

Strengthening the International Development Institutions

July 9, 1965

Adlai Stevenson II's Speech before the United Nations Economic and Social Council Geneva, Switzerland

Excerpt:

We travel together, passengers on a little space ship, dependent on its vulnerable reserve of air and soil; all committed for our safety to its security and peace; preserved from annihilation only by the care, the work, and I will say, the love we give our fragile craft. We cannot maintain it half fortunate, half miserable, half confident, half despairing, half slave—to the ancient enemies of man—half free in the liberation of resources undreamed of until this day. No craft, no crew can travel safely with such vast contradictions. On their resolution depends the survival of us all.

Background:

In 1961, President John F. Kennedy appointed Adlai Stevenson American ambassador to the United Nations. Although he sought the more important position as Secretary of State, Stevenson scored some successes during his four-plus years at the UN. For example, he played an influential role in the Kennedy administration's decision to sign the treaty banning atmospheric testing of nuclear weapons. These tests had spread deadly airborne radioactive "fallout" throughout the world.

In this speech, Stevenson echoed Abraham Lincoln's June 16, 1858 "House Divided" speech. "A house divided against itself cannot stand," Lincoln declared. "I believe this government cannot endure, permanently half slave and half free." Whereas Lincoln talked of slavery, Stevenson talked of a North-South divide of global dimensions. At issue was the gap between the affluent North, mainly the U.S. and Europe, and the developing South, mainly South America, Africa, and much of Asia.

Stevenson was all-too familiar with the promises and problems of the developing world. As ambassador to the UN, he was praised for his empathic diplomacy. During his overseas travels, he had seen firsthand hunger, grinding rural poverty, urban squalor, religious and ethnic pogroms, environmental devastation, and other problems. "We are talking about pain and grief and hunger and despair and we are talking about the lot of half the human race," he said.

Stevenson also knew how to get things done within the UN's complicated

bureaucratic machinery. In this speech, he discussed in considerable detail how the UN should address issues as wide ranging as industrialization and meteorology. Stevenson, though, toiled in a UN divided not only between haves and have-nots, but also between the free market West and the communist East. Despite these divisions, he believed UN successes proved that international politics was not a zero-sum game. “The reality is that international agreements can be reached,” he declared, “and international organizations can be formed—and international common law can be elaborated—on subjects which draw nations together even as they continue to quarrel about the frontiers and friends and ideological frenzies which keep them apart.”

This was Stevenson’s last major address. Five days later, on July 14, 1965, he died of a heart attack while in London.

FULL TEXT of address “Strengthening the International Development Institutions,” before the United Nations Economic and Social Council, Geneva, Switzerland, July 9, 1965:

Mr. President,

We meet here in Geneva at the midpoint of the year of international cooperation and the midpoint of the decade of development, as Ambassador Pachachi has reminded us [Adnan Pachachi, permanent representative of Iraq to the United Nations, 1959-1966]. Let us be neither cynical nor despondent about the gap between these brave titles and the fact that at the moment, our world community is chiefly notable for minimal cooperation and very lopsided development. Our aspirations are there to spur us on, to incite us to better efforts. They are emphatically not there as a blind or a cover or as rhetoric to suggest that we are really doing very well.

I take as the understood premise of everything I say that as a world community we are not developing as we should and that our record of cooperation is inadequate, to say the least. But I believe, I hope, we can do better and that the nations meeting in 1970 will say: “Ah, yes, 1965 was a kind of turning point. That was the moment at which we began to realize how much better our performance has to be.”

How much better can best be registered by a glance at where we are now.

We launched the Decade of Development because we realized, as a world community, that while our wealth was growing its distribution had become increasingly unbalanced. I need hardly repeat the figures—the developed market economies and the developed centrally planned economies make up about [one] quarter of the world’s population and account for three quarters of the world’s trade, production, and investment.

By the chances of history and geography, these developed nations are largely to be found

to the north of the Tropic of Cancer. Ideology makes no difference here. Soviet Russia belongs by income and growth to the developed “north,” Ghana to the developing “south” in our new economic geography.

These facts we knew in 1960. In the last 5 years the contrasts have grown more vivid. The developed nations with per capita incomes of above \$700 a year have grown—the index I use is gross national product per head of population—by not less than 3 percent a year.

Below them a smaller group of nations, which are in the range of \$200 to \$700 per capita, have grown even more rapidly—by 4 to 8 percent a year.

But at the bottom of the scale at a figure of \$200 per head and less, comprising over a hundred nations making up over two-thirds of humanity, the rate of per capita growth has in many instances been less than the average of 2.3 percent of the developing countries as a whole. Population growth has swallowed up their margins, and per capita growth hovers around zero.

I

This is the statistical picture which emerges from the present data about world development. But how bare and uninformative such numbers really are. They tell us nothing about the rates of child mortality ten times higher among poor than rich. They give us no picture of the homeless migrant living without water or shelter on the fringe of Asian or Latin American cities. We get no feel from them of the ache of hunger or the debility that comes from diets without enough protein and vitamins.

These are the hidden miseries about which we talk with our figures of per capita gross national product, our statistical comparisons, our impersonal percentages. We are talking about pain and grief and hunger and despair and we are talking about the lot of half the human race.

II

But we are also talking about another phenomenon—the extraordinary increase in resources available to human society taken as a whole. These 3- or 4-percent increases in the national growth of developed societies mean an unparalleled expansion of new resources.

Under steady and responsible economic management, we cannot see—and we certainly do not want —any end to this process of expansion. Out of the research that is connected with weaponry, with space, and with the whole wide range of needs of our civilian economy, we are constantly making new breakthroughs—new methods, new products, new sources of food or energy or medical relief that increase our capacity to reproduce wealth still further. We have harnessed energy to take us into outer space and to convert saline waters into drink for the thirsty. The isotopes which grow from nuclear

experiments can revolutionize medical and agricultural research. And we know not what new, still undiscovered sources of abundance lie ahead.

We have to begin to grasp and digest this new, astonishing liberation of our terrestrial resources, for only after such an understanding can we hope to act on the scale and with the audacity that our profound problems of poverty and hopelessness and obstruction demand. We shall conquer, no doubt, the dark face of the moon. But I would hope we can with equal confidence conquer the dark face of poverty and give men and women new life, new hope, new space on this planet.

III

Let's face it: We are nowhere near conquering world poverty. None of us—neither the weak nor the strong, the poor nor the rich, the new nations nor the old—have yet taken seriously enough the contrast between the abundance of our opportunities and the scarcity of our actions to grasp them. It is good that the rich are getting richer—that is what economic development is for. But it is bad that, despite our considerable efforts in the first half of this decade, the poor are still poor—and progressing more slowly than present day society can tolerate.

What shall we do to improve the trend during the next 5 years? There is something for everybody to do. There are tasks for all of us, and it won't help the poorer countries for us to sit around this table blaming the state of the world on each other. There are clear and present tasks for the developing countries in doing what they know is necessary to their own economic growth and social progress. There are tasks, equally clear and equally present, for the industrialized countries. And there are tasks—a growing number of much larger tasks—for UN organizations themselves.

I think each of us should come to this table vowing to bring proposals that his nation can—and intends to—do something about. In that spirit I will not rehearse here my views on how the developing nations can better help themselves but will suggest what the wealthier countries can do to help and how the UN itself can do more about development, and do it better.

IV

Let me suggest first the sense of a convergent strategy for the industrialized nations. Its aim should be to see to it that more of the wealth and purchasing power of our expanding world economy will be used to stimulate economic growth in the developing nations.

We can accomplish this aim only by the coordinated use of a variety of means: by the direct transfer of resources from developed nations to developing nations through effective aid programs; next, by assuring the developing countries greater access to the expanding markets of the world; next, by working to reduce fluctuations in the export earnings of the developing countries; next by working harder, doing more specific research, on what the more developed countries can do to help the less developed create

more wealth faster; next, by helping to slow down the vertiginous growth in the number of people which the still fragile developing economies have to support. A steady, overall four per cent rate of growth in national income is in itself a difficult achievement. Its effects are tragically nullified if the rate of population growth is 3 percent or even more.

These five strands of a convergent strategy contain no mysteries. We have discussed them over and over again. What has been lacking has been an adequate urgency of purpose and decision and a real determination to face the full costs.

There is no doubt that we can afford whatever direct transfer of resources can really be put to effective use. There are so many man-made obstacles in the development process that there is a kind of natural limit to the transfer of resources from the richer countries to the poorer countries.

In my judgment, we are in no danger at all of harming our own healthy economies by maximizing our efforts to promote international development. Our problem, rather, is to step up the training of people, the surveying of resources, and the investigation of opportunities—in a word, the pre-investment work—which still sets the ceiling on direct investment, public and private, in the economic growth of most developing countries.

With my next point—improved trading opportunities—I come to all the issues at stake in the continuing work of the new UN Trade and Development Board and its committees, and of the GATT [The General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade, adopted by sixty signatories in 1947, which provided for the phased elimination of tariffs, quotas, and preferences in order to achieve freer trade]. These are some of the problems we must face together. Primary prices are unstable, and many have tended downwards in the last decade. The tariff structures in the industrial countries hit harder at the processed and manufactured goods than at raw materials. Internal taxes discourage the consumption of tropical products. And finally, there is need for greater effort to improve production and efficiency in the export industries of the developing countries.

The enormous uncertainties of trade, the unstable, fluctuating export earnings, interrupt the development process, too much and too often. The world has already put into effect some means of providing compensatory finance and balance of payments support to help the developing countries deal with such difficulties. Perhaps we will never find an ideal solution, but I think we have by no means reached the end of the road in dealing with these problems. We must continue to do everything practicable to provide to developing countries resources that are effectively related to the fluctuations in their export trade.

When I say we need a concerted attack on these obstacles, I do not mean a great debate in which the attack is concerted against the governments of the wealthier countries. Complaints about other countries' policies have their place in international politics. They seldom change what the other nations actually do, but they help make the complainant a hero to his own countrymen—and that has its place in politics too. But when it comes to trade between the world's "north" and the world's "south," we need not a general debate about general principles but concrete proposals, direct negotiations, specific nose-to-nose

confrontations about particular ways the developing countries can increase their exports and how the rest of us can really help, commodity by commodity.

V

Another vital contribution the industrialized nations can make to development is to expand their own research into the causes and cures of poverty. Partly this is a matter of putting extra emphasis on those fields of science that are especially relevant to the needs and possibilities of the developing countries. We stand here in the presence of exciting breakthroughs in nutrition, in farming, in water use, in meteorology, in energy. All these are vital, and it is particularly gratifying that the United Nations advisory group of scientists have put the development of water resources and the evolution of new high-protein diets at the top of their list of points needing special attack.

Mr. President, while I am on this subject, I should like to say a special word about the work of the Advisory Committee on the Application of Science and Technology to Development. My Government will make known in due course its detailed views with respect to the specific proposals made by this group in the report which is before US. As to the report itself, I would only say at this time that it is clear, precise, and professional—high testimony to the quality of work that can be done in our international community. On behalf of my delegation, I should like to congratulate all members of the Advisory Committee, the many experts of the Specialized Agencies who contributed to it, and the members of the United Nations Secretariat under whose supervision the work went forward.

But I have more in mind than the merits of the recommendations put forward and the quality of the report as a whole. I have in mind the background of this report and the process by which these proposals have taken shape for our consideration.

The background of the report, as we all know, is the Conference on the Application of Science and Technology to problems of the developing areas, held here in Geneva in early 1963. That conference was criticized by superficial observers. They said that the whole thing was much too big—too many people, too many subjects, too many papers, too much talk to do any good. They said that the whole thing was much too vague, too general, too unfocused, too disparate. And perhaps there was something in some of this criticism.

But it was a start. And the big thing is that we did not let it die. We maintained the momentum generated at that conference. We went on to the next step. Within a few months after the close of that conference, this Council recommended the establishment of an expert committee of advisers to carry on—to pick up where the conference left off—to sort the important from what is merely useful.

I have no doubt, Mr. President, that what followed was a difficult and tedious exercise for the Committee of Advisers. But they went about it systematically. They consulted and took evidence. They worked steadily and quietly. And out of thousands of things that

might be good to do, they have derived a few dozen of things which it is urgent and necessary to do—which, in fact, it would be outrageous not to do. They have resisted dreams of tomorrow's science, and thought hard about today's technology. They have refrained from proposing yet another agency and come to grips instead with existing agencies—what more they might do, what we know they can do better, with foreseeable resources.

So what began as a seemingly unmanageable project has been tamed, mastered, and transmitted into a sensible list of specific proposals of priority value and manageable proportion. This is no small accomplishment in so short a time. And we can all take heart from this exercise. It bodes well for the work of the Council, and of the U.N. system at large.

VI

The Advisory Committee focused of course on science and technology—that is what it was asked to do. But we need research and inquiry fully as much in great areas of social confusion and uncertainty.

I must be content [today] with one vital example. All through the developing world we face an increasing crisis of accelerated and uncontrolled urbanization. Men and women and children are streaming into the great cities, generally the capital cities, from the monotony and all too often the misery of rural life, and they are moving, bag and baggage, long before farming can afford to lose their labor or the city is ready to put them to work and accommodate them properly.

This rootless, hopeless, workless urban poverty is the greatest single cause of misery in the world. Can we lessen or redirect this flow? Can we prepare the urban world better to receive it? Or improve the rural world enough to diminish the flood? We don't know, because we have not sought seriously to find out. We lack adequate policies, because we have so few facts and so few people trained to develop and implement programs. For too long we have proceeded on the false assumption that people would really rather live in villages than anywhere, and that it is better for society if they did. The trouble is they don't—even when the village is modernized and sanitized and electrified, people move into larger towns and cities.

Some countries have in fact recognized that the problem is not less urbanization but more urban areas—not just one or two in each country. Some are experimenting with regional development programs—and here I mean regions within countries—in an effort to create new urban centers which will not only deflect migration headed for already overcrowded capital cities but will have an impact on the surrounding countryside and improve rural living in a wide area around the new cities. But the process of decentralization is difficult and complex and failures temporary or permanent—are as common as successes.

This is the background against which we helped launch, and heartily welcome, the unanimous decision of the Social Commission to recommend a research training program

in regional development—using as a laboratory the current efforts being made in a variety of different lands, political systems and cultures to deal with the problems of urban in-migration.

With some systematic research perhaps some useable conclusions can be drawn about how best to encourage an appropriate pattern of urban development which will avoid the blight and misery so visible in so many cities throughout the world. This is precisely the kind of research we need if the full weight of modern discovery and modern resources is to be brought to bear on the social as well as the technical problems of the developing world.

VII

In this same context—of science applied to an explosive human and social problem—we have to make a wholly new attack upon what President Johnson has called “The multiplying problems of our multiplying peoples.” It is perhaps only in the last five years that we have come fully to realize on what scale they are proliferating. Since 1960, under United Nations auspices, censuses have been held in scores of countries, in nine of them for the first time. They have all underlined the same fact—that population is increasing more rapidly than had previously been imagined and that this accelerating growth, in all developing lands, is eating into the pitiful margins needed to give bread and hope to those already born. We have to find the ways of social, moral, and physical control adequate to stem the rising, drowning flood of people. We need more knowledge, we need more cooperative effort. In fact, much that we do elsewhere will be undone unless we can act in this vital field.

Aid, trade, research, population control—in all these fields we can mount a convergent attack upon the great gap between rich and poor. But we must also mount it together. And that brings me to some quite concrete suggestions about international organizations, in the development field—in what direction they should be going, and how fast they should be growing.

VIII

The organizations of the UN family perform a rich variety of useful labors. At a moment when one of the central political organs in the UN is temporarily hung up on a constitutional hook [Stevenson refers to the question of application of Article 19.] it is worth reflecting on the success and growth of the Specialized Agencies, and of the central funds which provide a growing fraction—more than half in some cases—of the resources they apply to the business of development. These agencies are an illustration—and a good one—of the proposition that international politics is not a game in which an inch gained by one player must mean an inch lost by another.

The reality is that international agreements can be reached—and international organizations can be formed—and international common law can be elaborated—on subjects which draw nations together even as they continue to quarrel about the frontiers

and friends and ideological frenzies which keep them apart.

So let's look for a moment at the political merits of functional organizations—the kind that work at peace through health, or food, or education, or labor, or communications, or meteorology, or culture, or postal service, or children, or money, or economic growth—or the exploration of outer space—organizations, that is, for the pursuit of some specific and definable task beyond the frontiers of one nation, a task for which technology is already conceived or conceivable, for which a common interest is mutually recognized, for which institutions can—and therefore must—be designed.

Organizations like these begin by taking the world as it is. No fundamental political reforms are needed; no value systems have to be altered; no ideologies have to be seriously compromised.

These organizations start from where we are, and then take the next step. And that, as the ancient Chinese guessed long ago, is the only way to get from here to there.

These organizations tackle jobs that can be managed through imperfect institutions by fallible men and women. Omniscience is not a prerequisite; the peace of the world does not stand or fall on the success of any one organization; mistakes need not be fatal.

These limited-purpose organizations bypass the obstacle of sovereignty. National independence is not infringed when a nation voluntarily accepts in its own interest the restraints imposed by cooperation with others. Nobody has to play who doesn't want to play, but for those who do play, there are door prizes for all.

All these special characteristics of the functional agencies are important to their survival value and growth potential. The best example is also momentarily the most dramatic. In the midst of the military, political and diplomatic turmoil of Southeast Asia, the governments which are working together to promote the regional development of the lower Mekong Basin have continued to work there in surprising and encouraging harmony.

IX

But a certain shadow hangs over the affairs of the technical agencies, a shadow which threatens to compromise the very virtues we have just been discussing. That shadow is political controversy—and it has no place on the agenda of the technical agencies.

I shall not attempt to draw sharp lines along the sometimes murky borders between the politico-ideological and the functional fields between just what is doctrinal and just what is technical. The important distinctions are clear enough. The difference between appropriate content for the general debate in the General Assembly and appropriate content for debates on international labor or world literacy or world health does not need much elaboration. We can all recognize that the remaining problems of colonialism have practically nothing to do with the problems of health—and vice-versa. We have

organizational arrangements for dealing with both. We have times and places set aside—we have agenda prepared and representatives assigned—for dealing in separate and orderly ways with these and other subjects.

Yet we cannot overlook a disturbing tendency to dilute the proceedings of the technical agencies with ideological dispute—and to steal time, energy and resources needed to help the developing countries, and divert it instead to extraneous issues calculated to stir everybody's emotions without raising anybody's per capita income.

This limits the value, inhibits the growth, hurts the prestige, and crimps the resources of the technical agencies. It is a wasteful exercise. It is only to be hoped that these diversionary tactics will fade from our forums so we may get along more promptly with the practical, useful, technical tasks which lie before us in such profusion.

The great spurt in useful activity by the UN specialized and affiliated agencies has come about through the good sense of the members, expressed in a series of actions by the Economic and Social Council and in the General Assembly, and designed to provide new resources to break down the main obstacles to development.

Through the Expanded Program of Technical Assistance and the Special Fund, the members have already provided close to one billion dollars to help the developing countries organize the use of knowledge and to get ready to make effective use of large capital investments. Now these two programs, on the recommendation of the Council, are to be merged in the 20th General Assembly to become the UN Development Program.

We are reaching this year, for the first time, the target of \$150 million a year for that program. My Government believes that this has been a useful and efficient way to provide technical assistance and pre-investment capital. The target should now be raised. For our part, we would be glad to see the target set substantially higher.

We also think that the use for development of non-commercial exports of food from some of the surplus producing countries, has been promising. At a meeting in Rome last week, we have already indicated that we would be glad to see the World Food Program continued, with a target for the next three-year period, almost triple that of the three year experimental period now coming to an end. We hope that other nations which foresee non-commercial surpluses in their agricultural horoscope, will join in expanding the World Food Program as another way to transfer needed resources for the benefit of the developing countries.

We're also pleased with the progress of industrial development. The establishment of the Center for Industrial Development in the UN Secretariat has clearly proved itself a sound and progressive move. We think the time has come to move further along this line, and find much promise in the suggestions made by the distinguished representatives of the United Kingdom [Lord Caradon, British ambassador to the UN, and Barbara Castle, British minister of overseas development] on this subject. We emphatically agree that it will be necessary to secure additional resources for the promotion of industrialization.

We believe, however, that rather than to establish yet another special voluntary fund, such resources could best be made available by special arrangements within the framework of the new UN Development Program.

X

Beyond raising the target for the Development Program and expanding the World Food Program, and giving a special push to the work on industrialization, I would foresee another kind of development activity to which I believe every government should accord a very high priority indeed. This is the field which might be called truly international development.

So far, we have tended to define the word “development” to encompass only the elements of an individual country’s economic growth and social progress. Some regional projects have gained favor as well. But clearly visible now on the horizon are programs and projects in which the operating agency will not be a national government or a private company or even a small group of governments in a region—but rather one of the UN’s own family of world wide organizations.

The best example—one that is already requiring our attention—is the world weather watch now being planned by the WMO [World Meteorological Organization]. In the preliminary design work already underway, it is proposed, for example, to:

- Probe into atmosphere from satellites in orbit;
- Establish ground stations to read-out what the satellites have to say and to process and communicate weather information throughout continental regions;
- Establish floating weather stations to give more coverage to vast oceanic areas, particularly in the Southern Hemisphere;
- Possibly even launch balloons from international sites which will travel around the world at a constant level making weather observations as they go.

The major components of the World Weather Watch must continue to be the national facilities, operated primarily for national purposes, and also contributing to the needs of the world. But we are speaking here of additional facilities, some of which may need to be internationally operated and perhaps internationally owned and which may be very costly even at the start. Money would have to be raised on a voluntary basis and placed in the hands of an international agency—the WMO, perhaps or some new operating facility.

Here, then is a new kind of problem for us to think about before it overtakes us. Here is a great big development project, involving activity inherently international which will have to be financed internationally. We would propose that the UN Development Program start experimenting with this kind of development activity, modifying as necessary the rules and procedures that were drafted with national development projects in mind.

Maybe such large projects will have to be financed in some special way. But for a start, we would like to see the new UN Development program, with its rich experience in financing various kinds of development, work on this subject and present to its own Board, and to this Council, an analysis of the problem of meeting the costs of global international operations.

XI

If all these suggestions for raising our sights—yes, and our contributions—give the impression that the United States believes in the strengthening of international development institutions, you may be sure that that impression is correct. Most of these institutions need to be strengthened to meet, within their respective areas, the challenge of the requirements and aspirations of the developing countries. Equally, and perhaps even more important, their policies and actions need to be harmonized for there is no room left in this world for narrow parochialism. The various aspects and problems of economic and social development modernization of agriculture and industrial growth, health and production, education and social welfare, trade and transportation, human rights and individual freedom—have become so closely inter-related as to call for interlocking measures and programs.

These basic conditions in the contemporary world give meaning and urgency to the Review and Reappraisal of the Economic and Social Council's role and functions which U Thant proposed in this Chamber a year ago. The position of my Government is set forth in our submission to the Secretary General reproduced in Document E/ 4052/ Add.2 and needs no further explanation.

But there are just a few points I want to stress:

With the UN system as envisaged in and established by the Charter, the General Assembly and ECOSOC are the two principal intergovernmental organs with overall responsibilities for UN policies and activities in the economic and social field, their orderly development and effective implementation.

Whatever the record of the Council in the past—and we believe that it is a good record—it has become evident that the Council faces ever increasing difficulties in the discharge of its functions due to the ever widening scope of the United Nations and the multiplication of machinery.

To make the Council fully representative of the enlarged membership of the UN, its size will soon be increased by the necessary ramifications of the Charter Amendment.

We believe that the role of the Council as a preparatory body for the General Assembly, and acting under its authority needs to be clarified and strengthened. It should make a significant contribution to the work of the General Assembly by drawing its attention to major issues confronting the world economy, by formulating proposals for action; by

providing supporting documentation; and in preparing and reviewing programs with a sense of financial responsibility, and thus assisting the preparation of budget estimates by the Secretary General for appropriate action by the Committees of the General Assembly.

In stressing the coordination function of ECOSOC every care needs to be taken to encourage rather than to hinder the work of functional and regional economic and social bodies and the activities of the Specialized Agencies and other related organizations. [We believe] The role of these functional organizations in achieving coordination within their areas of competence needs to be more fully recognized.

The Review and Reappraisal proposed by the Secretary General is a difficult task and adequate time must be allowed for it. Many of the constructive suggestions he made yesterday regarding research, documentation, and sound budgeting are directly related to the work of the Council and deserve most careful thought. It is our hope that the Council at the present session will make the necessary arrangements to facilitate and assure such study in depth and full consideration.

We assume the Review will go through several stages, including consideration by both the Council and the General Assembly. The Council will have to undertake thorough preparatory work in order to enable the General Assembly and its Committees 2, 3 and 5 to reach informed conclusions and to take the necessary actions.

Last but not least, and this I cannot stress strongly enough—the Review will require the closest possible cooperation between all members of the Council representing developed and developing countries. The Council will wither away, whatever conclusions are reached by the Review, unless there is a will among all of us to make it succeed. And succeed it must as an indispensable organ of the United Nations for the achievement, beyond anything we have experienced to date, of constructive cooperation in the economic and social fields and as a powerful aid to development.

In this connection I listened with interest and to Ambassador Pachachi's thoughtful observations on the role of the Council. We appreciate the weight and importance of his statements. They open the way to a frank and constructive discussion. The spirit in which they were offered give us hope and encouragement.

XII

Finally, let me repeat that the need for joint action in the wide field of development is obvious. Whether we are talking about aid, or trade or research, or urban redevelopment, or industrialization—whether we are talking about scientific discovery or about institution building—we hold that there are no monopolies of trained minds and disciplined imaginations in any of our countries.

Joint action is, after all, the final significance of all we do in our international policies today. But we are still held back by our old parochial nationalism. We are still beset with dark prejudices. We are still divided by angry, conflicting ideologies. Yet all around us

our science, our instruments, our technologies, our interests and indeed our deepest aspirations draw us more and more closely into a single neighborhood.

This must be the context of our thinking—the context of human interdependence in the face of the vast new dimensions of our science and our discovery. Just as Europe could never again be the old closed-in community after the voyages of Columbus we can never again be a squabbling band of nations before the awful majesty of outer space.

We travel together, passengers on a little space ship, dependent on its vulnerable reserve of air and soil; all committed for our safety to its security and peace; preserved from annihilation only by the care, the work, and I will say, the love we give our fragile craft. We cannot maintain it half fortunate, half miserable, half confident, half despairing, half slave—to the ancient enemies of man—half free in the liberation of resources undreamed of until this day. No craft, no crew can travel safely with such vast contradictions. On their resolution depends the survival of us all.

— Adlai E. Stevenson II

Discussion Questions:

1. Why did Stevenson believe an unbalanced distribution of wealth posed a threat to a peaceful world order?
2. What “divide” did Stevenson describe in global development? Who were the “North” and “South”?

Keywords: United Nations, UN, nuclear weapons, haves and have-nots, John F. Kennedy, Decade of Development, centrally planned economies, developing nations, population growth, per capita income, rich and poor, gap between rich and poor, child mortality, hunger, poverty, social progress, General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade, GATT, tariff, UN Trade Development Board, trade, export, north/south divide, science, technology, research breakthrough, New International Economic Order, urbanization, urban development, political reform, peace, colonialism, international labor, world literacy, world health, World Food Program, industrial development, World Meteorological Organization, WMO, Green Revolution, ECOSOC, international policies, interdependence, “space ship earth”