have opinions on international problems
and not to leave the solution of world problems
entirely to a cochairmanship of the two superpowers.
That would be the right to fight discrimination, the
right to freedom, to some extent the right to
territorial integrity and independence and the
right to development. And it might be curious to
note that these actions by the smaller nations in
the UN which congregate in rather the parliamentary
grouping, parliamentary rather than political,
because sometimes this is ~~irrespective~~ irrespective of
alliance or irrespective of allegiances, that this
action corresponds to a certain extent with the

actions and other activities of underprivileged groups within the internal boundaries of each state, that this right to freedom, this immunity right immunity from aggression, would correspond to the _____ ?

of the
reaffirmation of a certain declaration of rights

which is implicit in Article 2 ~~xxx~~ of the Charter which embodies principles and purposes.

As
~~to~~ most of the action done in the economical and social field on the question of trade and development do really correspond to many of the ideas which have ~~been~~ themselves already asserted within the national bodies of

many states and which the smaller countries or the undeveloped countries or the developing nations wish to carry to the international sphere as the recognition of a correlation

between trade and development, the principle which ?
settles the redistribution of wealth, the

principle ~~xxx~~ even of some slower ideal of international taxation. And so what I would characterize those nations you wish to call the Third World nations would

?

congregate

be that they ~~constitute~~ a number which have claims

and wish to assert their right to have a say in

the conduct of international relations which may

affect them. And their right to development and

their right to see that the promises of the

San Francisco Charter are ^{kept,} ~~carried out~~. To

this extent ~~and~~ I think that all those foreign

nations cannot be indifferent to _____ ?

of eventually at the earliest possible moment as

soon as political considerations will permit ^{of} ~~the~~

revising ^{of} the Charter. The immediate effect that

the overwhelming majority of the member states who

were not present at San Francisco and had not the

opportunity to have a say in a document which basically

governed their international relations, I think there

is a very strong argument for revision. Whether

political realities will permit this revision,

whether they will be able to get the unanimous consent

of the five permanent members is another matter.

Because as we try to, we may come to this point tomorrow, as we try to point out is that we see among the major powers a trend toward the freezing of power along two fundamental dates, one is 1945

I mean *signature*
~~xxxxxxx~~ the year of the signing of the Charter

which established that five permanent members

would be five permanent ~~xxx~~ members forever because

vote
the Charter cannot be revised without the ~~consent~~

of all the five and it's extremely doubtful that

have
any one of those who shared with powers and prerogatives

so that corresponds to an attempt to freeze power,

just as the Treaty of Non-Proliferation is another

attempt at freezing power to the extent that after

the deadline of the _____ 1967 no nation could

qualify as a nuclear nation. So I think that the

revision of the Charter which is a necessity to

we cannot live forever in this year 1945, but I

think we will be opposed, not only by the superpowers

but some of the other major powers because it would

a ?

go contrary to the standing towards the freezing of the international power, so I think it's quite obvious that the smaller nations have an interest in promoting this revision, although I think we should be realistic enough to say that under the present circumstances and political realities being as they are, I don't think that this will be done in the foreseeable future. But this would indicate, in my view, the actions to be taken by the smaller states which had in the last General Assembly an opportunity to reassert their views and to pass some resolutions. Whether this has been rather parliamentary than political is open to question. Maybe those words did not change political reality, maybe it is as I said that the smaller nations control the UN building but the major powers control the rest of the world. That's quite possible. But it still has a parliamentary significance because it is attached to a certain field, a certain

desire to fight for common goals and those are not necessarily political but they stem from the basic wish of those countries to see some rights recognized and basically that would be the right to freedom and the right to development. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

DOUGLAS Thank you, Ambassador Castro.

NARASIMHAN My name is Narasimhan. Not being a revolutionary, Mr. Chairman, I will not attempt to throw a Molotov cocktail.

RMH I don't think your being heard, C.B.

~~XXXXXXXXXX~~

DOUGLAS just
He/said he was not a revolutionary....

NARASIMHAN Not being a revolutionary I will not attempt to throw a Molotov cocktail but being an international civil servant I will attempt to throw a spanner in the works. (laughter) And I want to pose yet another alternative before going on to some observations on the question of collision with this collusion. And

this alternative is that in the '70's there will be more or less the power structure but there will be quite a different realignment and you might say that during the '70's, at any rate, the United States and China, the Peoples Republic of China, trying to come closer together and you might say within Europe a greater attempt has been made in the past towards healing the rift between East and West and trying to see if this could be a counterpoise to a future alliance or closer relationship between the United States and the Peoples Republic of China. I throw this out, as I said, as a spanner in the works.

 this
But coming to/question of collision versus collusion it is obvious that speaking in the United Nations context, there are distinct areas of disagreement, there's no need to elaborate on them, Ambassador Sen referred to that, but also in a very curious way there are a very large number of areas where there is agreement for whatever reasons in regard to the interests of the

two major powers. Reference has been made, for example, by Ambassador Castro to the Non-Proliferation Treaty which is a second attempt at freezing power in the hands of the two major powers. The same could be said of their attempting to impose a sea-bed treaty which they are agreed upon. In the economic field we notice, for example, we saw in Delhi two years ago that there is not much give in regard to trade policies on the part of the socialist countries, any more than on the part of the Western capitalist countries, but even more importantly if you take the capital development fund you see for whatever reasons an almost anti-development approach, a completely negative on the part of both the capitalist countries and the socialist countries. And yet the socialist countries have been telling us that in the United Nations Special Fund Mr. Paul Marc Henry must give money for capital development, especially in industry, and yet when there's _____

fund,

there are no takers. Reference has not been made perhaps, Ambassador Terence might have made it, or perhaps it was on the mind of Ambassador Akwei to make it, the attitude towards the _____ like Libya. There is a very curious closeness and similarity of attitudes toward such questions and ~~an~~ the unwillingness to invest the United Nations with more authority, as Ambassador Sen pointed out, the people who say that the United Nations has not attempted to do more are the very people who have made sure that it has not been able to do more, in these matters. These are some of the ~~important~~ parts that strike my mind. When you look at the problem of collision versus collusion. And for discussion of social change, here again, my spanner in the works would be I do not see the Cold War developing again on ideological grounds. I see a tendency for extremes in regard to ideology to die

t

down a little and in fact one can so far as to say that in the socialist countries they seem to have much the same internal problems of affluence and of dissent and so on as those characterizing the more advanced countries of the West, this country for example. And this doesn't seem to me to lead to conclusions that ~~would~~ be ~~a~~ kind of monolithic capitalistic structure, and the ~~kind of~~ monolithic socialist structure and there will be a Cold War between the two. I also wish to support the suggestions made by both Ambassador Akwei and Ambassador Castro and I think Ambassador Mojsov that in these circumstances what can the Third World, using that phrase in the accepted sense, what could it do. I think it could do something useful if it was more coordinated and organized within itself. And it could then have a say, at least, in many matters, as they were able to prove ^{regard to} in the Non-Proliferation Treaty to some extent

and even more in regard to the sea-bed treaty.

But apart from influencing the conduct of the

big powers, the First World and the Second World,

I think that especially in the economic and social

fields the Third World can be a very strong and

important pressure group and over a period of time

we have seen that there is some result, there is

some response to this kind of pressure. And if

these cases were true, then to some extent it

would solve one other dilemma to which Ambassador

Sen referred and that is that the Third World,

many of the countries of the Third World being

economically weak and not having a source of external

resources which to start to influence their political

action, ^{that} if you could develop something like this

within the United Nations and through the United

Nations, then the Third World countries could perhaps

become a little more free to be non-aligned and to

be able to have a say in world affairs on a more

independent if not a completely independent basis.

DOUGLAS Thank you, sir.

SEN May I ask a question?

DOUGLAS Yes, Mr. Ambassador.

SEN This is to ^{our} a non-diplomatic friend. That is, he conceived of the emergence of four superpowers, China, Western Europe, the Soviet Union and the U USA. Then he went on to one of his other variables, this time social changes variables and he felt that the other countries besides these four would, because of the social pressures and so on, align themselves, or at least be leaning towards, one or the other in the sociological aspect or ideological aspect. Now does he conceive of this arrangement as a kind of two spectra or two spectrums, if you like, that if that is so, what are the ideological contexts of these four? One could say Western Europe would be very near USA, ideologically, probably a little less for blue, and probably a little more red,

I don't know, but what would be these sort of four ideological groupings, I can understand four power groupings, even if we do not for the moment accept Mr. Akwei's point of view that there are other reasons for sociological changes, but even taking your point of view, what are the four ideologies you have in mind then?

BRUCAN

Well, the assumption was that now it is not the ideological factor that is predominant in international politics, but the national strategic factor I call which is predominant now in international politics. And this point could be illustrated by the division in both systems, I mean by the conflict that arose with the General De Gaulle phenomenon in the West opposing some American policies, and the Soviet-Chinese rift in the East. In other words, that they have no ideological character, but they represent rather a conflict on national interest lines. So starting from this assumption I said in my Molotov cocktail (laughs)

presentation that I foresee two alternatives.

Either the superpowers' thing will prevail in the '70's and then the national strategic factor will continue to be the predominant element in foreign policy making, as it is now, or if social change in a number of countries takes place, as it took place immediately after World War II, then there will be a shift and the national strategic factor will be replaced with a class ideological factor as the chief ingredient of international politics.

In other words, suppose, let's assume, for instance, that you have a series of revolutionary changes in Latin America, Asia, Africa, and so on. Then, the emphasis will shift from the national strategic factor and from big power rivalry on class ideological factor and the United States and the Soviet Union will clash again on the international arena because ~~if~~ each one will have a different opposing position on the social change that takes place, as it happened

immediately after World War II. This is what I mean by the two alternatives.

ASTROMyour second projection, it may be that the ideological war will not be between, ~~ideological~~ ~~differences~~

BRUCAN I didn't mention war...

ASTROM Ideological differences between the old protagonists but between those two on one hand and China ~~and~~ ^{on} the other which is what China herself..proposes...

BRUCAN Well my assumption is that if the ideological factor becomes again predominant, China will join with the Soviet Union. Yes, that's my assumption. In such a case, when they will see that their vital interest is in maintaining the process of social change, they will join forces. That's my....

SEN You don't foresee ideological differences being reduced, between the USA and the USSR?

BRUCAN I think they are now reduced...because now it's not the ideological factor that is predominant. There is

no ideological basic conflict between China and the Soviet Union. The ideological thing is only a coverup of a big power rivalry, that's my thesis.

SEN These two are the only ~~premise~~ trends? Can we not foresee a trend when neither national power politics or national interests in the sense we understand it today or ideology as we understood it yesterday, both these trends over the years, some ten years, both may take a different shape or both ~~may~~ be reduced a little?

BRUCAN I don't think so. I don't see other forces strong enough to determine the working of the international system, I don't.

MOJSOV May I, it's only a few words. I think the experience of the world relations in the past and the experience of the existing confrontation between two big superpowers now shows us that ideological differences and ideological slogans are only the screen for national strategic interests. That is why I don't see in this kind of

discussion of futurology in world relations that ideological factors will be again the line of division. The line of division will be the confrontation between national strategic interests and ideology will come only as an assistant to prove who are wrong or not wrong. That is why I think that the ideological differences in the future will be less and less and some confrontations on national lines and even on racial lines, which was posed by our colleague from Ghana, will become the force. That is why on this assumption of future divisions we can see many other new happenings and not just a repetition from what was going on in the last 20 or 25 years.

DOUGLAS

Mr. Terence.

TERENCE

Mr. Chairman I would like to say that, in my view, it should be essential to know that the policies

RMH

You are not being heard. These don't help you.

TERENCE

I'm sorry, no, that's alright. It will not be

long, consequently, no need of displacing you. So

I said that it should be taken into account the fact

that the international policies of the respective

big powers, the superpowers mostly, shift in

accordance with their respective national interests.

And I think Ambassador Mojsov touched the central

issue which dictates the political behavior of the

superpowers and big powers on the international

arena. And consequently, politically it is impossible

to measure mathematically what will happen within

this decade or would not will happen. I would like

rather to think that it will be prudent to formulate

that the attitudes and positions of the giants of

the United Nations will depend upon the circumstances

which vary from year to year, depending upon the

behavior of one of them or of more of them.

By that I mean the central point is that it is not

the ideologies, it is not even the racism which

dictates the policies to the different states.

Ideology, racism or any ideological labels are but arms of the national interests. In other words, they use those arms to protect safeguard develop and defend the respective national interests and I remember that Mr. Narasimhan put it very well, the small nations, I'm using my terms, will not be respected unless they are shifted/^{elevated}to an equal economic level as the big powers. And consequently, the most needy solution to the small nations problems is to elevate them to the economic equality, heh?, with other states power. This to me is the central and maybe I will come back to it when I read my paper, although it is not specifically in relations with the non-alignment ~~xxxxxx~~ but another aspect of the conference.

DOUGLAS

Thank you, Mr. Ambassador. We have about 25 minutes before lunch is served, perhaps this might be a good time to rise and we will reconvene at this table at 2 o'clock..... (END OF MORNING SESSION)

TRANSCRIPTION TAPE N-14

Track II, Feb. 13, 1970 PM

Ambassadors Conf.: UN and 3rd World

Guests: W.O. Douglas, R.M. Akwei,
S. Astrom, C. Bogdan, J.A. Castro,
P.M. Henry, M. Jakobson, L. Mojsov,
C.V. Narasimhan, S. Sen, E.L.F.
Seneviratne, Nsanze Terence.

Cys: EMB, FM, JC, Files (2)

*Hold for EMB
for Europe*

send to washer

DOUGLAS We are about ready to start. We thought we would have the two papers, first by Ambassador Terence, the second by Ambassador Astrom, and they will present their papers and following which there will be a discussion of the two of them. And we will adjourn at 4:00 o'clock. Ambassador Terence.

TERENCE (clears throat) First of all I would like to apologize because my voice these days is to some extent tailored, I would say, measured to my height (giggles from audience) so if anyone doesn't hear very well, you might stop me so that I can raise my voice, because I haven't been immunized against the virus which is now circulating throughout the United States and even in Europe I understood, which you would call 'flu. Mr. Chairman (then reads his paper)

Following is the discussion period of both papers.

(This next excerpt of Mr. Terence's was added on to the paper that was distributed)

(end of paper)

TERENCE "which no artist has ever dreamed of. And when we Africans speak of equality, our views are frequently met with some scepticism, suspicion, and even fear from the outside world. Underlining this scepticism is that once having attained our complete independence and statehood, we shall ^{use} our power to inaugurate an era of discrimination against the white man, deprive him of his equal status in the African state, his right in his possessions, in short, that we shall introduce a kind of racism in reverse, as I mentioned earlier. This is not the case. Let me say that this is pure theory and speculation emanating partly from bad conscience, of present oppressors in Southern Africa mostly, from a guilty subversion of the Gold Rule" that others will do unto you what we have done unto them."

What about the commission?

This fear ^{find's} ~~has~~ no justification in the history of the African states. Despite the emotional atmosphere

(?)

in which their freedom was attained, it is high time to note the remarkable fact that there has come out of Africa no single report of such persecution against the other colors or against other races. It has apparently never occurred to anyone to use the word xenophobia* ~~in connection~~ in connection with African nationalism.

The sole document on this question that has come out of Africa originated not from a single nation but first from fourteen nations which are ~~at~~ the eastern central African states, and lately, came ~~out~~ collectively from all the African states. I refer to the historic Organization of African Unity Manifesto which is a fulsome and positive denial with the very opposite, I mean of the speculation that Africa might practice a reverse racism. We're against it. Where a person of a multi-racial system where a racial ~~complementarity~~ complementarity will be in the effective use and practice. In this declaration held by all powers, big and small, for its supreme expression of

* Nancy Resnick
re. on this one

human rights and endorsed African initiative by the General Assembly at the last session, with the exception, of course, of the two remaining racist colonial powers, South Africa and Portugal, racism in theory and practice is foresworn forever by African states in this single voice. It is represented within the context of our theme ~~that~~ the African concept~~ion~~ of national identity, what I may call the equality of identities certainly in their rational components. African culture has astonishingly avoided chauvinism or racism, the philosophy of the African identity holds all cultures inherently supreme and that it becomes less so when it seeks to diminish the identity of another culture. This is the basis of our vision of the new world, of the human family. It is likewise the basis of our unalterable determination that all Africa must free, that African freedom is indivisible. I

thank you very much, Mr. Chairman.

Paul Tera

during the discussions period, I will be humbly at the disposal of any questions directly put to me in this context or in the interrelated topics.

Thank you, suh.

DOUGLAS Thank you, Mr. Ambassador. The next paper,

Astrom
Ambassador ~~Jakobson~~, would you....

ASTROM Would like me to....

DOUGLAS I think that might be a little better...

ASTROM Certainly. Justice Douglas, Dr. Hutchins, needless

to say I share the feelings of gratitude expressed

by several of my colleagues who have spoken ~~for~~ at

the invitation to come here and spend some time in

this intellectually stimulating environment and as

well in this/^{physically}so beautiful environment. The purpose

of the modest paper that I have contributed to the

seminar is to try to show some aspects of what I

believe to be, and nothing in the discussion has

confirmed this, one of the basic issues of our *whole*

modern time and that is the interrelationship between

the factual growing interrelation interdependence in the world, as well as a certain amount of growing recognition of this amongst the peoples on the one hand, and the, both the existence of nationalism and claims of sovereignty, naturally, and the legitimate ratio for nationalism and sovereignty also in the present historical context, and try to show a little how these concepts clash and also perhaps coincide. And finally, I thought that I may after very briefly reviewing this paper, say a few words about the United Nations and the Third World in this particular ~~xxxxxxx~~ context. May I preface my remarks by saying that it is impossible in a it seems to me ~~ix~~ discussion of this type to distinguish between factual analysis and value judgments. I think if we were sort of scholars and write for publication we would have to make this distinction in our papers ~~ix~~ much clearer than perhaps we have done. I do not apologize that I

have mingled the two things in my paper. I think that certain value judgment is clear throughout my paper and I make no apologies particularly for that. I point out first what is evident to everybody that both with respect in view of the means of destruction in the world and in view of the means of peaceful cooperation in the world, the economics, communications, and so on, all inhabitants evidently on the planet are I think I can say sort of growing interdependent in various ways. And it's perhaps particularly obvious in the field of communication where news travels around the world in seconds and with aircraft ~~and~~ news ~~and people~~ in hours with people and news in hours, one can of course wonder a bit to what extent mutual intelligibility between peoples has increased or not. And I'll not go into this problem only to say that it seems to me that a perfectly new dimension to international intelligibility has been added through television as it is gradually

being spread around the world and that another dimension to this new dimension will be added when, which does not lie very far in the future, direct broadcasts, television and radio, from satellites will be possible to individual receivers on the ground, which will immediately and in one stroke bring the messages, such as they are, information, entertainment, education, that TV and radio can bring, immediately placing it at the disposal of individuals around the world, irrespective of national frontiers, irrespective of the system of ground telecommunications that so far has been necessary to spread these messages. I'm also saying that no country can insulate itself against these influences and that indeed these influences move very quickly. I think it's clear from such a seemingly rather superficial fact or factor that young people around the world who are particularly sensitive to these influences seem to

perceive what happens in other countries and in other civilizations much quicker of course than ever before.

It is a fact that fashions amongst young people travel irrespective of political frontiers in a matter of weeks and months round the world. Fashions in dress, fashions in music, fashions in hairdo, and so on, all around the world, and irrespective, I repeat, of political frontiers. I point out one other factor which I think is important which is that most of those conflicts which nowadays lead to the use of force or armed clashes are seldom of, what shall I say, the old state character, that is, fight for a piece of territory or similar objectives, but they are more often than not of a social or ideological character and that therefore they are either domestic or they cut across the formal network of state boundaries. And I cite the example of the war in Vietnam as one obvious example. Now this fact as I think it is of growing

interdependence in the world between all inhabitants of the planet is of course perceived and even less taken into account only very slowly. And I think that~~x~~ the understanding of this mutual dependence is certainly behind the fact of the degree of, factual degree of interdependence. But I point out in a very fleeting manner some facts of international life which seem to point to a growing awareness, such as the interest that is taken round the world and not the least in all smaller countries irrespective of their state of armaments in the question of disarmament. Precisely because big war would jeopardize the interests of all peoples, they feel, it seems to me, that they have a legitimate interest in the state of armaments also of the big powers, a legitimate concern, and they express this freely and I think ^{one} I can say with increasing frankness, particularly in the United Nations, but also of course in the conference in

in Geneva. Another factor is that although what is known under a generic terms of technical assistance in the world from developed to developing countries is evidently still dismally inadequate. It still is a fact that there are large programs built ~~to~~, *multi-* lateral programs of economic cooperation including *AID* ~~and~~ and capital transfers now in existence which were not in existence 10, 15, 20 years ago. That the growing and which perhaps 20 years ago would *could not* not simply be imagined. They are there and they *are* supported by a growing *world* opinion by an awareness *in* particularly of interdependence ~~of~~ war and peace.

I draw the parallel between the situation inside a country, that the national loyalty demands that the government do not allow a particular class to starve or to be underprivileged for too long, or that a particular region, a depressed geographical region of the country starve or be discriminated against for too long. It's a *matter* of national

loyalty, it's accepted by everybody to pay taxes for these purposes. Now it seems to me that the degree of cooperation in the field of economic assistance that has sort of cropped up over the last years does point in the direction of this growing world solidarity of the same type on the global scale. Again, this solidarity falls dismally short of what is needed in its practical expression but behind all these programs, national or multilateral or economic cooperation, it seems to me there is a certain amount of this international solidarity without which surely the programs would be unthinkable.

I also touched upon the problem of race, saying that I think that one can look back with some limited satisfaction at the development in the way of recognition of racial problems. The UNESCO and other international organizations have done, it seems to me, a very great and perhaps not sufficiently

appreciated piece of work by teaching everybody that there is no basis in fact for, how shall I say, physical and biological facts for racial discrimination. This again is something that 20 or 30 years ago would have been impossible to say. Now, it is impossible to say the opposite. As I say here "today surely not many regimes dare proclaim openly that their policies are based on theories of racial superiority. The very violence with which public opinion in most countries reacts against racial discrimination between countries, relations between countries or inside countries seems to me to be indicative of this general change in attitudes." I also point out as one small sign of increasing international solidarity that whenever catastrophes happen, either manmade or nature made, there is a wave of compassion sweeping the world which does lead to often quite considerable efforts at relieving human suffering. I also quote the Nuremberg Principles, because it

seems to me that although in a very particular field but an important field, they also express the idea of world solidarity in a new way. The fact that you cannot refer to orders from a sovereign government as an excuse for committing a crime is a very daring and new invention in international law and international practice and behind again, it seems to me, is a growing awareness that there is a higher solidarity than to that of a national sovereign.

I also point to the particular problems that the new technology has created, on page 2, and some of those problems pertaining to sea-bed space, environmental controls and so on, simply necessitate international action and it is a fact the International community as represented by the United Nations has also begun to take such action on these worldwide problems, another, it seems to me, expression of a quasi-recognition of these problems and the necessity

to do something about it. I say that amongst younger people it is difficult to find the lowest common denominator between the various symptoms of youth revolt around the world. But it surely is true to say that underlying in almost most countries many of the reactions and attitude of young people is precisely a sense of world solidarity, a loyalty beyond national frontiers with people who think alike, and sort of a tendency on the part of young people to break down old barriers between people due to nation, race, and so on. I think that's again, if you want, an encouraging sign. I then go on to say that ~~xxxxxxx~~ it, this, at the same time as this, these are characteristics of our time, the factual growing interdependence and the growing recognition thereof, we live of course in a period of strong assertion of sovereignty and indeed one of nationalism. I trace briefly and very very superficially the history of the idea of

sovereignty, mainly to say that, mainly to bring out the fact that the idea of sovereignty is historically grown, if you want an ^{arbitrary} ~~arbitrary~~ concept which came up in Europe on the basis of various philosophical teachings and got its, what shall I say, got its modern formulation in the 16th and the 19th century, also that the national upheavals in Europe in the 19th century were based on this concept of unlimited sovereignty which had been developed by various writers in the 16th century.

And its also, this particular concept of national sovereignty and independence as being unlimited and unalienable is the word, and unlimited, which also is the concept generally accepted by the new independent countries as even a very important and fundamental ideological support for their whole existence. I point out amongst other things that also the Soviet Union after giving up the idea of permanent revolution and after adopting the theory

of the possibility of socialism in one state in the '20's now internationally speaking stands for a very absolutist interpretation of state sovereignty with certain ~~xxxxxxxx~~ obvious reservations.

Now it's quite obvious that in the Western societies people have been conditioned now over the centuries to live in this nation-state in the context of this particular interpretation of national sovereignty.

The state being entitled to take a person's life by sending him to war or very often in many countries still taking a person's life by sending a person to the gallows, and always having the right to confiscate part of our property through taxation and that also the preeminence of the concept of sovereignty is also clear from the fact that treason is, national, treason is considered the basis for crimes and loyalty to the state is one of the highest virtues. So this is the kind of environment that we, of spiritual environment that we all ~~agree~~ have

been brought up to but where these new tendencies and these counter tendencies break in into this situation.

I then say that it seems to me that there is there are certain political objectives served by the concept of national sovereignty at the present time which must be recognized as perfectly legitimate.

I point to the fact that it is in the name of sovereignty that the leaders of the new independent countries give, try, attempt to give to their peoples the social cohesion and the sense of solidarity which are necessary for national identity, if you want, for orderly administration and for economic and social progress and also say that is seen sovereignty/by many as a barrier against all kinds of neo-colonial pressures and I also say that also inside otherwise tightly knit groups, let's say the type of a military bloc, sovereignty is also used as an ideological tool to assert a certain amount

of national independence in relation to the leader of the respective bloc.

I finally say after this brief, and I repeat, rather summary and superficial analysis that I don't want in this particular paper to draw the full conclusions or even less to propose action, but I do point out certain things that it seems to me follow from this analysis. One is, it seems to me, that as I say, at the conceptual level, it would be important to achieve a deeper understanding of the true nature of sovereignty, its limitations as well as its continued ratio in the modern world. But it should certainly be stripped of metaphysical significance such as are often given to it and also of excessive emotional charge, while of course recognizing that it still has, serves a purpose, recognizing as it does the need for some factual supreme authority in ~~xxxx~~ organized social life. But I do feel that if it were, that if the concept of sovereignty were

a bit de-charged, I think that a lot of international tensions and conflicts that are due to an erroneous interpretation of national interests and indeed to national prestige would become perhaps less likely.

I also point to the necessity of directing the research, academic and otherwise, research, into this question and to try to look ahead boldly into the various/^{models}of cooperation which are not limited to interstate relations. I point to the possibilities of increased functional cooperation across state borders and the establishment of institutions with trans-national and perhaps super-national powers.

I also point out that to achieve some of this greater understanding of the growing factual interdependence in the world a certain amount of intellectual freedom seems to be necessary as far as I can see, both domestically in countries and for the flow of information and points of view across frontiers. I then come to say a little about the United Nations, ~~xx~~ that

as I say on the last page under f, that when it comes to strengthening the United Nations I feel that efforts should be particularly geared to the study of possibilities of using the organization more effectively for identifying areas where cooperation on a universal scale is a vital necessity and for devising arrangements and institutions appropriate for the drastically changed world conditions. And I point out some examples of this, including that for protecting and improving the human environment. I am perhaps may add a few words that are more directly related to the main theme of this seminar, that is, the United Nations and the Third World. I think it has emerged from our discussion already that the notion of non-alignment in the world is now a very much different one from what it was when it was first minted, I think one can say it goes back to the Bandung Conference. It was then to a large extent a question

of opposing overwhelming influences on the part of one of the other great powers to draw the smaller powers into their military, ideological, and political orbits. It had in this sense a negative connotation. Not to be squeezed between the two big powers. It was also in a more perhaps on the part of some countries an attempt to mediate between the big powers. It was also for some countries a way of playing one against the other to get certain advantages, let's say, of an economic character. But so many of these things have changed and it seems to me that the concept of non-alignment now is essentially a positive one. It is a question of striving for certain, for a new world community based on certain common ideals which can be briefly indicated as the principles behind the UN Charter. But it is also to offer an alternative to dependence, it still is to offer an alternative to dependence in economic and security and political terms on one or

two of the great powers, I say one or two. But to keep open options to the smaller powers, economic, security and political, other than collaboration with and dependence on one or both of the great powers. Now it seems to me that if this is the case, the dichotomy that I've tried to talk about is particularly acute and particularly important for the countries of the Third World, for the smaller countries, generally speaking. On the one hand, it is amongst those countries that the continued ration for national sovereignty is particularly acutely felt. And at the same time it is they who stand more to gain from the creation of international institutions appropriate to the growing interdependence in the world, indeed, including supranational institutions. Ambassador Akwei said that what the smaller nations of the Third World now want is not ideology of one kind or another,

They are wiser than that. They want, as he said, welfare, democracy and the good things of life. And they know they cannot get that except through wide cooperation amongst themselves and ~~a~~ on a world scale. And they try to bring to, to carry out this cooperation as much as possible within the framework of the United Nations. It seems to me that in the prolongation of this recognition lies indeed the possibility of giving the United Nations both in the economic and the security spheres increasing powers, as indeed Ambassador Akwei said, of one kind or another, even bordering on the transnational or supranational. There is a parallel for Europe which I think here is illustrative. The Rome Treaty contains certain possibilities of supranational decision. It is typical that the great powers of the Common Market have been stalling on the interpretation of precisely these provisions, in particular, France. It is also typical that it

is the smaller powers like in particular Holland,
that has been insisting on the implementation of
these supranational stipulations of the Rome Treaty,
precisely because they feel that supranational
authority will better take care of the interests
of the smaller countries than one great power or
several great powers in collaboration would do.

I think there is a parallel here from this particular
field of regional cooperation and the, as the picture
is about the supranational powers there on the one
hand, and on the other hand the wider global scale.
So my thought then is finally that this particular
dichotomy of modern times seems to me to be particularly
acute and topical for developing countries, for smaller
countries in ~~xxx~~ the world, and, and that therefore,
and that it is encouraging that I think many of them
recognize this dichotomy and also see as one way out
of it increased international cooperation even, as I
said bordering on giving to an international institution

supranational powers. Also may I come back to this for a second. The necessity of increasing awareness that the conceptual level of the limitations and special historical connotations of supremacy, of sovereignty, which can only be achieved through intellectual international intercourse. There was a man in 1951 who had this to say about this particular need. He stressed the need for some kind of international institution which would be composed of men who ~~are~~ were prepared to conduct a continuous Socratic dialogue on the basic issues of human life. They would be specialists but they would have passed beyond specialism. They would establish a genuine communion of minds. They would know no limitations of national boundaries, for they could be assembled from all parts of the world. They could therefore/advance at once and symbolize that world ~~community~~ community, that world republic of learning without which the world republic of law and justice

is impossible." These words were uttered by Mr.

Robert M. Hutchins in a lecture at the University of Upsala in Sweden, 1951. Thank you.

DOUGLAS Thank you, Mr. Ambassador. Now the questions, to either of the speakers or both simultaneously.

EMB I have a question to Ambassador Terence, or rather a comment on something that he said. And which ties in with the discussion of sovereignty of Ambassador Astrom. Ambassador Terence said that sovereignty was the last bulwark against power. I was abit struck by that statement and I don't think I could accept it. Because sovereignty without power is indeed a contradiction, it has no meaning. Sovereignty or supremacy, one might even say, is a synonym of power, and if you have no power you have no sovereignty. What I think he means and with which I would of course wholeheartedly agree is self-determination, is independence, is a quality surrounding development, is all these

things. Well and these are the things that, in the absence of power, one ~~only~~ can only have through international cooperation today. Yeah, I think that's what I wanted to say.

DOUGLAS

Any comments, Mr. Ambassador?

~~XXXXX~~
TERENCE

I think the pronunciation is one of the reasons why one doesn't understand what is said. I don't know if she, if Mrs. Borgese used my own words or if she tried to interpret. However, I would like to comment indeed that she might have not exactly understood due to my accent, half-British half-French (laughter) so I apologize for that. Indeed contradiction it would be a ~~contradiction~~, by sovereignty I do not mean it is a bulwark against power, but sovereignty understood in an individual context or in a collective context is only, as I said, a natural and inherent right which is claimed by all the peoples, no matter how (who) they are. And sovereignty should not be used as an arm against cooperation and a country ✓

when I spoke of the necessity of complementary identities. By complementary identities or this complementarity involves and comprises the political aspects, the economic aspect, the technical aspect and I think it might have been rather a misunderstanding and it would have been in fact contradictory to say that sovereignty is against power. Rather sovereignty should be, if I may say so, a springboard of power, economic power, political power, and also the springboard of the possibility towards an international effective cooperation. Because I rather believe in the limited sovereignty and I believe in equal partnership, not, that is why I am highly partisan of the necessity of a shifting of members of the Third World from the status of dependence, of dependence countries, to the ranks of the partnership of equals. And in case I have to add any elements to avoid any other misunderstanding, it would be....

DOUGLAS Thank you, Mr. Ambassador. Ambassador Sen has a question.

SEN Oh it's alright...no, no.

JAROBSON Well (laughs) f comes before i. Well, I think both the statements we heard today go to the heart of the problems in international life that we have to deal with. And what Ambassador from Burundi said about the desire or the dilemma facing African states who wish to retain their national cultural identity and at the same time participate in this process of integration which takes place in the world, the same is true of any small nation today, not only those in Africa but those in anywhere else in Europe. I'm speaking also of my own country, which has to make up its mind in the face of economic and other forms of integration which inevitably go on and become more and more pervasive in all aspects of life, must make up its mind in what way and to what extent it can, ^{indeed} retain a true

sense of independence and identity. At the same time I think that there is no alternative to national determination and state sovereignty and there need not be any contradiction between a further ^{degree} higher/of international cooperation between states and an assertion of this true independence and self-determination. We talk about the possibility of supranational institutions yet I think that no one has made it quite clear by what means and who and what authority will in fact exercise this supranational power. In fact the Charter provides the Security Council with supranational authority, we always forget that. ^{It has} ~~xxxxxxx~~ supranational authority with regard to all other member states except the government members of the Security Council ^{which} ~~to~~ have the veto. But with regard to other member states the Security Council can make decisions which are binding on the member states.

But it is this provision which is absolute, rather than any other in the Charter. I agree that the papre submitted by Ambassador Castro, ~~XXXX~~ and we will discuss this more tomorrow, I think it is true to say that these provisions of the Charter, these important provisions which are supranational in character have become obsolete and in fact we've forgotten about them and in fact never mention them. They have become obsolete because of the fact that not only the five permanent members but in fact every nation has the veto, When it comes to its basic national interests, if it has a ^{will} ~~way~~ to assert that veto. Every nation has a sort of irreducible minimum beyond which it is not prepared to go and which it is prepared to defend and ~~XXXX~~ has in fact defended as experience has shown. So that we have to accept the fact that there is this, that there is this national independence and that any further development in international cooperation has to be

built around that fact and based on that fact and that in fact it can be done, that it is not necessarily contradictory. Thank you.

DOUGLAS

Thank you.

~~XXXX~~
AKWEI

Mr. Chairman, I naturally disagree with the last speaker. (laughter) But I won't go into that just yet. The first question I would like to raise is in response to a part of a statement made by Ambassador Astrom/ⁱⁿ which he said "sovereignty is also seen a barrier against all kinds of neo-colonial pressures. I had some cold shudders in my system when I read this part of the statement because I had always been under the impression that the neo-colonialists in a way always preferred paper sovereignties on which they could work and in fact that is how the old philosophy of neo-colonialism arose, that you can ~~hardly~~ ^{have a} state which has ~~an~~ national anthem, a national flag, and a president, ambassadors, but which really will dance to the tune of a major power.

So it is not really correct always to think of sovereignty as a kind of barrier against neo-colonialist pressures. The whole history of the Congo, I think, is a lesson in that. And other parts of Africa which I will not mention, in fact, you have some kinds of independence where immediately the ex-colonial power grants independence ~~xx~~ and some kind of military or economic alliance is supposed to be established with the country which has just become independent. Of course, it is very weak, economically, militarily, and therefore you have the possibility of the ex-colonial power making use of such kind of unequal alliance to intervene in the sovereign internal affairs of the country concerned. So I would question that, from that point of view. And in fact this brings another problem which I had with the subject which was so exhaustively dealt with by Ambassador Nsanze, Independence and National Identity in Today's World. Now I find

some difficulty with the subject because there you
c can have two contradictory situations arising.

People like Voerster in South Africa say that there is really no national identity among the African tribes in South Africa, therefore what's the use of giving them independence, they are going to make a mess of things. You have the same thing in Rhodesia. This is something beyond them. They are not quite ready to bear the burdens of a nation-state. And therefore they are not amenable to the application of self-determination. When you have the opposite theory which is partly implied in my earlier remarks that let's give these weak small countries independence as rapidly as possible so that we can intervene, the big powers. And here is where you have a whole group of problems arising within the nation-state, the new nation-states which the big powers will do well to restrain themselves about. And here one cannot help thinking of the

Nigerian situation. It is quite true as was pointed out by Ambassador Nzanze that you do have ethnic groups, you do have tribal groups within most African states and that although there is this community of tribal mystique which is the common heritage there is an opposite development where sometimes you have the clash of tribal laws and tribal feelings, Just like Nigeria and Biafra. And then you have the makings of a very pleasant field for big powers to fish in troubled waters, which is actually what happened in Nigeria and Biafra, with regard to certain states. Now therefore there is an obligation resting on the big powers to respect sovereignty when sovereignty has been achieved. And to take into consideration the peculiar difficulties which arise in these new states because they are new and they have these vociferous forces which are playing against each other in the nation-state and this is something you have in most African states and I

believe this is not even peculiar to African states, you have it all over the world. You have it in this country with Black Power enthusiasts talking about an independent state, you have Ukrainian nationalism in the Soviet Union, you have, I believe you have even in Yugoslavia a Slovene coalition, so its very amazing when we see Europeans identify these things as peculiarly African (laughs). Even the British have to contend with Scottish and Welsh nationalists. So what I think is very very important for people to realize, especially the big powers, that if they have had a longer time to coalesce and make develop and evolve a more cohesive national texture, we have not had that much time. And we should be allowed a little more to consolidate our sovereignty. Now this is where there is a difficulty in moving beyond sovereignty or independence to interdependence which Ambassador Astrom spoke about. Here, again, we must appreciate that for, its like

giving a toy, a new toy to a child. He wants to enjoy it for a while. These new countries, they want to enjoy their independence for a while, their sovereignty for a while. Maybe not all of them, but at least those who are Presidents and Prime Ministers. And therefore their view of the immediacy of interdependence ^{may} ~~will~~ not be quite the same as the view in other countries. But I agree with Ambassador Astrom there is a conceptual agreement, more or less, but we really have to move beyond the nation-state towards an interdependence and here is where I would disagree with Ambassador Jakobson because once you start moving into the era of interdependence you must really have institutional machinery. I don't think that man is that highly motivated to yield very easily to orders from above. And here the picture which is always struck me very forcibly is the picture which the astronauts took of the earth, when they were going to the moon. It's

really pathetic to see that the earth is so small and therefore many of our daily preoccupations are really not that important, to see that we are condemned to be one and live together and yet we are fighting and making difficulties for ourselves all the time. And it brings the closeup in mind the necessity and the possibility of evolving institutions which will really enforce this oneness of the world. Of course I agree that there are certain areas like human environment, technology, the spread of hippie culture, all these things which are being sent so rapidly around the world where you have the makings of a voluntary kind of interdependence which can be built around technological systems, TV and things like that. But where it comes to law, international law, for example, one might well ask why is it that we don't apply the same philosophy in the national context that we talk about when we go into the realms of interdependence. We

say that this is possible without the institutions
and yet ~~no~~ nobody has yet found it to be possible
in ~~an~~ a national setting. Most of the problems we
have in the international world are just a repetition,
a recap of problems in a nation-state. And if we
find it necessary to have institutions in a nation-
state, because of the bad and inherently bad nature
of man, one would assume that we would agree that
it is necessary to have institutional machinery in
inter
the national sphere too. And here I think one of
the areas where the Third World can play a vital
part is in the evolution of international law and
the evolving of machinery to apply it, this
international law. Here we have an international
court which has no work, practically. I think they
had only two cases, the judges are there but there
is no work. We don't give them work, we don't
expect them to work, simply because of the institutional
arrangement which exists between the International

Court of Justice and the United Nations. Why should they be concerned only with giving interpretative judgments, why cannot we allow them to go beyond, here, again, of course, we have to think in terms of enforcement machinery, but if we find logical that this is necessary, why shouldn't we say so, and push for it? Rather than concentrate on the point we seem to have reached where we seem to think that national sovereignty is the point beyond which we cannot go. Everybody accepts that, we have to go beyond a state of national sovereignty. These are just..

DOUGLAS I'm glad somebody the judiciary into this (laughter)..

Mr. Ambassador?

SEN Well, Mr. Chairman some of the things I wanted to say have already been said, but my concern was really much more deep-rooted. The two statements we heard this afternoon brought up a large number of philosophical and most interesting points. And we simply haven't ~~the~~ *had*

time to discuss them. Whether these philosophical problems will lead to better concrete results or the other way, I don't know, but let us take Mr. Terence's paper first. It seemed to me that his main complaint, and I agree with him, the main complaint is that we are talking of equality, but equality as determined by the colonial powers. In other words, let the Africans be equal to us, not the others equal to Africans. And this kind of approach is all throughout what Mr. Akwei just mentioned is also a part of the same thing. The thesis: let there be international law but international law of what, international law of the European states drawn up 100 hundred years ago. There has been no attempt to adopt, adjust or modify international law to take into account the present society as we should today. Equality is a doctrine that if the Africans are claiming equality with the others, they have to be equal to us, not we to them. ~~This is~~

a

This is obviously a perversion. Now, in order to voice his complaint and make his point, Ambassador Terence got on a large number of subjects and theories on which one can have many many views. For instance, he talked about African civilization and roots and so on and so forth which is going on forever, those who read books can say it's 5 thousand years old, 7 thousand, 20 thousand, heaven knows how long. But the question is, has this continuity been present, if there's not continuity in this civilization, consciousness of the civilization breaks down. Therefore, is it possible for the African countries today to restore consciousness by conscious effort, is a very difficult question to answer. If there is no consciousness, if there has been a breach of consciousness, the continuing civilization, obviously the start has to be made from a new basis altogether. Secondly, he mentioned, again I agree with him, as an argument, that in order to resist neo-colonialism and

all that kind of thing African countries will have to give an impression of African identity, he gave various examples. Now it is possible to argue against that theory by saying that African countries, being as they are, are obliged, are almost compelled to give this impression of African identity, but if we think of Africa, not south of the Sahara, but the whole of ~~Africa~~ of the continent, to what extent does this theory hold good? Isn't that a kind of criss-cross of loyalty and so on and so forth.

The third point which is probably the most important of all, that many of the theories which are based on a most intellectual approach that the adaptation which the elite is making in the modern context.

B But as Mr. Akwei quite rightly pointed out, these elites were handed over power by the colonial regimes for reasons of their own. And it came so quickly ~~and~~ in six years practically the whole of Africa is free, for years we have been told Africa cannot

free, there are natives, to begin with, whatever that may mean, the savages are totally uneducated and everything else and ^{within} ~~ix~~ six years the whole theory is destroyed and everybody's independent.

Now has there been done with more than one diabolical reason, for more than one diabolical reason, some we are prepared to accept and some we are not. And if some we are prepared to accept, the reasons which Mr. Akwei gave, there are still others that because of this diabolical arrangement which some of the leaders fell for, quite understandably, I not talking of toys, of a national anthem and flags and all of that kind of thing, and all of us, including ourselves I think have fallen into a kind of mental mood where these things could have been avoided, but we have fallen into it, the national flag must fly at the United Nations, we must stand up sing songs and all that kind of thing. It was not necessary but again this is one of the many aspects, how we have been

suborned, governed, controlled, moulded, modified, conditioned by some other civilization which is not ours. And we accepted those values and now we are stuck with them, stick up for them. If that thesis is correct that there was a diabolical arrangement, the question is, will the people of Africa whether their loyalties are tribal or traditional or cultural, it doesn't matter how the loyalties come about or what the values are, will the people of Africa continue to maintain these values which are now being exercised by the leaders of today's African countries. If they are not going to be tolerated, then what is the pattern we foresee? This is quite apart from what we have been discussing before. Now this is about Mr. Terence's paper. Now we come to Mr. Astrom's paper. Here, again, he of course gave a slightly optimistic picture but there are many points which he left unsaid. He said that if people started growing long hair in Santa

Barbara in four days time Tokyo will be doing it,
 in five days time Liverpool will be doing it or
 something or other, if all that is intellectually
 so free and easy, why is it the immigration policies
 which are mainly based on whether you can use knives
 and forks are so rigid. ~~But~~ Because assimilation,
 social assimilation will take place so that fashion
 is very easy to copy, if it is still 10,000 miles
 away but not very easy to accept if it is two yards
 away. Now these are the intellectual dishonesties
 which we really have ^{nt} settled/^{down} on. We talk ~~of~~ about
 commerce, television and all that. Australia can't
 by any standards support 100 million people, the
 population of Australia is ^{now} 12 million, not that I
 want to go to Australia, but why is ~~it~~ ^{it} Australia can
 take the Lebanese and the Japanese and not the Burundis,
 this is not (???). They say, there's not television.
 Fair enough, we can ^{give} ~~have~~ entertainment, instruction,
 education, information, everything, but who is to

pay for these things? Where is the money? Can Burundi have, the other day we had a most interesting argument in Mr. Astrom's house at his hospitable table and we discussed the technical side of it, but we did not discuss, we could not discuss the financial side of it. If Peru, or Brazil or India or anybody else is going to have all these television sets, finding out how the hair is growing or not growing, whose to pay? Again, no particular answer. So it isn't that we cannot settle all these various issues, but why the thing goes wrong, I think, is that we stop short at what we believe is correct, and not what is uncomfortable, whether it is Africa or Sweden or India, it is true of all of us. And this soul-searching has a long way to go, but whether we can do in three days I don't know (laughter).

DOUGLAS

I think Ambassador Sen has posed us lot of interesting questions but it's four o'clock and we better postpone discussion of those until tomorrow.

ASTROM

May I just say, just clear up one thing with my friend Akwei. I think he really agrees with me that the notion of sovereignty is an important political tool to counteract influences from greater countries, economic and political and military. Even in Nigeria surely when the federal government wanted to oppose intervention in their internal affairs, it was in the name of sovereignty. And it was a very strong argument that surely ^{to} my country, for instance, was a very forceful argument, naturally, and I think in most other countries, so surely it is still a very powerful political tool, internationally speaking, to oppose great power influences. Another matter is, naturally, that sovereignty very often is but a sham, naturally, and that it even may be that great powers consciously set up sovereign states for the purpose of controlling it. Alright, but even so, the alternative to this is complete dependence and at least in the name of sovereignty in the long run

you may have created a situation where more of
for
independence ~~of~~ that particular unity will be made
possible.

DOUGLAS We'll stand adjourned until tomorrow morning at
10:30.

END OF FRIDAY SESSION