In its task of bringing Brazil's words in the United Nations to the public, the Alexandre de Gusmão Foundation relied on the valuable assistance of Ambassador Luiz Felipe de Seixas Corrêa, who wrote this book's introductions, as well as the comments that place each speech in the national and international historical context of the period in which it was proffered.

Luiz Felipe de Seixas Corrêa was born in Rio de Janeiro, on July 16, 1945. He is a Bachelor in Law by the Cândido Mendes Law School, in Rio de Janeiro. He entered the diplomatic career as a Third Secretary in March 3, 1967, and performed many functions in Brazil and abroad. He was promoted to Minister First Class, by merit, on December 17, 1987; consecutively, he was Ambassador in Mexico, Secretary-General for External Relations, Ambassador in Madrid and later in Buenos Aires, then once more Secretary-General for External Relations; afterwards, he was Ambassador in the Brazilian Mission to the U.N., Permanent Representative to the WTO in Geneva, Ambassador in Berlin, and Ambassador to the Holy See. He presently holds the office of Consul-General in New York. He is also a member of the Brazilian Historic and Geographic Institute and the author of several works in the area of Brazilian Diplomatic History and External Relations.

Since 1949, Brazil has been the first country to occupy the tribune of the United Nations General Assembly. This volume presents all Brazilian speeches made at the opening of the General Debate of the Assembly from 1946 to 2011 – preceded by a brief contextualization in which the external and internal factors that influenced each of them are highlighted.

Its study enables the distinction of the periods that characterize the Brazilian diplomatic performance, the different aspects that define each one and internal and external constraints that prevailed circumstantially. This identifies the elements of permanence and continuity that permeate Brazil's external projections. The set of speeches transcribed into this volume provides an accurate notion of the continuous debate between the emergence of Brazilian foreign policy, on one side, and the events which shaped the country's past, the risks and the opportunities that characterize its present days and the expectations placed in its future, on the other.

ISBN 857631431-2
9 788576 314318

FUNDAÇÃO ALEXANDRE DE GUSMÃO
www.funag.gov.br

639

Luiz Felipe de Seixas Corrêa
Organizer

BRAZIL IN THE UNITED NATIONS
1946 - 2011

Luiz Felipe de Seixas Corrêa
Organizer

BRAZIL IN THE UNITED NATIONS
1946 - 2011

FUNDAÇÃO ALEXANDRE DE GUSMÃO

Luiz Felipe de Seixas Corrêa
Organizer

BRAZIL IN THE UNITED NATIONS

1946 - 2011

As part of the celebrations of the 50th anniversary of the United Nations, the Alexandre de Gusmão Foundation presented a historical view of Brazilian diplomacy and Foreign Policy in the speeches proffered by the Heads of Brazilian Delegations in the Regular Sessions of the General Assembly.

In this new revised and updated edition, organized by Ambassador Luiz Felipe de Seixas Corrêa, FUNAG brings the reader elements of information and analysis up to the year 2011, including, in September of the same year, the first speech proffered by President Dilma Rousseff before the UN General Assembly.

Founded by delegates from 51 countries gathered in the city of San Francisco, at the end of the Second World War in 1945, the United Nations currently has 191 member countries. It is headquartered in New York. Its official languages are Arab, Chinese, English, French, Russian and Spanish. The main UN agencies are the General Assembly, the Security Council, the Economic and Social Council, the Trusteeship Council and the International Court of Justice.

The General Assembly is the UN's main deliberative body. It gathers all the member countries, each entitled to one vote. Its Regular Sessions are convened annually on the third Thursday of September, but Special Sessions are held when necessary.

The Security Council has 15 members, of which 5 are permanent (China, France, USA, Russia and the United Kingdom) and 10 are elected by the General Assembly, on a regional basis, for two-year terms.

FUNDAÇÃO ALEXANDRE DE GUSMÃO

Luiz Felipe de Seixas Corrêa
Organizer

BRAZIL IN THE UNITED NATIONS

1946 - 2011

FUNDAÇÃO ALEXANDRE DE GUSMÃO

BRAZIL IN THE UNITED NATIONS
1946 – 2011

Ministry of External Relations

Foreign Minister Ambassador Antonio de Aguiar Patriota
Secretary-General Ambassador Eduardo dos Santos

Alexandre de Gusmão Foundation



President Ambassador José Vicente de Sá Pimentel

Research Institute of International Relations

Center for Diplomatic History and Documents

Director Ambassador Maurício E. Cortes Costa

The *Alexandre de Gusmão* Foundation (Funag) was established in 1971. It is a public foundation linked to the Ministry of External Relations whose goal is to provide civil society with information concerning the international scenario and aspects of the Brazilian diplomatic agenda. The Foundation's mission is to foster awareness of the domestic public opinion with regard to international relations issues and Brazilian foreign policy.

Ministry of External Relations
Esplanada dos Ministérios, Bloco H
Anexo II, Térreo, Sala 1
70170-900 Brasília-DF
Telephones: +55 (61) 2030-6033/6034
Fax: +55 (61) 2030-9125
Website: www.funag.gov.br

Luiz Felipe de Seixas Corrêa
Organizer

Brazil in the United Nations
1946 – 2011

FUNDAÇÃO
ALEXANDRE
DE GUSMÃO

Brasília, 2013

Copyright © Fundação Alexandre de Gusmão

Fundação Alexandre de Gusmão
Ministério das Relações Exteriores
Esplanada dos Ministérios, Bloco H
Anexo II, Térreo, Sala 1
70170-900 Brasília-DF
Telephones: +55 (61) 2030-6033/6034
Fax: +55 (61) 2030-9125
Website: www.funag.gov.br
E-mail: funag@itamaraty.gov.br

Editorial Staff:
Eliane Miranda Paiva
Fernanda Antunes Siqueira
Guilherme Lucas Rodrigues Monteiro
Jessé Nóbrega Cardoso
Vanusa dos Santos Silva

Translator:
Sérgio Duarte

Graphic Design and Layout:
Gráfica e Editora Ideal

Impresso no Brasil 2013

C824

CORRÊA, Luiz Felipe de Seixas.

Brazil in the United Nations : 1946-2011 / Luiz Felipe de Seixas Corrêa; apresentação à terceira edição de Luiz Felipe de Seixas Corrêa. — Brasília : FUNAG, 2013.

969 p.; 23 cm.

Compilação dos principais discursos de representantes brasileiros na ONU.

ISBN: 978-85-7631-431-8

1. Discursos. 2. Seções ordinárias. 3. Organização das Nações Unidas. 4. Assembleia Geral da Organização das Nações Unidas. 5. Política externa brasileira. I. Fundação Alexandre de Gusmão.

CDU: 341.123.042(042.5)=111

Ficha catalográfica elaborada pela bibliotecária Talita Daemon James – CRB-7/6078

Depósito Legal na Fundação Biblioteca Nacional conforme Lei n° 10.994, de 14/12/2004.

Editorial Board of the Alexandre de Gusmão Foundation

President: Ambassador José Vicente de Sá Pimentel
President of the Alexandre de Gusmão Foundation

Members: Ambassador Jorio Dauster Magalhães
Ambassador Ronaldo Mota Sardenberg
Ambassador Georges Lamazière
Minister Luís Felipe Silvério Fortuna
Minister José Humberto de Brito Cruz
Professor Francisco Fernando Monteoliva Doratioto
Professor José Flávio Sombra Saraiva
Historian Clodoaldo Bueno

Contents:

Presentation to the Third Edition **17**

Introduction to the Third Edition **21**

Presentation to the Second Edition **23**

Introduction to the Second Edition **27**

Presentation to the First Edition **33**

Introduction to the First Edition **35**

1946 ..... **45**

I Regular Session of the UN General Assembly
Part I – Ambassador Luiz Martins de Souza Dantas 49

Part II –Ambassador Pedro Leão Velloso Netto 53

1947 ..... **59**

II Regular Session of the UN General Assembly
Ambassador João Carlos Muniz 63

1948 73

III Regular Session of the UN General Assembly
Minister Raul Fernandes 75

1949 81

IV Regular Session of the UN General Assembly
Ambassador Cyro de Freitas-Valle 83

1950 91

V Regular Session of the UN General Assembly
Ambassador Cyro de Freitas-Valle 93

1951 101

VI Regular Session of the UN General Assembly
Ambassador Mário de Pimentel Brandão 103

1952 111

VII Regular Session of the UN General Assembly
Minister João Neves da Fontoura 113

1953 121

VIII Regular Session of the UN General Assembly
Ambassador Mário de Pimentel Brandão 123

1954 129

IX Regular Session of the UN General Assembly
Ambassador Ernesto Leme 131

1955 141

X Regular Session of the UN General Assembly
Ambassador Cyro de Freitas-Valle 143

1956..... 151

XI Regular Session of the UN General Assembly
Ambassador Cyro de Freitas-Valle.....153

1957..... 161

XII Regular Session of the UN General Assembly
Ambassador Oswaldo Aranha.....163

1958..... 171

XIII Regular Session of the UN General Assembly
Minister Francisco Negrão de Lima 173

1959..... 179

XIV Regular Session of the UN General Assembly
Ambassador Augusto Frederico Schmidt 181

1960..... 191

XV Regular Session of the UN General Assembly
Minister Horácio Lafer 193

1961..... 201

XVI Regular Session of the UN General Assembly
Minister Affonso Arinos de Mello Franco.....205

1962..... 215

XVII Regular Session of the UN General Assembly
Minister Affonso Arinos de Mello Franco..... 217

1963..... 229

XVIII Regular Session of the UN General Assembly
Minister João Augusto de Araújo Castro 233

1964..... 255

XIX Regular Session of the UN General Assembly
Minister Vasco Leitão da Cunha..... 259

1965..... 269

XX Regular Session of the UN General Assembly
Minister Vasco Leitão da Cunha..... 271

1966..... 283

XXI Regular Session of the UN General Assembly
Minister Juracy Magalhães..... 285

1967..... 297

XXII Regular Session of the UN General Assembly
Minister José de Magalhães Pinto.....301

1968..... 311

XXIII Regular Session of the UN General Assembly
Minister José de Magalhães Pinto.....313

1969..... 321

XXIV Regular Session of the UN General Assembly
Minister José de Magalhães Pinto..... 323

1970..... 335

XXV Regular Session of the UN General Assembly
Minister Mário Gibson Barboza..... 339

1971..... 351

XXVI Regular Session of the UN General Assembly
Minister Mário Gibson Barboza.....353

1972..... 365

XXVII Regular Session of the UN General Assembly
Minister Mário Gibson Barboza..... 369

1973..... 383

XXVIII Regular Session of the UN General Assembly
Minister Mário Gibson Barboza..... 385

1974..... 397

XXIX Regular Session of the UN General Assembly
Minister Antonio Francisco Azeredo da Silveira 399

1975..... 411

XXX Regular Session of the UN General Assembly
Minister Antonio Francisco Azeredo da Silveira 413

1976..... 423

XXXI Regular Session of the UN General Assembly
Minister Antonio Francisco Azeredo da Silveira 425

1977..... 435

XXXII Regular Session of the UN General Assembly
Minister Antonio Francisco Azeredo da Silveira 437

1978..... 449

XXXIII Regular Session of the UN General Assembly
Minister Antonio Francisco Azeredo da Silveira 451

1979..... 459

XXXIV Regular Session of the UN General Assembly
Minister Ramiro Saraiva Guerreiro..... 461

1980 473

XXXV Regular Session of the UN General Assembly
Minister Ramiro Saraiva Guerreiro 477

1981 491

XXXVI Regular Session of the UN General Assembly
Minister Ramiro Saraiva Guerreiro 493

1982 505

XXXVII Regular Session of the UN General Assembly
President João Baptista de Oliveira Figueiredo 507

1983 521

XXXVIII Regular Session of the UN General Assembly
Minister Ramiro Saraiva Guerreiro 523

1984 535

XXXIX Regular Session of the UN General Assembly
Minister Ramiro Saraiva Guerreiro 537

1985 549

XL Regular Session of the UN General Assembly
President José Sarney 553

1986 569

XLI Regular Session of the UN General Assembly
Minister Roberto de Abreu Sodré 573

1987 589

XLII Regular Session of the UN General Assembly
Minister Roberto de Abreu Sodré 591

1988..... 601

XLIII Regular Session of the UN General Assembly
Minister Roberto de Abreu Sodré.....603

1989..... 613

XLIV Regular Session of the UN General Assembly
President José Sarney..... 617

1990..... 631

XLV Regular Session of the UN General Assembly
President Fernando Collor de Mello 633

1991..... 647

XLVI Regular Session of the UN General Assembly
President Fernando Collor de Mello 651

1992..... 663

XLVII Regular Session of the UN General Assembly
Minister Celso Lafer..... 667

1993..... 681

XLVIII Regular Session of the UN General Assembly
Minister Celso Amorim.....685

1994..... 699

XLIX Regular Session of the UN General Assembly
Minister Celso Amorim..... 701

1995..... 713

L Regular Session of the UN General Assembly
Minister Luiz Felipe Lampreia..... 717

1996..... 729
LI Regular Session of the UN General Assembly
Minister Luiz Felipe Lampreia..... 733

1997..... 743
LII Regular Session of the UN General Assembly
Minister Luiz Felipe Lampreia.....747

1998..... 757
LIII Regular Session of the UN General Assembly
Minister Luiz Felipe Lampreia..... 761

1999..... 771
LIV Regular Session of the UN General Assembly
Minister Luiz Felipe Lampreia..... 775

2000..... 785
Plenary Session of the Millennium Summit
Vice-President Marco Maciel.....789

LV Regular Session of the UN General Assembly
Minister Luiz Felipe Lampreia.....793

2001..... 803
LVI Regular Session of the UN General Assembly
President Fernando Henrique Cardoso.....807

2002..... 815
LVII Regular Session of the UN General Assembly
Minister Celso Lafer..... 819

2003..... 827

LVIII Regular Session of the UN General Assembly
President Luiz Inácio Lula da Silva..... 831

2004..... 841

LIX Regular Session of the UN General Assembly
President Luiz Inácio Lula da Silva.....845

Statement by President Luiz Inácio Lula da Silva, at the meeting of the
World Commission on the Social Dimension of Globalization.....851

Statement by President Luiz Inácio Lula da Silva, at the Meeting of
World Leaders for the "Action Against Hunger and Poverty", at the
Headquarters of the United Nations.....855

Words by President Luiz Inácio Lula da Silva, at the closure of the
Meeting of World Leaders for the "Action Against Hunger and Poverty"
at the Headquarters of the United Nations.....859

2005..... 863

Speech by President Luiz Inácio Lula da Silva, at the High Level Debate
on Mechanisms for Development Financing.....867

Speech by President Luiz Inácio Lula da Silva, at a Summit Meeting of the
United Nations Security Council.....871

Statement by President Luiz Inácio Lula da Silva, at the High Level
Meeting of the United Nations General Assembly on the Implementation
of the Millennium Targets.....875

LX Regular Session of the UN General Assembly
Minister Celso Amorim.....879

2006..... 887

LXI Regular Session of the UN General Assembly
President Luiz Inácio Lula da Silva.....891

2007 899

LXII Regular Session of the UN General Assembly

President Luiz Inácio Lula da Silva 903

2008 911

Message from President Luiz Inácio Lula da Silva on the occasion of the special meeting of the United Nations Economic and Social Council on the World Food Crisis 917

LXIII Regular Session of the UN General Assembly

President Luiz Inácio Lula da Silva 921

2009 929

LXIV Regular Session of the UN General Assembly

President Luiz Inácio Lula da Silva 933

2010 941

Statement by Minister Celso Amorim at the Summit of Heads of State and Government of the United Nations Security Council 947

LXV Regular Session of the UN General Assembly

Minister Celso Amorim 951

2011 959

Opening of the General Debate of the LXVI Regular Session of the UN General Assembly

President Dilma Rousseff 965

Presentation to the Third Edition

Antonio de Aguiar Patriota
Minister for External Relations

> *"As a woman who was the victim of torture while in prison, I am all too aware of how important values such as democracy, justice, human rights and freedom are to all of us. It is my hope that these values will continue to inspire the work of this house of nations, where I am honored to open the general debate of the sixty-Sixth Session of the General Assembly."**
>
> President Dilma Rousseff

For over sixty years now, Brazil has had the privilege of opening the general debate of the General Assembly of the United Nations.

From the speeches in the final years of the 1940's, still marked by the traumatic experience of World War II and the circumstances of the beginning of the Cold War, up to President Dilma Rousseff's statement in 2011 – the first woman to open the debate at the General Assembly – this tradition represents a tribute to all Brazilians.

At the same time it is a tradition that every year makes us confront the challenge of identifying the issues which, in the light of our values and interests, we deem worthy of priority attention from the diplomatic multilateral forum *par excellence*, the General Assembly of the United Nations.

This is not a minor challenge. It requires a sharp and always updated glimpse over the changing international reality, that also involves, in order to be inclusive, the ability to grasp the perceptions of our regional surroundings and those of the international community as a whole, and also entails the responsibility of contributing to the very definition of the global agenda.

The opportunity to assist in the shaping of the United Nations diplomatic agenda, in its political, economic and social aspects, is

* Statement by President Dilma Roussef at the opening of the general debate of the 66th Session of the General Assembly of the United Nations (New York, 9/21/2011).

especially meaningful for a country like Brazil, for whom the defense and promotion of multilateralism represents one of the structural factors of its external policy.

For Brazil, multilateralism is an international expression of democracy. In a way, multilateralism performs, in the field of relations among States, the role played by democracy and the primacy of the rule of law in the domestic sphere. Having consolidated our own democracy, to which we gave renewed scope through social policies that have rescued tens of millions of Brazilians to the full exercise of their citizenship, we believe ourselves to be particularly well placed, in the dawn of the 21st century, to widen by means of dialogue and persuasion the range of legitimacy that only multilateralism can ensure. The strengthening of the United Nations and of its ability to function becomes even more urgent in the current stage of the changes that are taking place in the international system.

The world is experiencing a period of transition that points to a more multipolar international order. In principle, this is a positive trend that may open additional possibilities of participation in the global decision-making processes for countries that had been kept out. One cannot imagine, however, that the existence of a multi-polar order would provide, by itself alone, more equitable governance structures and better conditions for the promotion of development and peace. We must endeavor to achieve this. We must strive to make the mark of cooperation prevail over that of confrontation in the multi-polarity that may come to affirm itself. In this effort, which is necessarily collective and presupposes concerted action in search of consensus, the United Nations have a privileged role that cannot be played by another forum, especially as the Organization and its different instances become more representative, more legitimate and more effective.

This is the wider sense of *Brazil in the United Nations*, organized by Ambassador Luiz Felipe de Seixas Corrêa. The compilation of the main speeches by Brazilian representatives at the United Nations – including all those that were delivered at the opening of the Sessions of the General Assembly – constitutes especially useful raw material not only for historical research but also for our present diplomatic action at the UN, because of the importance of background in external policy.

The speeches brought together in this book reveal the way in which Brazil's commitment to multilateralism has been expressed as time went by, always reflecting the Brazilian inclination to peace and the circumstances of each historic moment.

That was the case, for example, in 1963, with the doctrine of the "Three D's" (disarmament, development and decolonization); or, in the 1970's, with the fight against apartheid and the criticism of the "freezing of world power"; and also, in the 1980's, with the denunciation of the excessive burden of external debt on developing countries.

More recently in the 1990's, Brazil was involved as a central player in the debates on the reform of the Security Council and insisted on the imperative need of replacing asymmetry with solidarity with regard to globalization. In the beginning of the 21st century Brazil took the fight against hunger to the United Nations.

In 2011, President Dilma Rousseff stressed the political nature of the international financial crisis, beyond economic analyses. She supported the admission of Palestine as a full member of the United Nations, declaring that "only a free and sovereign Palestine can respond to Israel's legitimate desire for peace with its neighbors, security within its borders and political stability in its region". Availing herself of the podium of the General Assembly, the President proposed the notion of "responsibility while protecting" as a necessary complement to the "responsibility to protect" in the context of the debate on the protection of civilians in conflict situations.

In the texts compiled in this book one can discern the mark of an increasingly universal diplomacy, the features of a society aware that the international community must allow for a plurality of views to co-exist and which, for this very reason, values dialogue with a large number of actors. One can hear the voice of a country that today has diplomatic relations with all the other 192 Member States of the United Nations and even with States that are not yet Members, as is the case of Palestine.

Brazil in the United Nations, however, is more that a compilation of speeches. It includes, with significant value added, information and explanatory analyses by Ambassador Luiz Felipe de Seixas Corrêa both in the general introductions he prepared for the book and in the individual notes that describe the domestic and international context in which each one of the statements stands up as a historic fact. Ambassador Seixas Corrêa's analytic ability brings a valuable contribution to the book and provides the reader with a fuller understanding of the selected documents.

It is thus, with special satisfaction that Itamaraty and its Alexandre de Gusmão Foundation publish the updated version of this very relevant

work, whose contents is a source of inspiration and learning for all those who, like us, are interested, either for purposes of study of practice, in the activity of Brazilian diplomacy in one of its distinctive aspects – multilateral action.

Brasília, August 2012.

Introduction to the Third Edition

Luiz Felipe de Seixas Corrêa

The present volume adds to the texts that appear in the two previous editions the four opening speeches at the general debate of the General Assembly of the United Nations delivered during President Lula da Silva's second term (2007-2010) and the first statement by President Dilma Roussef (2011).

In my two previous introductions, I stressed the elements of permanence and change in the Brazilian discourse through the decades of intense Brazilian participation in multilateral politics. That analysis remains valid. I recommend to the reader to start his or her benevolent consultation of this book with a glance at the introductions that precede each statement, for what they may be worth in order to provide a contextualization and interpretation of the evolution of the external policy of Brazil as reflected in our speeches.

The external policy of a country is, by definition, a never ending story. It stems from specific historic, geographic and social conditionings that tend to remain in force. It oscillates, however, with internal circumstances and reflects the challenges and opportunities that come by in the international sphere. Ultimately it represents a constant endeavor to create in the external arena possibilities to realize the internal objectives of the country.

In the last few years – and particularly in the period covered by this third edition – there was a positive trend in the participation of Brazil in the international scene. Brazil displayed special activity in the search for more

assertive action by the so-called "emergent countries", particularly China, India, Russia and South Africa. In the multilateral commercial bodies (WTO) as well as in the political platforms of security, environment, and others, the participation of Brazil and the "emergent countries" became more affirmative. Our demands found increasing receptivity, all the more so because they were supported by significant progress in the regional integration sphere.

This did not happen by chance. In a large measure, it was certainly the result of the full consolidation of democracy in Brazil, something we had been pursuing earnestly since the end of World War II, but which kept eluding us. Consolidation of democracy made Brazil more respected in the world and in our own eyes. It lent credibility to our external proposals and at the same time allowed us to reach preeminent positions in the conduct of practically all global issues as well as of some specific questions more closely linked to international peace and security.

Equally important was the marked economic growth of the country during recent years, together – and this is particularly important – with exceptional progress in the area of social inclusion.

Democracy, sustained growth and social inclusion make up the triad that allowed Brazil to be seen positively in the last few years and helped to increase the effectiveness of our external action, as can be gleaned from the most recent series of our speeches at the United Nations General Assembly.

A worsening of conflict situations in different regions, nuclear proliferation threats and above all an insidious, growing and still undefined financial crisis characterized the last part of present times. Our discourse presented loud and clear the Brazilian demand for wider participation in the international decision making process. Our voice seems to have been heard with increasing attention.

We have not yet achieved the objective most consistently sought during these 67 years of speeches at the United Nations: a permanent seat in the Security Council. It is hard to say whether we are close to reaching this historic goal of Brazilian external policy or not. It is certain, though, that we have been farther from it in past years. And what is more significant, as our speeches show, we have not lost the coherence and vigor of our demands.

Presentation to the Second Edition

Celso Amorim
Minister for External Relations

Brazil in the United Nations

The opening of the General Assembly of the United Nations is one of the most important events in multilateral diplomacy. The Heads of Delegation of the 192 Member States, who nowadays are often the Heads of State or Government, present to the international community their position about a wide array of issues.

Subjects dealt with vary from peace and security to the fight against hunger and poverty. Since 1946 the United Nations is the venue where national views are heard about how the international community should act to prevent war, a tragedy that lies at the origin of the creation of the United Nations. Consensuses that legitimize questions which increasingly impact on the daily lives of people, such as those regarding the environment, human rights, protection of vulnerable groups and the promotion of economic and social development are articulated at the United Nations.

We owe the United Nations a wealth of invaluable achievements. Without the articulation of collective political will in its different instances, decisive progress in the decolonization process would perhaps not have been possible. The violence of *apartheid* might have lasted longer. Without the presence of the United Nations peacekeeping forces conflicts and civil wars surely would have prolonged the suffering of many peoples.

Of course these six decades of history did not go by without setbacks. Hampered by its own nature as a parliamentary instance based on the legal equality of States, the United Nations has often been unable to prevent the use of force from prevailing over the option for dialogue as the means to resolve differences.

The idea of utilizing the Brazilian statements at the General Debate of the United Nations General Assembly as the basis for a historical view of Brazilian diplomacy came up in 1995, when the Organization celebrated its 50th anniversary. The speeches were published by the Alexandre de Gusmão Foundation in the belief that they constitute a starting point for those who wish to study the evolution of Brazilian foreign policy in its aspects of permanence and change.

The texts compiled in this book are of great reference value as a global and consistent presentation of that policy. The opening speeches at the general debate were always very carefully crafted, either because of their external significance as a display of Brazilian positions or as a means to indicate to Brazilian public opinion the objectives of our international action.

Accordingly, we can see that at the first General Assembly Brazil received with enthusiasm the idea of the organization of an "international society" attuned to the pacifist tradition that has always guided the external relations of the country. Seventeen years later, Foreign Minister João Augusto de Araújo Castro delivered the emblematic "Three D's" speech, which put forth Disarmament, Development and Decolonization as the three fundamental issues for the Organization. In his first pronouncement before the General Assembly, in 2003, President Luiz Inácio Lula da Silva reaffirmed his faith in the human capacity to conquer challenges and evolve toward higher forms of living together both within nations and in the international sphere.

The texts obviously do not provide an exhaustive knowledge of our multilateral policy. Interventions and votes in the Security Council, as well as positions taken by Brazil in many other instances, are indispensable to provide a complete picture of the matter. The opening speech at the General Assembly, however, is the great public showcase of that policy, not only due to the importance of the United Nations or to the role of Brazil in modern multilateralism, but also because of the expectation it creates, since by tradition Brazil is entrusted with opening the general debate.

This compilation of the Brazilian opening statements over the last 61 years provides a valuable contribution to the diplomatic historiography

of Brazil. Moreover, it presents to a public increasingly attentive to the external agenda of Brazil a comprehensive view of the way in which the country has perceived the international reality as years go by. The initiative of Alexandre de Gusmão Foundation to provide students and all interested persons with yet another tool for a better understanding of Brazilian international relations is therefore extremely welcome.

Introduction to the Second Edition

Luiz Felipe de Seixas Corrêa

The basis of the knowledge, analysis and transmission of History does not derive necessarily from the facts in themselves or by the images of the facts, but rather by the texts that refer to them. Historians, however, particularly those that deal with hermeneutics, know that before constituting an objective datum of reality, and thus susceptible of scientific proof, the meaning of texts is above all a cultural emanation, subject to the mysterious whims of interpretation and subjectivity. In principle, texts will have as many meanings as there are authors dedicated to their analysis, each one enveloped in its own circumstances.

Hence the importance of trying to bring together as often as possible the texts and their different interpretations. The original edition of this book paid attention to this. It was published in 1995, on the occasion of the commemoration of the Fiftieth anniversary of the United Nations. The task of organizing it was entrusted to me by the then President of FUNAG, Ambassador João Clemente Baena Soares. It consisted of the compilation, contextualization and analysis of the speeches delivered by the Heads of Brazilian delegations at the opening of the general debate in all Sessions of the General Assembly held since the first one, in 1946, up to the Fiftieth, in 1995.

I began working with great pleasure. Since the period between 1971 and 1974, which I had spent as Second Secretary at the Brazilian Mission to the United Nations under the direction of Ambassador Sérgio Armando Frazão, I was interested in the process of preparation of the Brazilian

speeches at the General Debate. As a member of the speech-drafting team for the 1971, 1972 and 1973 Assemblies, I perused the previous statements, compared trends of thought and stresses in the different texts in the course of time. I realized then the unique value of our opening speeches in the general debate as a primary source for the analysis of the recent historical course of Brazilian foreign policy.

In 1981 I collected and examined all the speeches delivered until then. I used them for my dissertation at the High Studies Course (CAE): "From confrontation to confrontation: relations USA-USSR – Brazil and the superpowers", in which I endeavored to examine the evolution of Brazilian policy toward the United States and the Soviet Union through the lenses of its enunciation in our opening speeches at the General Assembly. In different periods of my diplomatic career I kept constantly abreast of our statements and later on I participated in their drafting as Secretary-General of the Ministry of External Relations in 1992 (XLVII Session) and again in 1999 and 2001 (LIV, LV and LVI Sessions).

For the organization of the original edition of this book in 1995 I took advantage of the experience gathered especially from the preparation of the CAE dissertation. The transcript of each speech was preceded by a short text in which I sought to contextualize them according to the prevailing circumstances at the time in the internal Brazilian situation and in the sphere of international relations. I tried to be as objective as possible and avoid the risks inherent to any deeper analysis of each text. By presenting every year the Brazilian view on the international reality, the speeches contain an "institutional" analysis of facts and situations, from the standing point of Brazilian diplomacy. I refrained therefore from a personal analysis, except in the general introduction of the book, even though each contextualization can be strictly considered as a form of analysis inasmuch as it supposes a certain selection of facts.

In this year of 2006 Minister Celso Amorim honored me with the request to update the original edition by adding the subsequent speeches. Again I took up the task with great gusto.

It seemed appropriate to keep the 1995 format and the model then used. The presentation by then Minister Luiz Felipe Lampreia was also kept, as well as the presentation I originally wrote, in which I describe:

1. The historical importance of the multilateral system of the United Nations, in particular for Brazil;
2. The circumstances that make the Brazilian discourse unique, being invariably the first to be delivered at the opening of the General Debate of each Assembly;

3. The different stages of Brazilian presence in the international panorama and in particular the previous periods of Brazilian participation in the multilateral process; and
4. The chief values that historically contribute to the formulation, enunciation and implementation of Brazilian external policy.

I commented then that in its multilateral policy, Brazilian diplomacy always sought to function simultaneously as an instrument for the preservation of the ethical values of the country and the respect to international law and as a vehicle for the competitive insertion of Brazil in the international scenario.

These same objectives appear in the ensuing speeches. Brazil presents itself to the rest of the world with remarkable coherence. Circumstances change. There are moments when positive expectations are clearer and at times there is not much room for optimism. Occasionally, illusions seem to prevail over realities. Often the formulations are precise and the enunciation takes a prescriptive tone. A utopian component sometimes takes over. Somehow, however, the consistent demands of Brazil for changes in the international order – so that it can be permeated by emerging realities and for the consolidation of the United Nations, *de jure* and *de facto*, as the formal expression of legitimacy in the treatment of the wider political, security, economic and social questions of the international agenda – are always present.

The eleven years covered by the present edition encompass the mandates of Presidents Fernando Henrique Cardoso (up to 2003) and Luiz Inácio Lula da Silva (2003-2006). The speeches of both periods contain, albeit with different modulations, several similar components, among which the reform of the United Nations and the Brazilian quest for a permanent seat in the Security Council; the priority of Latin America in the foreign policy of Brazil; the growing trend toward the recognition of South America as a unique political and integration space; the adherence of Brazil to the values of multilateralism, democracy, human rights and economic development with social justice; repudiation of terrorism; the need for a solution to the Israeli-Palestinian conflict that leads to the effective institutionalization of the Palestinian State; the need for an appropriate management of the very serious problems of Africa. In practically all the texts the importance attached by Brazil to multilateral trade negotiations is evident, to the extent that they can contribute to the removal of the distortions and inequalities between developed and developing countries.

Understandably, the emphases vary and some singularities are visible.

In the speeches of the period of President Fernando Henrique's Administration there is special insistence on the themes of globalization, economic and commercial opening, general economic liberalization, the great risks associated with the volatility of capital movements and the need to reform the institutions of Bretton Woods. There are also extensive references to the issue of disarmament.

The speeches of President Lula's Administration, in turn, display a greater emphasis on the themes of social justice, with stress on the programs implemented by the Government in the social arena as a matrix for global projects. Issues related to the "war on hunger and poverty" prevail over formulations linked to macroeconomic stability and the volatility of the international financial markets. Mentions to Latin America definitely take a secondary place in comparison with mentions to South America.

With this updated edition, the reader can avail himself of all the Brazilian speeches at the opening of the General Debate of the Assembly from 1946 to 2006. Also included are, with regard to the year 2000, the speech of Vice-president Marco Maciel at the Plenary Session of the "Millenium Summit"; for 2004, the statements of President Lula during the world meeting on the social dimension of globalization and at the Meeting of World Leaders for "Action Against Hunger and Poverty"; and for 2005, the speeches of President Lula at the high level debate on mechanisms for financing development, at the Summit Meeting of the Security Council and at the High Level Meeting of the UN General Assembly on the implementation of the Millennium targets. These additional texts are indispensable for the contextualization and correct understanding of the pronouncements delivered at the General Debate of the Assembly Sessions in those years.

Each of the speeches transcribed and briefly contextualized in the present volume is important, both in itself and, at the same time, as part of a *corpus* of external policy that unfolds over time. Each one is part of a two-way dialogue between the authorities responsible for the Brazilian foreign policy and its circumstances – a dialogue in real time between the facts and their interpretation and, simultaneously, a deferred dialogue between Brazil and its diplomatic traditions, that is, between Brazil and its self-perception, its *weltanschauung* and its real or imagined insertion in the world at large. Taken together, the speeches reproduced in the present volume tell an attractive and singular story; an unfinished, *in fieri* story, and provide the reader with a trustworthy

source of the unending debate between the formulation of the external policy of Brazil, on the one hand, and the vicissitudes that shaped the past of the country, the risks and opportunities that characterize its present and the hopes long deposited in its future.

Presentation to the First Edition

Luiz Felipe Lampreia
Former Minister of External Relations

A valuable compendium

This edition of the statements by the Heads of Brazilian delegations to the opening Sessions of the General Assembly of the United Nations during the last fifty years constitutes another contribution of the Alexandre de Gusmão Foundation (FUNAG) to the study of the history and the diplomatic doctrine of Brazil.

For us, in Itamaraty, this effort marks the celebration of the Fiftieth anniversary of the United Nations and at the same time puts at the disposal of the interested public a valuable compendium of fundamental texts of our diplomacy. In them one can find the synthesis *par excellence* of the world view and the projects of Brazilian diplomacy, updated yearly according to the evolution of international relations and of our own conception of our country and the world.

Compiled by FUNAG, this collection is presented by Ambassador Luiz Felipe de Seixas Corrêa, an experienced diplomat of recognized political acumen, who is also responsible for the texts that place each speech in its internal and international contexts. This book, thus, becomes an authoritative source of historical and doctrinal reference. Throughout the fifty-two statements included here, the great themes that shaped the most recent history of international relations are expounded; these are the issues on which, accordingly, the Brazilian government focused its attention during this post-war half century. They also contain the main

Brazilian contributions to the debate promoted by the United Nations throughout its existence, which operated a qualitative transformation of international law and its normative process. Development, disarmament, collective economic security, the normative gap between the Charter and the evolution of international relations, the most modern concept of "sustainable development", are all perfectly reflected and examined here according the diplomatic optics of the time of the delivery of the speeches. The emphases, evaluations, perceptions and sensitivities in Brazilian external policy spring up with particular sharpness in the opening speeches of the General Assembly.

At the same time, these speeches will gradually reveal to the reader a great and successful learning effort on the part of the Brazilian diplomacy along these last fifty years: the apprenticeship of multilateralism. The United Nations, a veritable school of modern diplomacy with a distinctive character, served at the same time as a political arena and as a forum for the perfecting of international coexistence, which nations were compelled to internalize in their external policies.

A political document *par excellence*, record and memory of the policies defended and implemented by a Government, the opening statement at the United Nations is a paradigm of the well-thought and carefully elaborated diplomatic discourse and attains its true historic dimension through the contextual perspective in which it is placed in this collection, displaying at the same time the lines of coherence of Brazilian diplomacy.

For all these reasons, this collection appears as an opportune and valuable initiative which will help everyone to better understand a period of our diplomatic history that renews itself symbolically with the commemoration of the Fiftieth anniversary of the United Nations, to which the Brazilian government and particularly Itamaraty gladly associate with this edition.

Introduction to the First Edition

Luiz Felipe de Seixas Corrêa

In October 1995 the United Nations Organization celebrated fifty years of its existence. Necessity and hope, reason and illusion, reality and utopia – under any point of view the United Nations constitute, since its inception in 1945, the central point of reference in the process of international relations. The pressures and counter-pressures inherent to a decentralized international system prone to anarchy flow to the United Nations; there the coalitions of interests are articulated and the configurations of power that move the international decision making process are expressed; from it different kinds of directions arise, aiming at introducing elements of norm creation and cooperation in the international order.

The United Nations is a system of institutions based on the San Francisco Charter which gradually builds up the legal *corpus* regulating international life. It is at the same time an end and a process. It is impossible nowadays to conceive the world without the United Nations Organization. One may criticize this or that failure, in one or another field of action. It is, however, imperative to recognize the wisdom of its original conception, the merits of the results achieved during its operation and above all its capacity of self-renewal through the incorporation of new themes, new concepts and expanding areas of action. At the close of this half century of its existence, the United Nations and its Member States have become a matrix in the international order.

Brazilian diplomacy is an original part of this project, which became the great collective effort of the international society in the 20th century.

A founding Member of the Organization, Brazil has always ascribed a central role to the United Nations in the formulation and implementation of its external policy. The status of active and fully participating Member State of the UN became an inseparable element of Brazil's international personality.

As we commemorate the Fiftieth anniversary of the Organization, no initiative could be more adequate than recovering the words said by Brazil at the General Assembly. With the publication of its statements at the general debate, Brazilian diplomacy celebrates the Organization and at the same time retraces its own itinerary. By doing this, it erects a diplomatic monument that exemplarily exalts Brazilian foreign policy, undoubtedly one of the most valuable moral patrimonies of Brazilian society.

In the following pages the reader will find all the speeches delivered by the Heads of Brazilian delegations to the fifty Regular Sessions of the United Nations General Assembly, from 1946 to 1955. The statements are reproduced in their entirety. Texts not found in Portuguese were duly translated, since until the 1970's it was customary to speak in one of the official languages, usually English.

Each speech is preceded by a short introduction that explains the main external variables which shaped the historic moment of the delivery of the statement. Attention is called to the distinctive elements of the speech and to the analysis of its insertion in the flow of the formulation and enunciation of Brazilian external policy. This contextualization aims at providing the reader with a few keys that will enable him to follow and evaluate the contemporary Brazilian foreign policy.

***

Since the first Session of the General Assembly, Brazil has been the first country to come to the podium at the general debate. This practice is believed to have started in 1949 as a result of the climate of confrontation then prevailing, with a view to avoid giving the primacy either to the United Sates or to the Soviet Union. From then on, before opening the speaker's list for the General Debate, the Secretary General sends a note to the Mission of Brazil asking whether, according to praxis, the Brazilian Delegation wishes to be the first to speak. The invariable affirmative answer ensures the validity of a tradition that honors and distinguishes Brazil.

This circumstance has solidified in Brazilian diplomacy a high evaluation of the importance of the "opening" statements in the General Debate, which for many years constituted the main vehicle at the disposal of Brazilian diplomacy to make its voice heard internationally. Unlike the

large majority of Delegations intervening in the General Debate, mainly concerned with topical questions, the Heads of the Brazilian Delegations, being the first to speak, usually make more general speeches, in which the evaluation of the international situation serves as the background for the enunciation of the Brazilian view of the world and for the discussion of the chief international issues.

Some statements are more explicit, others sometimes more reticent; some are innovative and others conservative; some are more academic, others oriented to the field of diplomatic operation. Taken as a whole, these texts constitute a kind of *book of hours*, a summary of Brazilian external policy. Through their study it is possible to discern the different periods that characterized Brazilian diplomatic action, the several emphases that marked such periods, the internal and external constraints that occasionally prevailed and also to identify the elements of permanence and continuity present in the external projection of Brazil.

Besides its ample scope, the material is valuable from the standpoint of is documentary quality. The Brazilian discourse is linear, objective and trustworthy. No ambivalence exists between the policies enunciated and the diplomatic action implemented.

In fact, in external policy discourse and action are complementary and superimposed on each other. Often, discourse is action and action is the discourse. In the case of a country such as Brazil, whose capacity of expressing itself internationally through power is limited, the diplomatic discourse becomes the chief means of policy definition, mobilization of coalitions of interests, transaction and search for balance.

A great political leader used to say that during his life as a parliamentarian he had heard many speeches that made him change his opinion about the issues in debate. None, however, had ever changed his vote. It is possible that the Brazilian diplomatic discourse in New York during these fifty years has not been able to make other Delegations change their votes. Surely, however, it has been a fundamental element to disseminate in the international community the image of a nation that distinguished itself by its seriousness, by its sense of responsibility and by the high quality of the external representation of its interests.

***

For a correct evaluation of the evolution of Brazilian external policy in the light of the texts included in the present volume, it is convenient to recall very generally the stages historically covered by Brazil in the international scenario and particularly previous instances of Brazilian participation in the multilateral process.

As an instrument of defense and promotion of the fundamental interests of the State in the field of international coexistence, Brazilian external policy can be perceived in three great moments. The first one encompasses three centuries. It opens with the negotiations between Portugal and Castella which produced the Treaty of Tordesilhas (1494), takes hold in the 18th century with the Treaties of Madrid (1750) and Santo Ildefonso (1777) and culminates with the establishment of the Portuguese Court in Rio de Janeiro in 1808. During this extended period, the fundamental axis of the external projection of the territory which would gradually evolve toward the formation of the State of Brazil was the "delimitation of the national space". The next stage corresponds to the period of the monarchy, although it really extends up to Rio Branco. It is the moment when the Brazilian society, already fully structured in a State, looks to the "consolidation of the national space" through its effective occupation, its defense, especially in the Plata area, and the definitive configuration of the territorial borders. The third moment, which spreads until the present days, can be characterized as the "development of the national space", that is, the use of external relations as an instrument to gather resources, negotiate coalitions and neutralization of obstacles to the economic and social development of Brazil.

The participation of Brazil in the international multilateral instances stems from this third and present moment of the external policy. It begins at the start of the century, after the proclamation of the Republic, with the search for a partnership with the emerging power of the time, the United States of America. Until Rio Branco, Brazilian external policy followed two complementary objectives resulting form the imperative of consolidating the national space: dealing with the British preeminence and preserving the integrity of the Southern border, occasionally threatened by either Paraguay or Uruguay, and permanently by the Argentine Confederation. In spite of his monarchic beliefs and his European formation, Rio Branco perceived the risks of marginalization of Brazil in a Eurocentric international context and foresaw the shift of the centers of power toward North America.

Since Rio Branco, Brazilian external policy began to look, either simultaneously or successively, for an "alliance" with the United States and for a widening of the international insertion of Brazil as factors of its economic and social development. The periods of greater alignment with the United Sates coincide with the times in national life when the correlations of internal forces permitted the adoption of political models that gave primacy to obtaining resources and cooperation needed for the economic development process through the "alliance" with the U.S.

Contrariwise, the periods of less vigor of the "alliance" coincide with more diversified alternative proposals, not exclusively dependent from the expectation of American cooperation. In the last few decades, in the light of transformations in Brazil and in the world, Brazilian statements reveal how the "alliance" ceased to present a univocal reference value. It is no longer, as was the case in the past, the mark of a positive or negative sign for the mobilization of Brazilian diplomacy, whose widened horizons started to view in the strategy of universalism the appropriate manner to achieve the competitive insertion of Brazil in the world.

In the multilateral field, the first landmark moment of the internationalization of the external projection of Brazil is the II Hague Peace Conference in 1907. In the Hague, Brazilian diplomacy would make its debut in the international arena with an affirmative and demanding discourse in which it showed its willingness to play, as an intermediate country, a role in the elaboration of the norms that should preside over the great international themes of the time: mitigation of laws and customs of war, codification of the law of neutrality, reform of the Arbitration Court and stipulation of compulsory arbitration. At least two of the chief paradigms followed since then by Brazilian diplomacy stem from the participation of Brazil in the Hague Conference under the leadership of Ruy Barbosa: the paradigm of Brazilian singularity and the paradigm of respect to International Law. It is clear in Ruy Barbosa's formulation the concern for the singularity of Brazil in the international context as a country that does not feel comfortable with *a priori* typecasting and rejects being framed in groups or movements. From the Hague also came the desire of Brazil to act in the concert of nations not with the might of its arms or eventual ambitions of power, but rather with the strength of its reasons and the ascendancy of its adherence to Law. As Ruy Barbosa would significantly remark when analyzing the results of the Conference, the international presence of Brazil should be built "by work, education, faith, alliance between tradition and progress, love of law and Right, and aversion to immorality and disorder".

Participation in the Hague Conference permitted the formulation of the ideological basis for the subsequent Brazilian decision to adhere to the cause of the Allies in World War I and after the end of the conflict to take part in the Versailles Conference, where Brazil was officially classified, for the purpose of reparations, as "a power with limited interests".

The Hague paradigms were essentially the same that guided the participation of Brazil in the League of Nations and that influenced the decision to abandon that Organization in 1926, when the Brazilian bid for a permanent seat in the Council was thwarted by the appointment of

Germany. By leaving for reasons of principle an Organization that soon after would disappear under the violence unleashed by Germany itself, Brazil felt strengthened in the certainty of its singularity and its adherence to international order and morality.

Having participated of World War II in the European theater, the same convictions moved Brazil to join the original nucleus of the countries that founded the Organization of the United Nations. The fundamental policy lines remained the same: to strengthen the "alliance" with the United States and to widen the international insertion of Brazil with a view to its full development. The Hague paradigms were also kept despite the disappointment caused by the non inclusion of Brazil as a permanent member of the Security Council due to the opposition of the USSR, the ambivalence of American support and the determination of France to maintain a status as a great power. In this connection, the Head of the Brazilian Delegation to the San Francisco Conference, Minister Pedro Leão Velloso, observes in his report that he did not refrain from sounding out the possibility of obtaining for Brazil a treatment similar to that given to France, in consonance with what had been agreed with the other four permanent members of the future Council (United States, Great Britain, the Soviet Union and China) at the preparatory meeting in Dumbarton Oaks. Finding out, however that the Great Powers "do not seem willing, for reasons of prudence, to allow in San Francisco the reopening of the debate on the increase of permanent seats in the Security Council", Leão Velloso decided to abstain, as he explains in his Report, and only registered, in a letter to the American Secretary of State, the "disappointment that the exclusion of Brazil could cause in the opinion of the public".

In San Francisco, the conduct of the Brazilian Delegation would determine the shape of at least three great themes that would be inscribed, as was the case with the Hague paradigms, as constant elements of the Brazilian discourse at the United Nations: the twin questions of veto and the functioning of the Security Council; the reform of the Charter; and economic and social development. Regarding the veto, the Brazilian position was at first ambiguous. Leão Velloso recalls in his Report that the Brazilian Delegation stated formally during the debate of the issue in San Francisco that "Brazil would be, for reasons of principle, opposed to the granting of the veto ... (and that) accordingly, would support amendments aimed at limiting its use, but, wishing to give further proof of its willingness to help in the success of the Conference, in case no amendment is adopted and its vote is necessary to form a majority, the Delegation would be ready to vote in favor of the original text, that is, in favor of the veto". In the end, Brazil accepted the formula contained in

the Charter, derived from an American proposal which was only useful for the increase of the number of non-permanent members of the Security Council and the ECOSOC. In his Report, Leão Velloso linked the issue of the veto to that of the reform of the Charter by pointing out that Brazil accepted the former because it was unable to act otherwise: "had we done that, certainly we would not be able to sign the statute of the new World Organization and would have to remain on the margins of the community of nations. Our efforts (...) aimed at the attenuation of the rigidity of the veto by way of the revision (of the Charter)". In what regards the theme of economic and social development "an element which would gradually become the most forceful among the persistent themes in the Brazilian discourse at the UN" the foresight shown in San Francisco is remarkable. The Report registers the determination of Brazil to give to ECOSOC "a more dynamic character, in order to prevent that (its) main concern be the maintenance of an economic *status quo* for the countries with a more developed economy or for the economic reconstruction of the nations destroyed by the War". This formulation summarizes the basis of what would become the multilateral economic diplomacy of Brazil.

***

As reproduced in the following pages, the Brazilian speeches at the fifty Sessions of the General Assembly that followed the founding Conference of San Francisco reflect faithfully the path trodden by the diplomacy of Brazil during the last fifty years. They demonstrate that in spite of occasional changes in emphasis and orientation, Brazilian diplomacy invariably sought to serve as an instrument for the preservation of the ethical values of peace and respect to International Law, as well as for the competitive insertion of the country in the international scenario.

The statements provide a glimpse of some of the main dichotomies that characterize the process of formulation of Brazilian external policy: nationalism and internationalism; realism and idealism; pragmatism and utopia; demand and invention; the West and the Third World; universalism and particularism; fatalism and hope; subjectivism and objectivism; democracy and authoritarianism; permanence and change, and so forth.

These dichotomies show the ambivalences of the often contradictory dimensions of Brazil, but never conceal the ethical scale of values by means of which Brazilian diplomacy wants to evaluate facts and

distinguish the real from the unreal, illusion from reality. During these five decades of multilateral politics within the United Nations, Brazilian diplomacy always projected a world vision based on values. The ethical quality of the Brazilian discourse is evident in formulations constantly turned to the realization, in the international sphere, of the objectives of freedom and equality inherent to the human condition.

The Brazilian utopia emerging from the reading of these texts is the universal utopia. A utopia that faces the future. Unrealized. Unredeemed. The utopia of a singular country that strives to discover itself and at the same time seeks to build its place in History.

The statements compiled in this book represent a tribute to the past and an offering to the future. They honor the Brazilian diplomatic tradition and set an obligation for the coming generations.

1946

1946

The end of World War II unleashed important political and institutional changes in Brazil. Once press censorship was abolished, manifestoes by intellectuals and artists in favor of the restoration of democratic order followed one another. The parties that would dominate Brazilian politics until 1964 were established: on the one hand, the National Democratic Union (UDN) which would carry the anti-Vargas sentiment; on the other, the Social Democratic Party (PSD) and the Brazilian Labor Party (PTB), bringing together the conservative and labor forces linked to the Vargas system. In October, President Getúlio Vargas was deposed by the military chiefs and General Eurico Gaspar Dutra was elected to the highest office of the Republic. After his inauguration in 1946, President Dutra undertook the institutional normalization of Brazil following the fifteen years of exceptional conditions that prevailed since the 1930 revolution. In September, a new liberal Constitution was enacted re-establishing the principle of the separation of powers and nationwide direct elections.

The changes underwent by Brazil followed the logic of an international scenario marked by the affirmation of Western democratic values that had triumphed over the nazi-fascist totalitarianism. The alliance still in force among the main Western powers and the Soviet Union made it possible for the trends favorable to a rapprochement with the USSR to be countered by the strategic dependence of Brazil vis-à-vis the United States. With the demise of the Estado Novo, the 1945 amnesty

and the new electoral legislation, the Brazilian Communist Party (PCB) would rise from the war as a relevant political factor. At the time, PCB was the only Communist party in Latin America to attempt the seizure of power by violent means, the so-called *intentona* (attempt) in 1935, which caused very deep resentment among the military. Relations between Brazil and the Soviet Union had never existed formally. Until then Brazil had not recognized the regime resulting from the 1917 revolution. As the war came to a close, this situation would change. Wishing to obtain Moscow's support to its ambitions regarding the multilateral arrangements which would shape the international order in the postwar, the Brazilian government recognized the USSR by exchange of diplomatic notes in Washington, under the auspices of the United States.

The bipolar domination of the world could already be foreseen. The relationship between the United States and the Soviet Union, previously peripheral to a scenario whose main driving forces remained in Europe, became the central feature of international relations. From the end of World War II until the breaking up of the Soviet Union the history of international relations was confined to the chronicle of the interrelation between the two superpowers, their enduring obsession for security and their competition for ideological, political and economic influence in the remaining regions.

This scenario would soon lead the United States to look for the strengthening of its strategic relations. Already bilaterally associated to the American defense system, Brazil would later on, in 1947, join the regional system of collective security through the Inter-American Reciprocal Assistance Treaty (TIAR).

The alliance with the United Stated generated positive expectations in Brazil. It was believed that an inflow of American resources would soon promote the development of the country. Those positive expectations would not diminish even in the face of the disappointment caused by the final negotiation of the United Nations Charter, when the Brazilian bid for a permanent seat in the Security Council was thwarted by the appointment of France despite previous hints and some promises of support by American authorities.

Under the influence of the changes taking place in the world, the Brazilian politico-institutional panorama looked complex. The relative simplicity of the Vargas model was replaced by an institutional process lacking a model (the "Old Republic" obviously was an inadequate yardstick) and limited by the absence of social cohesion in the country. Internally divided, Brazil would also become externally cleaved around

the Soviet-American confrontation, with which the political debate would start to interact ideologically. In 1946 the Communist leader Luiz Carlos Prestes declared publicly that he would support the Soviet Union in case of war between that country and Brazil. Months later the leader of UDN, Octavio Mangabeira, kissed General Eisenhower's hand during the latter's visit to Rio de Janeiro.

It is therefore not surprising that the first Brazilian statements in the General Assembly were cautious.

The first General Assembly was divided in two parts. The inaugural Session took place in London. The Brazilian statement, delivered by Ambassador Luiz Martins de Souza Dantas, took a pronounced moralist, even mystic, content. The configuration of an intellectual community of nations and the formation of "a single spiritual home" was proposed in order to "eliminate war, disease and need". Such expressions were meant to describe what later would become known as international security and economic and social development. One should remark the reference to the unavoidable dissemination of the "cosmic science" then liberated, as a harbinger of the problems which would result from nuclear proliferation.

The second part of the First General Assembly was convened in New York. In his intervention at the general debate, Ambassador Pedro Leão Velloso displayed benevolent expectations regarding the ideals of the Organization and did not refrain from showing between the lines some resentment for the failure to elevate the status of Brazil. The wounds from the episode of Brazil's withdrawal from the League of Nations over the refusal of its bid for a permanent seat in the Council were still fresh. Avoiding the problems that divided Brazil and the great ideological questions that darkened the international scene, Leão Velloso projected the image of a mature country, guided by ethical considerations and ready to act with increased responsibility in the external field. Nevertheless, the representative of Brazil admitted that peace depended effectively from the great powers, despite the grand legal construction of the San Francisco Charter, and stated that Brazil would be willing to accept the institution of veto as a pragmatic way to "obtain results". Stressing the security objectives of the Organization, Leão Velloso identified the constitution of the Staff Committee as the main distinctive feature of the San Francisco Charter vis-à-vis the Pact of the League of Nations. Foreshadowing a course that would become an essential direction of Brazilian foreign policy, he mentioned the importance attached since then by Brazil to the work of the Economic and Social Council.

I Regular Session of the General Assembly of the United Nations
1946

First Part

Ambassador Luiz Martins de Souza Dantas [*]

Mr. President,

In the name of the Brazilian people and its Government, I should like, in the first place, to say how grateful my country is to this august Assembly for the sincere vote of confidence that was given it when it was elected to the Security Council of the United Nations. In this way you wished to place on record your sympathy for our peaceful traditions and our share in the sacrifices incurred in the fight for freedom and human dignity.

The Republic of the United States of Brazil has never ceased to work for peace, and is happy to have been the first nation to introduce in its Constitution a clause prescribing compulsory arbitration in all international conflicts. Her diplomatic history was at all times written in the clear light of day, and shows a succession of treaties and agreements bearing the stamp of a spirit of understanding and solidarity. She resorted to arms only in order to place them at the service of the general cause of peoples whose independence and territorial integrity were threatened. Her blood was mingled with that of the Allies, her resources were placed at the disposal of all, and her only wish was to serve the cause of international peace and collective security.

[*] **Luiz Martins de Souza Dantas**, Born in Rio de Janeiro, RJ, on February 17, 1876. Bachelor in Law from the Faculty of São Paulo. Legation Attaché 3/2/1897. Ambassador 11/1/1919. Twice Acting Minister of State for External Relations, in the period 1913-1917. Served as Brazilian Delegate to the League of Nations, in Geneva, in 1924 and 1926. † Paris, April 1954.

It is on the strength of these merits and in the name of our soldiers who gave their lives for the common victory that we take our place at your side, in order to accomplish the work of reconstruction which is the duty of all of us. With this end in view, we shall spare no effort and shall recoil before no difficulties. The task to be fulfilled is too fine and too noble to allow the admission of any impure thoughts or minor preoccupations. We assume wholeheartedly all the duties which our position within the United Nations may carry with it.

The problem now facing the peoples which have undergone the test of terrible catastrophes is that of replacing self-interest, to the exclusion of the rights of others, by an appreciation of their mutual duties. In the admirable phrase of St. Paul, we are all members one of another. Therefore, collective efforts should be coordinated in order to preserve and improve human society considered as a single indivisible unit, of which the various nations are the necessary constituent organs. If need be, in the attainment of this unity, each nation must learn to subordinate its sovereignty to the overriding interest of humanity as a whole; and if, amongst the United Nations, there are some more powerful than others, such superiority must serve only to produce greater devotion to the common cause.

The organization which we are called upon to build up holds out great promise, but let us not forget, at the beginning of this great work, the lesson of the past. No purely temporal force can hope to put an end to international disputes. If the guns are to be silent forever, the heart of man must first be disarmed; it must be drained of all prejudice as to race, nationality and religion; it must be purged of the sin of ambition and pride; and it must be filled instead with hope and brotherly feeling. A system of international morality must be built up, drawn from every kind of spiritual force, and it is this morality which must direct the political treaties and agreements of the world of tomorrow.

More than ever, an intellectual community is becoming urgently necessary in the constitution of a true gathering of nations. Let us see to it that it shall be built up without political interference and that it shall be based on the great religious movements which have sprung from the teachings of Christ, Mohammed, Buddha and Confucius, and on the contributions of lay poets, philosophers and scientists from all countries. Without the support of a widely informed and free public opinion, any attempt at an international organization would prove illusory, particularly at the present time, when material forces, released by the genius of man, are already threatening to overtake him. The cosmic energy which man is preparing to handle will engulf him if he is not first trained

to use it properly. For some time still the secret armaments derived from this energy may remain secret. But it would be idle to think that this is a final solution: scientific discoveries are not the privilege of any single people or group of men. When the initial steps have reached a certain stage, these discoveries will arise simultaneously in a number of minds. History has proved this over and over again.

If the dangers in international relations proceeding from the release of atomic energy are to bewarded off, there is no alternative to the development of the brotherhood of man by all the intellectual and moral means at our disposal. The United Nations Charter points out clearly the path to be followed, by providing for the establishment of the Economic and Social Council side by side with the Security Council. If the former fulfils its duties, it is to be hoped that the latter will never have to intervene. It is my fervent hope that it shall remain, as it were, a shield which none dare attack.

The disturber of the peace is always wrong, and this shall be the guiding motto of the United Nations. Anyone seeking to break the peace, to sow discord amongst nations, or to carry on a war of nerves, shall henceforth be subdued by the unshakable determination of all those who have suffered the bitter ills of war and who are resolved never again to allow a similar catastrophe to occur.

Politically speaking, there are fifty-one distinct countries represented in this Assembly; our work can be said to have succeeded if, when we part, our various countries form altogether but a single spiritual home. Thus, man will have made his greatest conquest, and we can join in a common effort to stamp out the three great scourges of war, disease and want, which at the moment are dividing and oppressing us.

One single thought should inspire our actions toward setting up on unshakable foundations the Organization of the United Nations and I hope that it may be its motto: "*Communis humanitatis causa*".

London, January 10, 1946.

I Regular Session of the General Assembly of the United Nations
1946

Second Part

Ambassador Pedro Leão Veloso Netto [*]

Mr. President,

I would first like to express to the city of New York, on behalf of the Brazilian delegation, our sincere gratitude for its kind hospitality to us during the period of the General Assembly.

The United Nations first saw the light of day on the soil of the United States; its creation was inspired by the great President Roosevelt, assisted by his eminent Secretary of State, the Honorable Cordell Hull. The plan drawn up at Dumbarton Oaks was approved at San Francisco by the States which form the United Nations. They drew up a Charter which was henceforth to govern their mutual relations. Those facts have a significance which should not escape us and which, as a son of this continent I am happy to stress.

America, land of liberty, inhabited by people who are without the prejudices accumulated in other continents by centuries of endless struggles, cradle of the greatest of all democracies, offers the United Nations an opportunity without precedent to flourish and fulfill its great political economic, social and cultural mission.

Brazil, in its two-fold capacity as a member of the community of nations and as a State forming an integral part of this hemisphere, is

[*] **Pedro Leão Velloso Netto**, Born in Pindamonhangaba, SP, on January 13, 1887. Bachelor in Legal and Social Sciences from the Faculty of Law of Rio de Janeiro. Second Secretary in 1910. Minister Plenipotentiary, First Class, by merit, in 1934. Minister of State for External Relations 11/1/1945 to 1/31/1946. † New York, January 1947.

proud to have contributed to the creation of the United Nations Charter. Its past, its peaceful tradition, its love of order, its respect for law and its democratic sentiments made it ready to welcome keenly the idea of the organization of an international society to maintain justice, the respect of treaties and the other sources of the law of nations.

That is why my country has given wholehearted support to the initiative of the great Powers. It took part not only in the San Francisco Conference, but also, in August 1945, in the preparatory work prior to the first part of the first session of the General Assembly.

The United Nations has been functioning for only a few months. The fact that the Security Council, the Economic and Social Council and other organs have had regular meetings since January of the present year does not mean that they are not still in the process of being organized, with an incomplete personnel, a tentative budget, the problem of permanent headquarters as yet undecided, and so on.

To that must be added the post-war conditions throughout the world resulting from the delay in drawing up and signing the peace treaties.

All things considered, we have only been in existence for a very short time, during which we have been busily engaged in organizing ourselves in a world which is still waiting to return to normal. It would be entirely premature, in the circumstances, to attempt to judge the part played by the United Nations up to the present.

I wish to say that my country has very great faith in the cause of the United Nations. After the painful years we have just passed through, we cannot conceive of the world on the threshold of which we now stand without support of the kind which the United Nations proposes to offer for the benefit of mankind, namely, a guarantee of the maintenance of order and of international security in a political and legal system which guarantees to both victor and vanquished respect for their lives, their rights and their liberties.

As you see, I am speaking to you with my eyes fixed on the Charter. The latter represents the second attempt within twenty-five years to give to the peoples a statute enabling them to live as a society in an orderly and civilized world.

An attempt was made at Dumbarton Oaks, and afterwards at San Francisco, to improve on the Covenant of the League of Nations by the introduction, in the Charter of the United Nations, of more realistic provisions than those contained in the instrument of which the invasion

of Manchuria marked the failure. The most important of the provisions marking a difference between the Covenant and the Charter is that establishing a Staff Committee to help the Security Council in case of a threat against the peace, a breach of the peace, or aggression.

The United Nations has, however, been established on the basis of a very far-reaching principle. This principle, to which the creators of our Organization attached the greatest importance, both before and during the San Francisco Conference, has been embodied in Article 27 of the Charter. In their view, in order that the United Nations should survive, and fulfill its task, unanimity among the permanent members of the Security Council, that is to say among the great Powers, was essential; without that the United Nations would cease to be.

Article 27, if it is considered in the light of the principle of the equality of all States before the law, was a very heavy price paid by small and medium-sized nations in order to obtain a charter. That provision of our statute is more generally known as the right of veto granted to the permanent members of the Security Council.

Brazil, although theoretically opposed to the veto, accepted it in a constructive spirit in order to get results. We thought that, whereas all States are equal before the law theoretically, their responsibilities as regards the maintenance of peace are in direct proportion to their means of action and, consequently, vary greatly. For that reason we decided that it was necessary to place trust in the great Powers.

It is, however, obvious that this trust which was placed in them in the same spirit by the majority of the Members of the United Nations, lays an obligation on the great Powers, which benefit from it, to honor it. They will succeed in doing so, in the first place, by working together for the reorganization of the world. We all realize that the task is not easy. But we are equally convinced that, however difficult the obstacles may be, they will not prove insurmountable when confronted with the good will and sincere desire of the great Powers to achieve all the purposes to which we have subscribed since the Atlantic Charter.

Today the peoples of the world have one supreme desire. After the terrible suffering of the last war they long for order and peace. They are anxious for two things: they wish for a return to order and they hope that it will be lasting. They will not tolerate the idea that every generation will have to undergo the horrors, more terrible each time, resulting from the illusion of solving by war problems which war can never solve. Peace rests, no doubt, in the hands of the great Powers; but the world will never

accept the idea that their conflicts of interest can justify the sacrifice of the well-being of mankind.

Let us look again at the Preamble to our Charter, which says that we are "determined to save succeeding generations from the scourge of war, which twice in our lifetime has brought untold sorrow to mankind". Nations have frequently an historic mission to fulfill in the world; if that is their destiny nothing can hinder it. Today, it would, however, be madness, it would be a crime, to attempt to fulfill it outside the framework of the United Nations to which they belong.

A heavy task awaits us. We have met here, in the first place, to finish the work started in London at the beginning of the year. In the meantime, many additional subjects have been put forward for us to study. We are faced with an extremely heavy agenda. Moreover, we are meeting after a considerable delay resulting from a double adjournment.

All the subjects before us are naturally of very great importance; whatever their nature, they deserve the same attention from us. At the stage the United Nations has now reached, however, I have no hesitation in saying that some of those subjects have a predominant interest. These are, in the first place those connected with its organization; and, secondly, chose which have been submitted to us for examination by organs such as the Economic and Social Council, *et cetera.* We must concentrate our efforts on them if we wish the work of the United Nations to give the fullest results and if we desire the United Nations, which is at last emerging from the preparatory phase which has lasted quite long enough, to play the part for which it was created.

Such is the purpose of the Brazilian delegation in coming to participate in the second part of the first session of the General Assembly which is now meeting in New York. Brazil is thus continuing to act in accordance with the objective and constructive attitude which she adopted at San Francisco, of which the essential purpose is the formation and development of the United Nations in the world. This General Assembly can count on our wholehearted support in carrying out the work we have undertaken in the shortest possible time.

New York, October 23, 1946.

1947

1947

In February 1947 international relations witnessed the initial developments of what would be known as "Cold War". Pressed by severe internal hardship, Great Britain announced its inability to continue providing economic and military aid to Greece and Turkey, two countries that had fallen into London's sphere of influence according to the arrangements of the close of World War II. Faced with the possibility that Soviet power would encompass those two vital countries for the strategic Mediterranean routes, the United States assumed the responsibilities for their defense. Upon submitting his plans to the Congress, President Truman unveiled the doctrine that would be attached to his name and announced the determination of the United States to assist the "free countries" that resisted the temptation to succumb to subjugation by armed minorities or external pressures. In July, the United States announced economic support to the European defense policy through the Marshall Plan. In the following month the magazine *Foreign Affairs* published an article under the pseudonym of Mr. X, in which George Keenan, an American diplomat specialized in Soviet affairs, argued in favor of the need to contain the USSR through the systematic application of counterforce by the United States anywhere in the world, a doctrine that became known as *containment* and that would come to dominate strategic thinking in the United States in the initial postwar stages.

The USSR reacted to *containment* with the creation of COMINFORM (Communist Information Bureau) which aimed at coordinating the

action of the international communist movement. At the same time, despite the rejection of COMINFORM by Tito's Yugoslavia, the Soviet domination of Eastern Europe was asserted with the installation of Communist governments in Hungary (June 1947) and Czechoslovakia (February 1948).

For its turn, Western Europe was gearing up to face the new power realities. France, England, Belgium, Holland and Luxemburg formed the "Western Union", which would originate the alliance to be established in reaction to the Berlin Blockade and would be transformed into NATO. Brazil stayed in the sidelines of developments. In the initial period of the Cold War, Latin American countries observed from a distance the developments taking place chiefly in Europe and Asia. It was, however, a good opportunity for the reaffirmation of fundamental loyalties, and the United States would strive for the consolidation of its preeminence in the hemisphere.

The year 1947 marks the start of a period of alignment of Brazil with the United States. Expecting that the alliance with Washington would create the necessary conditions for the development of the country, such as had happened in Western Europe and Japan, Brazilian diplomacy resorted to a policy of blocks. On the pretext of an incident with a diplomat in Moscow, diplomatic relations between Brazil and the USSR were severed. At the United Nations, Brazilian delegations invariably voted with the United States in questions pertaining to the East-West polarity. At the Rio de Janeiro Conference for the Maintenance of Peace and Security in the continent, which approved the Inter-American Reciprocal Assistance Treaty (TIAR), Brazilian diplomacy actively supported the American proposals about the defense of the region.

In his statement before the Second General Assembly Ambassador João Carlos Muniz showed some concern with the cleavage between the great powers. Accordingly, he praised the General Assembly as representative of the conscience of mankind and as an organ fully entitled to carry out functions similar to those of the Security Council in matters affecting peace and security. While not mentioned by name, the URSS was presented as a factor of irrationality and as making the United Nations unfeasible by constantly resorting to veto.

From the statement by Ambassador Muniz one can glean the world view of a diplomacy that realized the secondary role to which the country had been relegated in the post-war arrangements and took solace in idealistic, even utopian formulations. The representative of Brazil stated that mankind was going through a truly existential

period, a phase of tension and confusion of values. The reconciliation of personal freedom with security was the path to salvation for the forsaken and fearful individual facing the threats of the moment. Between totalitarianism and the prospects for progress and welfare open by scientific development, Brazil expressed its preparedness to contribute with liberal and democratic ideas that formed the basis of its national life. Conciliation, said Muniz, evoking the policies of the Cabinet headed by the Marquis of Paraná in the II Empire, is the essential distinctive feature of the Brazilian people: our participation in the international sphere aims at the conciliation of opposing ideas with a view to promoting progress through persuasion.

The idealism of the discourse is, however, tempered by remarkably pertinent and insightful observations. Particularly notable, in this connection, are the mentions to the "extreme interdependency of people put in contact by the multiplicity of means of communication" and the pioneer evaluation of the shortcomings contained in the Charter which could be corrected by means of a revision or by the adoption of consensual practices.

II Regular Session of the General Assembly of the United Nations
1947

Ambassador João Carlos Muniz [*]

Mr. President,

The present session of the General Assembly of the United Nations imparts a note of hope and encouragement in the anguished moments in which we live today. The reason for this is that the General Assembly represents the conscience of the world, and its decisions are the embodiment of that conscience in the effort to solve the problems which concern all peoples. Without deep reflection on these problems, we can never arrive at organic solutions capable of harmonizing national interests and of promoting the general welfare. Hence the importance of the General Assembly, which must be considered the central organ of the United Nations and to which all other agencies are related.

While the other organs deal with fragmentary aspects of the problems, the General Assembly keeps watch and ward in order that all its agencies may function properly. It is the only organ in the system in which all the Member nations participate. It is the great forum to which are brought all questions that interest the international community. For this reason, the Charter does not set limits to its competence; on the contrary, it defines it in the broadest possible terms so that all subjects that affect international relations may be included within its jurisdiction.

[*] **João Carlos Muniz**, Born in Cuiabá, MT, on March 21, 1883. Bachelor in Sciences and Letters and in Legal and Social Sciences from the Faculty of Rio de Janeiro. Doctor in Legal Sciences from the New York University. Chancellor in New York in 1918. First Class Minister, by merit, in 1939. † Rio de Janeiro, 1960.

In order that the United Nations may achieve its purpose, it is essential that world public opinion be formed with a perfect understanding of its objectives and the conditions requisite for their achievement; public opinion must support its action and impose respect for it. Without the support of world public opinion, the United Nations can never become a reality. The General Assembly, with its facilities for broadcasting ideas, is the organ that is preeminently equipped to create this worldwide public opinion. In a world characterized by the extreme interdependence of people: drawn into contact by the multiplicity of means of communication, both in the material sphere and in that of ideas, the absence of a forum like this Assembly could only lead to confusion and to conflicts arising from the lack of an instrument to conciliate and synthetize national positions through free discussion and take common decisions. In so far as the General Assembly exercises the salutary function of forming public opinion, many of the problems which now beset us will disappear and give place to areas of agreement between nations, thus intensifying international collaboration.

The second session of the General Assembly meets at a moment that is truly "existential"; a moment of forceful contradictions affecting the destinies of peoples; a time of stress and confusion of values, such as always precedes the dawn of a new period in history. All civilizations have passed through identical epochs before attaining superior forms of consciousness. It might be said that the spirit, in its upward quest, resorts to negation and to opposition as a propellant toward the higher goal.

Discouragement is not admissible, therefore, because it is precisely in periods of doubt and strain, such as the present, that man reveals the immense potentialities of his spirit in overcoming apparently impassable obstacles and attaining a broader conception of freedom.

If, on the one hand, our world is tragically overshadowed by antagonisms and contradictions, its vast horizons, on the other hand, offer wide vistas of progress and improvement. The present generation utilizes extremely advanced technical methods; application of these methods can create a high standard of living throughout all regions of the world and eliminate misery and poverty. This technical progress already permits us to envisage the advent of a new mankind, highly civilized as we are, by forming, as it were, a single body endowed with a broader conscience and more receptive to the realization of all the aims of the human race. In order that this aspiration may be gradually attained, existing antagonisms have only to be conciliated. If the United Nations succeeds in carrying out this task, the most dangerous turning point of our time will have been

passed and we may look to the future with the confidence of the traveler who has reached the top of an arduous mountain path and views at last an unlimited reach of smiling plain.

I need say no more to emphasize the importance of this second session of the General Assembly. Our discussions and the decisions we take must be of a nature to lead us to an ample conciliation of existing antagonisms, or, at least, to the preparation of the ground for such conciliation.

The Brazilian delegation, whose membership represents a true cross-section of the democratic forces of our country, is determined to use all its efforts to bring to the work of this second session of the General Assembly the contribution of the liberal and democratic ideas on which our national life is based. Conciliation is the essential trait of the Brazilian people; it can be explained by the geographic and historic development of the country. The record of our participation in international life is precisely one of conciliating opposing influences and ideas with the purpose of promoting progress in international relations through persuasion. That is why Brazil, throughout its history, has always been one of the most ardent advocates of arbitration and other means for the pacific settlement of disputes.

International collaboration presupposes not only the existence of an adequate instrument to set in motion the numerous forms of collective activity, but also a minimum of agreement between the various nations on fundamental questions, such as the nature of international relations and the relations between the individual and the community. In other words, collaboration is conditional upon a certain degree of spiritual unity among the nations. When that unity is lacking and the divergences of opinion on fundamental questions are accentuated even to the point of appearing irreconcilable, the work of cooperation becomes precarious if not impossible. Such is, essentially, the present situation. The ideological struggle remains unabated by reconciliation, and a middle term has not yet been found that can promote agreement and common action in all fields of human endeavor. Under these conditions, all the efforts toward cooperation are nullified, no matter how perfect the instrument intended for this purpose.

In our consideration at this General Assembly of the difficulties of the distressful moment in which we are living, those difficulties which relate to divergences of principle should be differentiated from those which bear upon the imperfections of the instrument. If we lose sight of this essential distinction we shall run the risk of mistaking effect for cause

and become unable to direct our efforts properly to the removal of the real causes which hinder the work of international collaboration and the re-establishment of peace throughout the world.

The United Nations is an instrument wielded by sovereign nations that voluntarily accept certain restrictions to their freedom of action, with a view to advantages accruing from cooperation. As an instrument of voluntary cooperation, the Charter incontestably reveals certain defects which may be corrected either by revision or through the adoption of certain practices which the States may agree upon.

The voting procedure, which requires unanimity of the five permanent members of the Security Council for decisions on matters of substance, constitutes, without any doubt, a serious obstacle to the pacific settlement of disputes and renders impossible any action intended to guarantee security whenever such action is opposed by a great Power or even by a State that has the support of a great Power.

The veto, let it be said in passing, was not contemplated initially as a negative element to permit any of the great Powers to oppose decisions of the Security Council. It was intended rather as a positive factor and as an element of balance to ensure solidarity among the great Powers, which bear the greatest responsibilities for the maintenance of peace. It was believed at Yalta that the rule of unanimity, judiciously applied to important decisions by the great Powers, would serve to maintain solidarity among them in order that world peace be ensured. This solidarity among the great Powers did not materialize, however, and as a result of differences among them, the veto has been transformed into a negative instrument which is frustrating all efforts of the Security Council towards peace. It has been employed indiscriminately as a means of frustrating methods of pacific settlement and preventing the admission of new Members into the Organization.

For these reasons we are in favor of the adoption of practical means which will lead to discipline in the use of the veto.

The United Nations certainly does not constitute a perfect mechanism. It contains flaws which must eventually be corrected in order to ensure greater efficiency. We must not forget, however, that no matter how perfect it may become, it will still remain a mechanism which can only be used effectively if the nations continue to strive sincerely to take advantage of all its facilities. Despite its faults, the United Nations is an admirable instrument for collaboration between peoples. But the will to use it properly is divided and action becomes impossible.

What has just been said means therefore that the veto is an effect rather than a cause. It is but the reflection of the deep antagonism which divides the world over the conception of life and civilization and even over the actual destiny of man. Until this antagonism is resolved – and this can only be through the acceptance of a formula broad enough to reconcile the two contradictory conceptions so as to reinstate confidence and collaboration – we cannot place too much trust in mere changes in the mechanism.

Among the defects of the Charter to which I have referred, one of the most obvious was the non-acceptance at San Francisco of the principle of compulsory jurisdiction by the International Court of Justice in the various types of dispute dealt with in Article 36 of the Statute. This principle satisfied the demands of universal juridical conscience; this was proved by the acceptance by many States of the optional clause. If compulsory resort to the Court had been written into the Charter, a powerful instrument would be in our hands today for the promotion of the pacific settlement of disputes. The absence of such a provision relegated the International Court of Justice to a secondary role when it should actually have become one of the most important organs of the Organization.

The Charter contains potentialities in the field of security which have not yet been explored. Article 10 authorized the Assembly to discuss any questions or any matters within the scope of the Charter or relating to the powers and functions of any organs provided for in the Charter, as well as to make recommendations on any subject, except as provided in Article 12.

The broad terms in which the powers of the Assembly are defined leave no doubt as to its competence in matters of the peaceful settlement of disputes, even regardless of the precise definitions introduced by Articles 11 and 35 which expressly establish the competence of the General Assembly to consider general principles of cooperation in the maintenance of international peace and security, and to consider specifically any situation or dispute.

It is permissible, therefore, to affirm that in matters of the peaceful settlement of disputes the General Assembly has the same powers as the Security Council: in both cases, the power to make recommendations. The supremacy of the Security Council in this matter resides only in the provisions of Article 12 prohibiting the Assembly from making recommendations on a dispute or situation in respect of which the Council is exercising the functions attributed to it by the Charter. The power of the Assembly to bring any questions to the attention of the

Security Council, and conversely the right of the Council to refer any matter to the General Assembly for recommendation, and the fact that the Member States can submit any dispute or situation to the consideration of the General Assembly, with the single exception prescribed by Article 12, demonstrates dearly that the Charter vests in the Assembly an important function in matters of security, second only to that which is attributed to the Security Council. There is every advantage, therefore, in this function of the General Assembly being exercised fully, thus completing the action of the Council.

If it is true, on the one hand, that the Assembly is precluded from entering into the plan of action reserved for the Council, it is no less true, on the other hand that it represents even more than the Council the power of world public opinion, and that its recommendations carry an indubitable prestige. We must therefore mobilize this moral force which represents the will of fifty-five nations gathered together at this Assembly, with a view to making effective the aims of the Charter, of ensuring peace and security as primal conditions for the development of international collaboration.

The rules laid down for the General Assembly by the San Francisco Conference were even more judicious than those governing the Security Council. While the latter contain exaggerated concessions to the might of the great Powers, giving preponderance to power politics, those of the General Assembly represent on the whole the victory of persuasion over force. The Assembly is the essentially democratic organ of the United Nations; in its decisions the democratic role of the majority is respected. Its action is bound to increase in importance since persuasion and not force is the only element capable of organizing the world.

We must confess, therefore, that the United Nations has not succeeded in achieving the main objective for which it was created: ensuring security and peace. The results in this field are almost nihil. The international armed force, which should be the keystone of the system of security, has not yet been organized, nor has an agreement been reached between the Powers in regard to making disarmament a reality. A tragic insecurity weighs upon the world and is translated into manifold forms of fear, rendering collaboration impossible in other fields.

The treaty of mutual assistance recently concluded in Rio de Janeiro among the countries of the American continent represents the only optimistic note in the otherwise sterile effort to organize security. This treaty is based on the principles of the Charter which favor legitimate collective regional defense as a complement to general collective security.

However, the present crisis is not a crisis of the United Nations alone, but a worldwide crisis. It is a crisis of human conscience which finds itself divided and incapable of rising to a higher plane where its internal contradictions can be reconciled. It is also a crisis of freedom. History has shown that whenever man has succeeded in overcoming the contingencies of his former burdens, and achieving liberty, he has felt alone and lost, and his first reaction has always been one of dread of his conquest.

While progress in science and technique has opened new horizons for the freedom of man, the very vastness of the outlook instills a sense of isolation and fear into his heart. But fear is dispelled and superseded in time by man's effort to reconcile freedom with the security of individual. In this effort lies his salvation.

New York, September 16, 1947.

1948

1948

A series of developments in Europe accelerated the Cold War. BENELUX, the customs union formed by Belgium, Holland and Luxembourg, entered into force in January. Monetary reform in the part of Germany occupied by Western powers made possible the start of the economic recovery of the country and the establishment of the European Organization of Economic Cooperation assured the efficient management of the resources of the Marshall Plan. In July, the Soviet blockade of Berlin produced a determined response from the Western Allies. The former capital of Germany became the outpost of the Cold War. After taking power in Czechoslovakia, the Communist parties gained ground in Bulgaria. The arrest and conviction of cardinal Mindszenti in Hungary unleashed a strong anti-Communist reaction from the Catholic Church. Gandhi's death accelerated the process that would lead to India's independence. And the proclamation of the State of Israel, followed by the invasion of Palestine by Arab armies, marked the start of the protracted conflict in the Middle East.

However, this international panorama had little bearing on Brazil. The brief prosperity inherited from the war and the relative stability of the Dutra government generated an alluring sense of ease which contrasted with the tension prevailing in the areas where the interests of the great powers clashed. Some symptoms of the ideological confrontation, however, were felt in Brazilian political and institutional life: the board of the House of Representatives voided the mandates of the deputies elected by the Brazilian Communist party.

In the regional sphere, Brazilian diplomacy followed a line of support to American policies and acted accordingly at the Conference of Bogotá, which adopted the Charter of the Organization of American States (OAS).

Perhaps as a reaction to a certain feeling of exclusion, since international developments still ascribed a peripheral role to Brazil, the diplomacy of the country expressed itself along formulations of principle and of a moralistic character. An attitude of prudence prevailed. Brazilian delegations displayed low militant disposition, a few notches below the rhetorical level of the speeches. At the Third Session of the General Assembly, in Paris, Foreign Minister Raul Fernandes laid out the vision of a diplomacy that saw international reality ever more distant from the expectations of preeminence nurtured by Brazil on account of its participation in the war. He reiterated the adherence of Brazil to the purposes of the Organization and at the same time criticized the continuing divergence among the great powers. The Minister stated that Brazil would deal with the items of the agenda at a suitable time in view of the relevant reports, based on the traditional principles of "moderation, equity and justice". He did not shirk, however, from applauding the inclusion of the issue of human rights as deserving international recognition.

In the 1948 statement one observes for the first time the use of the question of human rights as an instrument of condemnation of the USSR. Raul Fernandes initiated a practice that would be followed in almost all statements until 1955, when the texts of Pacts negotiated in the I Committee came to be considered unacceptable by Brazil.

III Regular Session of the General Assembly of the United Nations 1948

Minister Raul Fernandes[*]

Mr. President,

The United Nations meets for the third time in a regular session of the General Assembly to discuss questions of peace, security, and the welfare of mankind.

On behalf of Brazil I greet the United Nations, and particularly France, which welcomed the Members so graciously. Brazilians are bound to France by the ties of an unbreakable friendship, as well as by a culture that borrowed the best features in the French spirit of universality.

The present Assembly is not and should not be a clearing house in which international disputes are settled by compensation, nor a tribunal competent to pronounce sentence, but rather a world forum in which each could plead his own cause before world opinion, and in which everyone should ceaselessly plead the cause of justice, freedom and equity, or a family council with the power to make recommendations.

Brazil assisted in the accomplishment of that task through its fidelity to the ideals and principles incorporated in the Charter of the United Nations. Brazil promptly accepted them, together with the responsibilities which derived from them, all the more easily because

[*] Raul Fernandes, Born in Valença, RJ, on October 24, 1877. Bachelor in Law from the University of São Paulo. Congressman in 1909. Brazil´s Delegate to the Paris Peace Conference, and to the Assembly of the League of Nations, from 1920 to 1925, being appointed by the League´s Counsil to join the International Court of Justice. Minister of State for External relations from 12/12/1946 to 2/1/1951 and from 8/26/1954 to 11/12/1955. † Rio de Janeiro, in January 1968.

it had always made them the golden rule of its conduct in international relations. History bore witness that even in the most difficult and dangerous times, Brazil had risen to the obligations imposed by such a rule. There is an active faith in law and justice, not merely an attitude of mind. The proof thereof lay in the fact that Brazil had joined the Powers fighting for liberty in the two great wars of the century and when the wars were over and the victorious Powers tried to organize an international community that could ensure peace and the welfare of mankind, Brazil had cooperated with them without reserve. In that spirit Brazil had worked with the League of Nations in earlier days and was now active as a Member of the United Nations.

On the threshold of the fourth year in the life of the Organization the Brazilian delegation pays tribute to the work done in the social field, which had been successfully achieved in the partial or full settlement of certain conflicts, as recorded in the Secretary-General's annual report. At the same time, however, the Brazilian delegation was bound to note that, founded as it was upon the principle of power and granting pre-eminence to certain States in return for their promise to guarantee security, the United Nations had so far failed to fulfill that obligation because of the continued disagreement among these privileged States.

In the opinion of the Brazilian delegation, the Assembly should do everything in its power to eradicate the causes of that disunity, or at least not to aggravate it by taking decisions which while unlikely to be implemented and might even cause the United Nations to go back instead of forward on the path of that universality at which is its objective.

Nevertheless, it is clear that the Assembly's power to compose the existing divergences is very limited, since the source of those divergences lay primarily in the impossibility of reaching peace with Germany. If his problem cannot be brought before the United Nations, must it remain under the exclusive purview of the great Powers, while those same Powers admit their inability to draft the clauses of an acceptable treaty?

The other belligerents see with concern that this particular peace treaty is being indefinitely postponed, to the great detriment of Europe, of the world and of Germany itself, and with harm to the rights they had derived from the common victory and to their interest in the re-establishment of normal relations with Germany.

Moreover, and above all, there exists in this situation a great threat to world peace, a neglect of solemn promises, a flagrant denial of the principles on which the new order instituted by the Charter of San Francisco was based. It is high time for the responsible Governments

to change their methods in order to overcome the obstacles, by having recourse to wise mediators and not to non-existent arbitrators.

I refrain from prejudging any of the questions on the agenda. The Brazilian delegation will decide on them in the light of the reports made by the Committees to whom those questions had been referred. I confine myself to saying that my delegation shall consider these problems in accordance with the traditions of my country – that is, with moderation, equanimity and justice – collaborating loyally to the full extent of its power to see to it that the Assembly remains faithful to its highest duties and to the hopes of mankind.

Finally, I wish to praise the inclusion of the fundamental human rights among those that deserve international protection. This is a progressive proposal that does honor to our generation. In his great and generous speech the other day Secretary of State Marshall told us of the calvary of individual liberties in certain regions of the world that calls itself civilized, and stressed that among the Members of the United Nations who sincerely strive to live in accordance with the Charter are in fact those who wish to uphold and protect the dignity and integrity of the individual.

May these wishes be realized!

Paris, September 21, 1948.

1949

1949

With the detonation of the first Soviet atomic bomb on July 14, the possibility of a nuclear holocaust exacerbated the ideological confrontation. In Western societies, the Communist threat acquired a dimension of terror. Due to the victory of the Chinese Communist forces under Mao Zedong, Communist parties achieved control over vast territorial areas of the word. Already in May the establishment of the two German States brought a new and significant configuration to the European geographic strategy, giving final shape to a cleavage that would last for over four decades. In opposition to the EEC, the COMECON emerged as the organizing element of cooperation in Eastern Europe under Soviet guardianship. The international panorama became more rigid. A new conflagration was believed to be imminent.

In contrast, developments in Brazil followed a rather slow course. Some signs of economic crisis, however, started to be noticed. The decline of world gold reserves unveiled the weaknesses of the economic policy and fostered inflation. In May, President Dutra visited the United States in search of credit and investment. On the political arena, the adversarial relationships that had marked the end of the *Estado Novo* resurfaced. The candidature of Getúlio Vargas to the presidency was launched by the PTB of the state of Paraíba, provoking reaction from UDN and the launching of Air Force general Eduardo Gomes as its candidate.

The hope of a partnership with the United States suffered a setback with the conclusion of the work of a bilateral bi-national commission, the

so-called Abbink Report, which excluded the possibility of cooperation at the governmental level, wished by the Brazilian government, and stressed above all the need for a balanced development of Brazilian resources through private initiative.

In his statement before the Fourth Session of the General Assembly that met in Flushing Meadows, at the provisional headquarters of the United Nations in New York, Ambassador Cyro de Freitas-Valle started by recapturing the issue of the veto and disclosed that Brazil had been the first of the fifty Member States to vote for the inclusion of that instrument in the Charter, due to its reliance on the five great powers. Ambassador Freitas-Valle kept to the line of the speech delivered at the previous Assembly by Minister Raul Fernandes. He mentioned the "purity" of Brazilian idealism and avoided discussing specific points of the international agenda, focusing instead on an analysis of the feasibility of the purposes of the United Nations, and on criticism of the excessive growth of the Organization, to which responsibilities beyond the material means for their achievement had been assigned. The analysis of the reasons that had led to the adoption of antagonistic collective security policies by the great powers is worth noticing. The comparison between the United Nations and the League of Nations would certainly have seemed bold. Between the lines of the assertion by the representative of Brazil that one of the main causes of the collapse of the League of Nations had been the "painful obligation" to enforce the Treaty of Versailles one can perceive an issue that would become persistent in the Brazilian rhetoric of reform of the Charter.

Another point then expressed by Freitas-Valle would also become a compulsory element of Brazilian statements at the United Nations. In arguing for the need of "a technical assistance program for economic development", Brazilian diplomacy was already laying out in 1949 the basis for its multilateral action in the economic and commercial field.

The 1949 speech is also valuable on account of the professionalism with which it dealt with the organizational questions of the United Nations and for the quality of its analyses. Freitas-Valle approached for the first time the question of the emergence of colonial peoples toward independency, which he describes as "a great political revolution". In a cautious, yet firm manner, he condemned certain practices on the part of colonial powers as capable of distorting the process of autonomous political expression of the territories under United Nations trusteeship.

IV Regular Session of the General Assembly of the United Nations
1949

Ambassador Cyro de Freitas-Valle [*]

Mr. President,

Brazil's participation in the San Francisco Conference was marked by a spirit of confident hope, so much so that, despite its earlier opposition to the institution of the veto, Brazil was the first of the fifty States represented there to vote for the inclusion of the veto in the Charter, a fact which shows that Brazil relied on the five great Powers to use the veto wisely.

In London, the whole-hearted cooperation of the representatives of Brazil was directed towards the task of the establishment of the United Nations by the implementation of the Charter. Brazil gave earnest support to the decision to locate the headquarters of the Organization in New York. Its election to the initial membership of the Security Council was secured by an almost unanimous vote; one of its nationals had twice been President of the General Assembly and it was currently a member of the Economic and Social Council. By a generous decision of the General Assembly, I was appointed as one of the Vice-Presidents of the fourth session. Why, then, should Brazil have cause to complain about the United Nations?

What impels Brazil to criticize the United Nations is the purity of its idealism. Its total lack of prejudice, however, is undeniable evidence of

[*] **Cyro de Freitas-Valle**, Born in São Paulo, SP, August 16, 1896. Bachelor In Legal and Social Sciences, from the São Paulo Faculty of Law. Second Secretary in 1918. First Class Plenipotentiary Minister, by merit, in 1938. Acting Minister of State for External Relations from 5/4/1949 to 6/20/1949. † Rio de Janeiro, November 7, 1969.

the faith which it has in the future of the Organization. The time has come to return to the spirit of San Francisco.

The League of Nations was a mere instrument of conciliation. The United Nations constituted a great political league for the preservation of tranquility and the defense of peace – the peace which God had promised to men endowed with that good will which in current times many appear to lack. It is just as useless to try to find who to blame for that as it is necessary to recognize the fact.

It could be asked whether it was the fault of the United Nations that it had not made greater progress. I, for my part, do not believe so, for in my opinion circumstances were cruel for the protagonists of peace. I cannot deny, however, that, as units of the Organization, few Members of the United Nations showed the detachment from interests and vanities that is necessary if people are to associate without prejudice. Each State, or, more precisely, each Government, gave more thought to its own subsistence than to the progress of the United Nations. Even if it were the sad truth that certain Members were using the United Nations instead of serving it, it could yet be argued, without entering into too many subtleties, that abuse of the services of an institution was a sign of belief in its worth.

Mr. Trvgve Lie, the Secretary-General of the United Nations, has on occasions frankly explained the slow progress of the United Nations, placing the entire blame on the shoulders of those who fail to cooperate. Would it not perhaps be fairer to speak of lack of mutual confidence than to seek to apportion the blame?

The United Nations could hot have proclaimed that peoples were uniting with the determination "to save succeeding generations from the scourge of war" if such determination had not in fact existed. It was that thought that prompted me to recall the spirit which reigned in San Francisco, so much broader than that which had been manifested at the subsequent meetings in London. Every Member should have the courage to admit that fact and to return to that earlier spirit if true progress is to be made.

It is evident that in so doing the Organization should not allow itself to be discouraged by those who seek to criticize the United Nations for the delay in fulfilling the aims for which it was created. What sacrifice of principles would it have meant for some Members, in the cases where the veto was invoked, to think in good faith of a system of equilibrium and guarantees?

Exactly three years and eight months have passed since the General Assembly of the United Nations first met in London, still under

the impulse of the spirit of San Francisco, for its initial attempt to set up the framework of the structure the outlines of which had been traced in San Francisco. Everyone was living in anxious expectation of arriving at the goal that was set there. Could not the Organization, from the very first, have been fully capable of doing what was expected of it when confronted with the problems resulting from the war, problems which the victors had unfortunately been unable to solve?

Furthermore, the formation of the United Nations has taken place at the height of one of the periodical world crises, and it was exactly during such periods that Governments and peoples accelerated their evolution and molded themselves to circumstances, while idealism declined. One of the causes of the lack of perfect adjustment within the Organization lay in just such an evolution in attitudes and in international conduct since the time of the San Francisco Conference. While it is an accepted fact that international policy should not be made to undergo violent changes, it is no less true that it is extremely difficult to maintain steadiness in a structure the foundations of which had been laid under the auspices of a group of countries which, from the very inception of the work, had lost the power of mutual understanding and had begun to tread antagonistic paths in the field of collective security. The unhappy mandate-obligation of enforcing the Treaty of Versailles was one of the main causes of the downfall of the League of Nations.

What is wrong, therefore, is not the United Nations but the world itself. Proof of that could be found in the fact that while the Security Council conducted its ceaseless round of meetings, the International Court of Justice did little, not through the fault of its members but because no cases were submitted to it, since people apparently no longer believe in the domination of the spirit over force. Nations are, in fact, afraid of force itself, as is evident from the fact that the Security Council was unable to exercise its high functions for the preservation of peace. The world might well bewail the conflicts within the Security Council and the lack of appeals to the International Court of Justice.

One way in which an attempt was made to cover current deficiencies, not only in the system itself but arising from unfortunate circumstances, had been to lay undue emphasis on activities which can always be explained but not often justified. The aim, apparently, is to solve concrete problems, often of a material nature, while losing sight of fundamental ones; to heal the body, while forgetting the soul. The body of the Organization is growing at an alarming rate, with an uncontrolled development of organs and functions. Practically every international

problem which arises is handed outright to the United Nations or to one of its agencies, without any attempt being made to find out beforehand whether the Organization is or is not equipped to face the question and solve it. The result has been the almost automatic creation of agencies and commissions to solve the problems which are daily submitted to the United Nations as new ones. The problem is not solved but an international apparatus is forthwith created for its detailed study, which tends only to make it more complicated and its solution more difficult.

The number of meetings called in consequence of the ever-growing tendency to establish new international machinery is incredible: during 1947, 1948 and 1949, the various organs of the United Nations held respectively 3,504, 4,092 and 3,683 meetings, and 3,850 were already planned for the following year.

Brazil considers that such a procedure is not only misguided but detrimental to the prestige of the United Nations. I am not here to make charges, still less to denounce that which should be known to all. I realize, however, that some Members may be unaware of the circumstances, since not all have been able to attend the countless meetings, while the Members which have attended often failed to be adequately represented.

The purpose of all Members – for in San Francisco and in London the thoughts of all was centered on the United Nations of the future – was to assemble the many international agencies together under what might be called the new Super-State, not to complicate, but to simplify international life. The results in that field can perhaps be said to show that the procedure has been erratic. It is well to admit that fact and try to remedy the situation.

On the other hand, it should be recognized that many of the efforts in question have not been expended in vain. In the economic field, for instance, the organization of a broad program of technical assistance for economic development – the pattern for which was based on President Truman's high-minded proposal – constitutes an important and constructive task. Only with the organization of the plans for large-scale technical assistance will the Economic and Social Council come of age.

In the field of social progress, many important achievements are on record. It is satisfying to recall resolution 217 (III) of the General Assembly, adopted on 10 December 1948, proclaiming the Universal Declaration of Human Rights, followed by a covenant on human rights and measures of implementation, and by the codification of international law. The Convention on the Prevention and Punishment of the Crime of Genocide, approved by the Assembly in its resolution 260 (III) of 9 December 1948,

also represents a step towards the maturity of the juridical conscience and the settlement of the question of international penal responsibility.

Although it has not yet had any direct part in the activities of the Trusteeship Council, the Brazilian delegation has been observing them with great interest and attention. The emergence of colonial peoples to independent life undoubtedly gave rise to a major political revolution. It is to be hoped that the process will be expedited and facilitated by the activities of the Trusteeship Council, which bears an immense responsibility in its function of representing the international consciousness of peoples who are as yet deprived of autonomous political expression. It is not without some concern that the Brazilian Government views a certain tendency on the part of metropolitan Powers governing non-autonomous territories to make use of administrative unions, whether for the purpose of reducing the area of international supervision or whether – which is far more alarming – as a preparatory stage for political absorption. It is, fortunately, the duty of the Trusteeship Council to be on the alert and to curtail such tendencies.

The administrative organization of the United Nations, although handicapped by the lack of a better geographical distribution in the Secretariat, is already marked by the outstanding quality of its services and by the regularity with which its growing and difficult tasks are being fulfilled. The completion, in 1950, of construction work on the new headquarters will free the Organization from the inconveniences and loss of time incurred by the holding of meetings outside New York, with the consequent impairment of efficiency and the heavy burden on the budget.

In conclusion, I express the sincere hope that the current session will make speedy progress and that the inspiration of political instinct and greatness of soul will result in the solution of some of the problems which were causing so much distress, in particular that of the former Italian colonies, the fate of which depends on the wisdom and fairness of the decisions the United Nations will make.

Reaffirming the confidence of Brazil in the United Nations, I add that the Brazilian delegation simply wished to point out some of the shortcomings of the Organization, since it is Brazil's desire to see them corrected for the betterment of international life and the welfare of the human race.

New York, September 20, 1949.

1950

1950

The Cold War was institutionalized with the approval by President Truman of the memorandum of the National Security Council known as "NSC 68". When the American government set its goals and programs on national security it dismissed the possibility of peaceful coexistence with the USRR, which was believed to intend to dominate the world by Cold War methods. The singular importance of this document for the course of international relations stems from that antagonistic perception and from the imputation to the USSR of the objective of destroying not only the United States, but all civilization. In order to stand up to a threat so clearly defined the U.S. felt compelled to mobilize, marshal and organize the whole world's resources. The presidential doctrine stipulated that a defeat of democratic institutions anywhere in the world would be considered a defeat everywhere in the world. In this way the political and institutional foundations for the globalization of American external action were set.

International events soon put the American policy to the test with the invasion of South Korea. It became imperative to respond to what was perceived as a deliberate act of aggression under Soviet inspiration. The intervention in the Korean peninsula marked a new stage in the confrontation with the USSR by making clear the determination of the United States to employ military power in areas far away from its territorial and European borders.

In this confrontational context, the diplomacy of the United States proved capable of mobilizing the United Nations in the defense

of its security tenets. A parliamentary maneuver made possible by the fortuitous absence of the Soviet Union in the Security Council allowed the U.S. to legitimize intervention in South Korea through the Resolution *Uniting for Peace* in the General Assembly, an organ where the Americans held the majority of votes thanks to Western European and Latin American alignment.

Brazilian external policy soon felt the consequences of the Korean conflict. The government resisted pressures to dispatch troops to the peninsula, but in exchange felt compelled to take active part in the parliamentary confrontation in Flushing Meadows.

Once again charged with the task of delivering the Brazilian statement in the general debate, Ambassador Cyro de Freitas-Valle used a decidedly anti-Soviet rhetoric at the Fifth Session of the General Assembly. His speech was a statement of position. While the USSR is mentioned by name as having stirred up the condemnation of the world on account of its attitude, the U.S. was praised for its determination to shoulder the onus of the fighting in Korea. The references to the theme of human rights and fundamental freedoms also fall into the same anti-Soviet perspective.

Notwithstanding the alignment expressed in the combative formulations of the speech, Freitas-Valle did not refrain from yielding to utopian rhetoric. He described peace as a question of honesty and compared the conciliation of divergences among United Nations Member States to the harmonious fusion of diverse and unchangeable notes in a melody. He also proposed a complete overhaul of the Security Council.

Delivered on the eve of the election which would bring Getúlio Vargas to the constitutional presidency of Brazil, on the basis of a nationalistic program, Freitas-Valle's speech gives particular relevance to the question of development. He ascribed the problems of the Organization to the underdevelopment of a large part of the Member States and requested more comprehensive and positive measures to ensure what was known as "economic and financial assistance" or "mutual assistance" in those initial stages of multilateralism.

V Regular Session of the General Assembly of the United Nations
1950

Ambassador Cyro de Freitas-Valle [*]

Mr. President,

Because I am the first representative to have the honor to address the fifth session of the General Assembly, I beg to pay tribute to the memory of one of the founders of the United Nations, Field-Marshal Jan Christian Smuts, who passed away last week. In doing so, I feel sure that I speak the thoughts of all of us. Marshal Smuts was a brave soldier and it was because he fought many wars that he became one of the most enthusiastic leaders of the movement for peace in the world.

The General Assembly of the United Nations is not a stage. However, as we gather here, the eyes of the world turn to us as though we were on a stage; and this is due to the fact that all believe this Organization to be able to help the world to live. It is still the hope for peace that unites us, as figures in a drama, to the vast attentive audience.

Such hope has come to take the place which belonged, and should still belong, to confidence. There was confidence at San Francisco when, on stating the vote of Brazil for the rule of veto, it was possible for me to say:

[*] **Cyro de Freitas-Valle**, Born in São Paulo, SP, August 16, 1896. Bachelor In Legal and Social Sciences, from the São Paulo Faculty of Law. Second Secretary in 1918. First Class Plenipotentiary Minister, by merit, in 1938. Acting Minister of State for External Relations from 5/4/1949 to 6/20/1949. † Rio de Janeiro, November 7, 1969.

> Such constructive step is taken as a demonstration of our belief in the good faith with which the four sponsoring Powers seek the granting of the right of veto as an inescapable necessity to the maintenance of peace and as a token of our confidence that they will make a prudent use of said right.

None of us would today reiterate those words, for the plain truth is – and we all know it – that the right of veto has been abused.

If just for the sake of demonstration we wished to substantiate that assertion by the enunciation of a single fact, we should hardly need to do more than to ask why the noble Italian nation has not yet been allowed to sit among us, in keeping with what was solemnly stipulated at the Paris Conference. Is it not true that the new Italy was given the assurance that it would come to work with us, on an equal footing, once the peace treaty it signed with its former enemies was ratified? Have we not seen, and are we not still seeing, as a consequence of the veto, fundamental decisions affecting Italy being taken without its full participation therein?

On the other hand, as was said from this very rostrum one year ago, whoever purposefully misuses this forum shows thereby an implicit belief in it. It is evident that the Soviet Union would not be arousing the ever growing condemnation by the whole world of its hitherto negative attitude, were it not inspired by some constructive aim. May the Soviet Union some day decide to set forth the motives behind this unwarranted attitude, thus clearing the road for an understanding with those who put trust in its loyalty when it joined us as a coworker for peace. Is it not expressed in Article 1 of our Charter that one of the purposes of the United Nations is to be a "centre for harmonizing the actions of nations"? A man has grounds to suspect he is wrong when he is sure he is right at a moment when everybody else thinks otherwise.

The events in South Korea, arising from the aggression unleashed from the north, motivated immediate and effective action by the Security Council. But they demonstrated also – and there no longer seems to be any doubt on this point – that it is necessary better to equip our Organization, the establishment of an international force and the creation of a system for the prompt mobilization of all common resources being kept in mind. The Member States did not fail to show solidarity with the United Nations. But almost the entire burden of the fighting has fallen upon one of them, one whose action in the cause of democracy commands the respect of all free men. Some others are joining it in this effort. Many others have

not yet been able to transform their good intentions into actual material assistance.

This deficiency on the part of many – a deficiency arising through no fault of theirs – stems partly from economic underdevelopment. The generous idea of helping those regions to help themselves so that for the benefit of all they may produce and consume more, can never be deemed overly ambitious. This problem is one of such magnitude that, although the Organization has already given attention to it, more and more comprehensive and positive measures are still needed.

Moreover, the fact can never be too often emphasized that, owing to the lack of an adequate program for economic and financial assistance, many Member States are not yet in a position to render to the United Nations all the cooperation they would like to give. The problem which confronts those States is the simple one of developing their physical strength in order that they may offer it for the defense of the Organization.

Mutual assistance among the Member States is the corner-stone of our grand alliance. In the introduction to the excellent report in which he demonstrates how much has been achieved by the United Nations during his tenure of office, Mr. Trygve Lie directs our attention to Article 103 of the Charter, which rightly determines that the obligations assumed by Member States in the Charter shall prevail over any other international obligations.

On the other hand, *horresco referens,* we have not as yet conceived a practical device for compelling States to respect or to restore, when by any means violated, human rights and fundamental freedoms for all without distinction as to race, sex, language or religion. However, so dominant was the desire in San Francisco to ensure definitely such rights and freedoms that the promise is six times enunciated in the Charter. And those who, like my very dear friend, Sir Gladwyn Jebb, happened to sit in the Coordination Committee at San Francisco, will recall that the same promise appeared twice as often in the drafts voted upon by the twelve committees.

It is quite impossible to go on without referring to the proceedings of the Security Council. When normally carried out, its activities are an indication that everything else in the Organization is functioning normally. If, on the contrary, this main spring gets jammed, everything else – including the specialized agencies – will be headed for trouble. The least of those predicaments – but still a serious one – is a resulting atmosphere of distrust, and sometimes of acrimony, among people who should work with a mind always open to unlimited cooperation.

It has been suggested that the way to deal with the situation would he to enlarge the functions and strengthen the powers of the General Assembly, to the detriment of the Security Council. But the Council is the organ primarily responsible for the maintenance of peace, and it would be impossible to curtail its power without incurring risk. What is truly indispensable is to achieve a complete change in the state of mind which has prevailed in the Security Council. We should think of what the Council should and can do and should not concentrate merely on technicalities of its rules of procedure, which are intended to guarantee the hones search for truth but which have nonetheless been used to block the functioning of the United Nations. The men who sit in the Council and the governments they represent ought to prove themselves equal to their mission and so restore universal confidence in the Security Council. The world needs that confidence.

This severe but constructive criticism does not apply to the General Assembly or its Interim Committee, generally known as the "Little Assembly", over which Brazil had the gratifying honor to preside this year. But even in those organs the proceedings are often inadequate and incomplete, and this can be traced back to the atmosphere to which we have referred.

The Brazilian Government awaits with the utmost interest the report on the measures to be taken towards avoiding the proliferation of our agencies and meetings, the number of which, as was ascertained during the fourth session, have been increasing at an alarming rate.

This fifth session of the General Assembly, proclaimed by the President of the fourth session, General Romulo, as the most historic of all, is, in the words of one of my colleagues, pregnant with destiny. Let us be worthy of this opportunity, which faces us with a dilemma: either to keep harrowing ourselves, thus destroying the hope still placed in the United Nations, or else, with our eyes set on the Creator and our hearts raised in a resolute effort to spare mankind the scourge of a new war, to ascend again to a level which we should never have abandoned.

Peace is a matter of honesty. What was said over twenty years ago holds true today more than ever. Let us be honest with one another. Let each of us be honest with his fellow nationals who, without exception, hate war and detest violence. Let us be honest with the men and women of the generations to come, whose only inheritance from us will be intricate problems, whereas it is our clear duty, in recognition of the fight for democracy put up by their fathers, to pave their way to a destiny of happiness.

We all speak earnestly here of peace and disarmament, human rights and education, security and freedom. But we cling – why not avow it? – to rigid points of view, and that is why we do not reach the understanding which is the very reason for our association. Musical notes are likewise diverse and immutable, but from their harmonious fusing arise the most inspired melodies. Why not boldly seek to reduce our differences and reconcile our divergent opinions?

The fifth session of the General Assembly of the United Nations is confronted with a most dramatic choice: light or darkness.

New York, September 19, 1950.

1951

1951

Upon taking up his constitutional mandate, President Getúlio Vargas found Brazil considerably changed. The fledgling process of industrialization and urbanization had rendered more complex and diverse the relations of internal forces. Questions linked to development started to gain preponderance in the social and political agenda. In consonance with his program, Vargas adopted the ideas of economic nationalism. His policies were perceived as favoring the primacy of the State in the economy and hostile to foreign capital. The country was split in the debate about the creation of Petrobrás. Support to nationalistic policies by the Communist party aroused concern among the armed forces, which continued to identify the guarantee of internal and external security with the alliance with the United States. At the start of 1951 the U.S. began to organize its network of military agreements in the hemisphere. Negotiations initiated at that time would result in the signature of the Military Agreement between Brazil and the United States.

The year of 1951 was relatively calm in the international sphere. Churchill came back to power in London. Europe took a decisive step toward integration with the establishment of the Steel and Coal Community. Worried about Japan's security, the United States pledged to work for the recovery of that country. Developments in several areas would later evolve into a context of ideological confrontation:

Mossadegh's Iran nationalized oil and China imposed its dominance over Tibet.

The Brazilian statement at the Sixth Session of the General Assembly, delivered by Ambassador Mario de Pimentel Brandão, kept mainly to generic formulations. The uncertain internal panorama did not favor bold definitions on the external field. However, expressions of support to United Nations interventions in Korea and Greece were not absent. The rhetoric sounds grandiloquent, perhaps as an indirect reflection of the lack of participation by Brazil in the conduct of the main questions that put international stability at risk. The fact that the Assembly took place in Paris led the Brazilian representative to laud the French capital and in an impressive array of associations to renew Brazil's loyalty to Christianity, the rule of law and Mediterranean culture. In this speech Ambassador Pimentel Brandão made an expressive profession of faith in the "Latin world" and regretted the absence of certain great Latin nations until then excluded from the United Nations, in an allusion to Spain and Italy.

For the first time in statements by the Heads of Brazilian delegations to the General Assembly the ambivalences of the positions of Brazil on decolonization became evident. On the one hand, Ambassador Pimentel Brandão affirmed Brazil's sympathy for the legitimate national aspirations of peoples and recalled passages of the Message to Congress in which President Vargas declared colonialism intolerable in international life. On the other hand, however, he expressed doubts about the practical implementation of the process, recommending prudence and calm to countries in search of independence, in order to avoid damage to international structures. The ambivalence of the Brazilian discourse in matters of decolonization derived from a process of policy formulation mainly guided by the ideological confrontation. The distinctive historical, cultural and strategic interests of Brazil in the Western Atlantic region had little weight.

VI Regular Session of the General Assembly of the United Nations
1951

Ambassador Mário de Pimentel Brandão [*]

Mr. President,

From this platform, which I have the honor to be the first to mount today, I salute Paris in all its splendor. *Flutuat nec mergitur*. Our faith and our confidence in peace, freedom and right shall likewise never founder.

Like the poet of old, in admiration and gratitude I cry: "Oh holy light, golden eye of day!" And in the glow of the hallowed radiance that greeted the birth of Lutetia two thousand years ago, let me render to France, welcoming us with all her matchless, stately charm, a tribute of solemn and heartfelt homage. In the name of all those peoples whose language echoes, even from afar, the tongue of Latium, I renew the oath of eternal fealty to Christianity, to the rule of law and to the culture of the Mediterranean Sea.

The tradition of the philosophy of law, and of the basic principles which issue from that great original fount was proclaimed and adopted by the peoples and was embodied by them in the Charter of the United Nations at San Francisco. It is there that we shall find a constant source of inspiration for our labors in the Sixth Session of the United Nations General Assembly, labors bearing on matters of the highest import to international peace and security.

[*] **Mario de Pimentel Brandão**, Born in Rio de Janeiro, RJ, October 9, 1889. Bachelor in Legal and Social Sciences from the Faculty of Rio de Janeiro. Secretariat Attaché, 1912. Minister Plenipotentiary, First Class, by merit, 1934. Acting Minister of State for External Relations from 11/06/1952 to 11/22/1952 and from 6/19/1953 to 7/1/1953. † Rio de Janeiro, in 1956.

The diversity of the topics which the General Assembly must study during its Sixth Session brings out in clear relief the importance of the work of this session. No matter what the subject of debate, whether it be the vital problem of the maintenance of world peace and security, or the details of economic and technical cooperation between Member States, the Assembly once again emerges as the quintessential body of the United Nations. Containing within itself the most varied trends of thought, analyzing and discussing the whole gamut of the problems of international society, it assumes the character of a universal forum in which all the Members of the Organization are represented with equal rights.

The existence of the Security Council, the body specifically charged with the handling of issues relating to the ultimate purposes of the United Nations, does not in any way detract from the supreme authority of the Assembly. It is the Assembly that by reason of its structure is responsible for the effective working of the Organization and the realization of its aims. And the many obstacles which the Council has encountered in the attempt to achieve its high objectives fully justify the adoption by the Assembly at its last session of resolution 377 (V) which seeks to ensure that the great Powers shall work together in a spirit of mutual understanding and thus to make good any deficiency that might result from failure on the Council's part.

In this connection, may I recall that the Fourth Meeting of Consultation of Ministers of Foreign Affairs, held in Washington at the beginning of this year, showed its complete agreement with the spirit of that resolution, entitled "Uniting for Peace", by recommending to all members of the Organization of American States that they should adapt their resources and their defense systems to the present day requirements of international security without, however, prejudicing the legitimate needs of their own defense.

We have here in a concrete example of effective participation by a regional body in the endeavors of the United Nations to round off its task of international peace. There is no need for me to dwell on the importance of the activity of such bodies within the system instituted by the Charter. Regional organizations have a steadily increasing value as agents for the propagation of the United Nations and the development and application of its principles. The benefits that accrue there from are undeniable once it is conceded that neither by their existence nor by their activities shall they ever detract from the universality upon which the hope of final victory for the United Nations rests.

If it is successfully to cope with the present crisis in international relations, our Organization must strive with a vigor renewed each day to expand its sphere of action and to increase its territorial domain by admitting all those nations which desire loyally to collaborate in its noble task. It is regrettable that we still cannot hear within these walls the voice of certain nations, particularly of certain great Latin peoples, whose assistance could be valuable indeed, not only for the United Nations but also for the large numbers of mankind dwelling within their frontiers.

Recently, Brazil convened the first Congress of the Latin Union. This is a movement for the progressive reinforcement of the peaceful and constructive work of the United Nations by interlinking twenty-six European and American nations of Latin origin. The movement, the first Congress of which was held at Rio de Janeiro, reached conclusions that represent a reaffirmation of the principles on which western civilization is based.

In view of its competence and of its composition, universality is the vital condition for the success of the United Nations. We shall gain but little profit from the continual proliferation of specialized agencies and *ad hoc* committees, unless our labors are directed by a spirit of loyal, of unreserved cooperation on the part of all peoples of the world. As Mr. Trygve Lie, Secretary-General of the United Nations has so truly stated, neither walls nor curtains will prevent the peoples from belonging to the United Nations, nor the United Nations from belonging to the peoples.

It is now almost a truism to say that the colossal difficulties with which certain communities are at grips are political and not technical in character. For the Brazilian delegation it is a sad thought that the human intellect, which has applied itself so successfully to the unraveling of the most arduous mysteries of science, is often baffled and frustrated in achieving practical results, through the lack of understanding of certain governments actuated by ideological fanaticism or a mistaken attitude of firmness. The growing interdependence, indeed the virtual coincidence, of the internal and external policies of States has had the truly paradoxical result of threatening the cause of world peace. An age which claims to be enlightened is faced with the grim reality of multitudes enslaved in a somber moral and spiritual thralldom, a fertile soil for the propagation of doctrines both anti-democratic and contrary to the interests of peace.

The problems arising out of the nationalistic claims of certain groups are delicate and difficult to solve. While Brazil, in accordance with its political traditions, feels deep sympathy with the legitimate national

aspirations of the peoples, it has Nonetheless always been in the vanguard of those who advocate peaceful and conciliatory solutions for all the conflicts of international life. President Vargas, in his message to the Brazilian Congress this year, stated that all colonialism must be regarded as an undesirable survival in international life today. At the present juncture it is of pressing importance that peoples aspiring to total freedom should endeavor to act with the prudence and calmness demanded by the need for safeguarding the security structure that has been so slowly and painfully built up and that affords the best guarantee of the realization of their desires.

It is therefore vital to seek compensatory agreements through friendly negotiation. To bring a dispute before the United Nations without having first exhausted all other means of peaceful solution is to run counter to the spirit of the Charter and to do it considerable harm. At a moment when the problems which weigh upon the world are submitted to the United Nations no reaffirmation can be too strong of the vital need for mutual confidence and for faith in our Organization and in its aims and objects.

It is imperative that the resolutions and recommendations, both of the General Assembly and of the Security Council, should be respected by all States Members and that the decisions of the International Court of Justice should be upheld by all governments. Brazil feels herself particularly well qualified to support such projects in that the spirit of conciliation and peace, so often attested by her historical development and by her conduct within the community of nations, is part and parcel of her legal tradition and of the character of her people. For the true democratic spirit is founded upon a just reconciliation of group and individual interests.

In advocating, under the authority of the Charter peaceful solutions for the problems which threaten the world, the Brazilian delegation has no intention of restricting the freedom, detracting from the rights, or ignoring the aspirations of certain peoples to the advantage of others whether large or small. It seeks only to establish an equitable balance of interests by giving a measure of satisfaction to either party and by guaranteeing to all the minimum conditions of life which will permit them to enjoy the rights they have thus acquired.

Looking back on the work undertaken by the United Nations since its creation I feel we can say that it has already many positive achievements to its credit. As an example of those achievements, it is with great satisfaction that the Brazilian delegation, at the opening of the

General Assembly's Sixth Session, can point to the felicitous intervention of the United Nations in Greece and Korea.

Those who cast doubt upon the Organization's activity up to the present time tend to an over-simplification of the issues and an unduly superficial analysis of the principles on which the United Nations is based. It is truly encouraging to review all that has been planned and achieved during these six years of work. We have established standards and techniques for the economic and social advancement of man as a pre-eminently political being. We have reaffirmed the fundamental rights of man enunciated in the convention which we shall discuss and which is one of the most ambitious attempts at legal and social creative action ever undertaken by an international organization. The United Nations is an institution created by man for man, and this fundamental feature expresses at once its whole weakness and its whole strength. Its vicissitudes, its setbacks and hesitations are the vicissitudes, setbacks and hesitations of modern man, at a loss before a multitude of problems, war-weary and yet ever filled with the hope of peace notwithstanding the darker aspects of contemporary existence. The fidelity with which the United Nations reflects and interprets the situation in which man thus finds himself today is above all eloquent proof that it is a vital instrument of politico-social progress and development.

The experience of joint action in Korea, on bases which I would have been thought highly improbable arid even impossible a few years ago, has demonstrated the degree to which the peoples of the world are imbued today with the ideals of the Charter. Realization of the fact that peace is indivisible and that aggression against any State is not only a violation of world peace but an act directed against the community of free nations, has led to the establishment of certain standards of international conduct and the crystallization of certain principles which will complete the collective security system of the Charter in so far as they reflect the political and social systems of the contemporary world. It is for this reason that the Brazilian delegation is particularly interested in the careful analysis which we shall make of the report by the Collective Measures Committee. The preliminary work carried out by fourteen delegations, meeting throughout seven months at United Nations Headquarters, provides us with a basis for discussion of the principles of collective security. As Brazil has already stated in that Committee, the establishment of a system of collective security is not the final goal of the United Nations. On the contrary, we regard it as a contingency arising out of the continuing precariousness

of peaceful international relations, and as an admission that new acts of aggression are still possible.

The results thus far achieved are a step on the road to peace; but they do not signify that we have achieved the final objectives we have set before ourselves. We are striving to render collective security as universal as possible. But how much further on our way should we be if a glimpse were vouchsafed to us now of an age in which we could regard a genuinely universal system of collective security as something completely incompatible with a stage of political development in which the principles we are formulating today will be seen to be the inadequate and obsolete conceptions of men still obsessed by the fear of aggression and war.

We live in an age of profound political and social change; our task is not to oppose or to retard it. Our Organization, in the form in which we have planned it, has received from all nations the task of imparting substance and form and shape to these new aspirations, of creating a link between the achievements of the past and the promises of the future, between thought and action, between the ideas which inspire us and the aims which, in the spirit of the Charter we have set before ourselves, and with the realization of the responsibilities incumbent upon us at a specially critical stage in the history of mankind.

I endorse the hope expressed by one of the outstanding leaders of Brazilian thought, who is a member of our delegation, that the storms of the soul may take hold of this Assembly.

Paris, November 6, 1951.

1952

1952

Starting in 1952 there was a significant reversal in Brazilian pronouncements. Alignment with the United States seemed not to have brought the expected results. Formulations in favor of the implementation of more effective multilateral mechanisms or the promotion of economic development, as opposed to bilateral assistance, that marked the previous period, started to appear in Brazilian statements at the United Nations. Without abandoning American assistance, Brazilian diplomacy began to introduce qualifications to it.

The external panorama did not undergo fundamental changes, except for the victory in Egypt of the anti-monarchic and nationalistic coup led by Colonel Gamal Abdul Nasser, which would later on introduce critical elements in the dynamic of the Middle Eastern conflict.

Reflecting the nature of the concerns present in the Brazilian domestic panorama, Foreign Minister João Neves da Fontoura expressed at the 1952 General Assembly the importance ascribed by Brazil to the economic cleavages that characterized the world. Without abandoning the confrontational rhetoric, the Brazilian statement attempted at the 1952 Assembly the initial steps of the economic diplomacy that would take hold in the Kubitschek period. João Neves' diagnosis was simple and accurate: a handful of States had industrialized fully their economies. Meanwhile, the world was being divided into a prosperous community of rich countries and a vast international proletariat. Following the logic of an evaluation that would have important consequences for the

evolution of the external policy of Brazil, the Minister went on to say that a minority was becoming richer and the majority was increasingly poor. Such formulations, undoubtedly bold for a Latin American country in the year of 1952, during the Cold War, contain the elements of reasoning that would lead Brazil to veer gradually away from the dynamics of the East-West ideological confrontation to become one of the main agents of multilateral North-South economic diplomacy.

The shift in emphasis was warranted by the internal situation. Brazil was undergoing serious economic difficulties with the intensification of the inflationary process and the increase in the cost of living. Plans for reduction in the balance of payments and containment of inflation did not find support in Washington. With the change in the American government, Eisenhower's administration discontinued the practices started by Roosevelt and followed by Truman which favored special measures of international economic assistance. In accordance with Republican orthodoxy, the role of agent in international cooperation was incumbent on private enterprise. The creation of adequate conditions, through liberalization and opening of their economies, was the task of governments interested in American investment.

In Brazil, however, the prevailing view was that the State had an essential role to play in the promotion of development. Legislation restricting the remittance of profits and the repatriation of capital was enacted in 1952, as well as the establishment of the National Bank for Economic Development (BNDE) and the Brazilian Coffee Institute. The Brazil-United States dialogue would meet increasing hardship, including encouragement of internal entrepreneurial sectors linked to American interests, which would add elements of tension to an already troubled political panorama.

VII Regular Session of the General Assembly of the United Nations 1952

Minister João Neves da Fontoura [*]

Mr. President,

Before expressing my country's views in the general debate, I wish, on behalf of the Government of Brazil, to pay sincere tribute to Mr. Trigve Lie, who yesterday informed us of his intention to resign from his post as Secretary-General of the United Nations. While I appreciate the reasons and considerations which prompted Mr. Lie to take that decision, with the sole intention of facilitating the peacemaking work of the United Nations, I cannot share his views and the venture to express the hope that his decision is not irrevocable.

Peace continues to be the basic objective of the United Nations. The Organization was certainly not established to perpetuate the world of 1945, with its fixed groups of victors and vanquished nor to drag out interminably the settlement of the hates, destruction rivalries of the last war. No more that any other political organization can the United Nations remain static. As a creation of men, it must follow the course of events, endeavoring at all times to devise methods which must always vary, calculated to provide better conditions of life for the international community.

[*] **João Neves da Fontoura**, Born in Cachoeira, RS, November 16, 1887. Bachelor in Law from the Faculty of Law of Porto Alegre. Appointed Ambasssador 5/19/1943. Minister of State for External Relations, from 1/31/1946 to 7/24/1946 and from 2/1/1951 to 6/19/1953. † Rio de Janeiro, March 31, 1963.

This Assembly is a manifestation of the unqualified recognition of the principle of democracy, in that, free of coercion or restriction, it considers problems of common interest – not only those involving a threat to the peace but also those relating to the method of ensuring the peace. That, we believe, might be described as the technique of peace. The representatives of Governments here assembled can freely express their differences of opinion, differences which are inevitable because the right to dissent and the freedom to exercise that right are the very basis of democracy. Totalitarian regimes are based on force, intimidation and silence; democracy alone is reinvigorated by the conflict of ideas. Even when the circumstances of contemporary life justify State interference in economic affairs to direct production, the distribution of wealth and consumption, the different schools of opinion must nevertheless survive, provided that civil, political and spiritual freedoms are protected. We, for our parte, consider that controversy is not only natural but necessary and salutary. Unanimity almost always implies the unbridled and absolute domination of one opinion over all others, and its effect on this collective body would be frustration through functional atrophy.

It would, however, be unfair criticism to stress only the negative aspect of our disagreements, without referring to the valuable work already accomplished by the United Nations; for example, its function as a place of permanent contact, between all states, where major and minor differences are gradually whittled away by discussion and where action is taken to prevent the perpetuation of those misunderstandings which historians rightly detect at the origin of all wars. It is true that the efforts of the United Nations have not always produced positive results. In all great historical movements, however, there is always a stage of dialectical evolution in the course of which, synthesis prevails over thesis and antithesis, which contemporaries are temporarily unable to distinguish.

Brazil is among those countries which place the greatest trust in the United Nations, its aims and its methods. It cannot be denied that through the United Nations the world has become aware of the political consequences of economic inequality among peoples and has come to understand that the prospects of peace are bound up with the constant improvement of the conditions which make for general welfare, in which all peoples should be able to share without suffering the hazards and delays of a long evolution. In addition, the United Nations is making a decisive contribution to the creation of an international awareness of

human rights and has elevated all matters pertaining to human dignity and respect for individual freedoms to the rank of supreme international objectives. Only in such a spirit of internationalism based on the principles of Christianity and humanist tradition which is the very foundation of contemporary civilization, will it be possible, with the free consent of States, to make the necessary legal changes, so that respect for sovereignty will find its natural complement in the recognition of human rights and the proper safeguards of security and peace.

However, the United Nations will not achieve full vigor until it includes among its Members all nations which genuinely and sincerely support its basic principles. After all, the purpose of the United Nations is not solely to maintain peace among its Member States, but rather to establish peace on a universal basis. Hence all States that fulfill its fundamental principles should be admitted to membership forthwith. That is my Government's position. It has always defended that position and regrets that the Security Council is not able to recommend that the General Assembly admit certain States to membership, many of which, in the course of their long histories, have helped to enrich the highest values of our civilization. In addition to being absent from our midst; some of the countries concerned are at present subjected to special regimes which are contrary to the interests of peace. I refer particularly to Austria, whose unhappy people were among the earliest victims of Nazi enslavement. The restoration of that country's full sovereignty is being delayed and impeded in flagrant disregard of the ideals proclaimed in the United Nations Charter. My Government, faithful to the Brazilian people's tradition of Justice and concord, strongly urges all nations, and particularly the Powers directly responsible, to restore to that noble nation, situated at a spiritual crossroads where East meets West, its independent place in the modern world.

If we are now able to say that there exists a State of equilibrium in military forces which ensures peace, however precarious, that situation is undoubtedly due to the work of the Collective Measures Committee and to its enunciation of the principle that, in taking military action to restore peace, the United Nations is not engaging in an act of war but in a police operation against crime and in defense of law. Problems of such magnitude necessitate constant vigilance by the United Nations, and particularly by the General Assembly, if we wish to prevent diversity from destroying the united world we aspire to achieve. I have in mind the problems and the claims of certain communities which do not yet enjoy sovereignty. In accordance with its traditions, the Brazilian peoples

genuinely sympathizes with the legitimate aspirations of those peoples, and appeals to the parties directly concerned to reconcile their divergent interests through the recognition of reciprocal rights, in a spirit of sincere cooperation, excluding any circumstances and conflicts which can only injure both sides and endanger world peace.

I am convinced, however, that our greatest problem are our economic problems, and that what is needed here is a dynamic policy, capable of satisfying the needs arising in many countries as a result of their growth. It is well known that Member States in the so called underdeveloped areas are suffering the effects of a crisis which influences every aspect of their daily life. Unable to obtain the equipment necessary not only to meet the growing needs of their industries but also to replace equipment worn out through constant use, unable to renew the tools essential for their economic expansion, deprived even of their traditional customers owing to the shortage of currency for the purchase of the consumer goods produced by the underdeveloped countries, these countries are faced with a problem which, complex in itself, is further aggravated by the progressive depletion of the currency reserves they had succeeded in accumulating at the cost of tremendous effort. It is therefore a matter of imperative necessity for them to restore their prosperity – indeed, to secure at least a reasonable standard of living. These countries are in the grip at once of a crisis of growth and a crisis of impoverishment. That is why those who have the power to guide the reconstruction of world economy and trade must classify and evaluate economic problems in terms not only of priorities but also of urgency.

Unfortunately, there being few States which have completely industrialized their economies, the world is in process of being divided into a group of wealthy States and another, much larger, group of poor States. As the minority accumulates wealth, the majority is impoverished. States in the latter category are in the position of *coloni*; or, to apply internationally a classification used in national affairs, we may say that today we have a small number of prosperous communities vis-à-vis a vast international proletariat. The States in the so-called underdeveloped areas are seeking to emerge from the stage of primitive economy based on agriculture and cattle raising. They are seeking desperately to benefit by the resources of modern technique, and are endeavoring to profit by the experience of to nations which are more advanced on the road of industrial progress. The United Nations must also devote more attention to the problem resulting from the fact that all the goods and all the resources are concentrated in the hands of certain States, while

other States, lacking means and opportunities, are on the road to terrible poverty because they do not have the capital and adequate technical equipment to exploit their agricultural and mineral resources.

If the United Nations aims at establishing the principle of the dignity of the human person as an integral part of the international legal order, it must take advantage of man's powers as a creator of work and of wealth. In the interests of international solidarity, plans for raising living standards in the underdeveloped areas which constitute the larger part of the world, must be put into effect without delay. The time has come to give careful consideration to this very serious problem, with the definite and unambiguous intention of understanding and solving it. Immediate steps must be taken to frame a broad program of action for the benefit of the underdeveloped countries and those which have not even reached an economic level ensuring mere subsistence. Unless such action is taken, these countries will not only continue to lack the means to resist the domestic repercussions of economic crises in foreign countries, but also the opportunity of accumulating the reserves of goods, labor and foreign currency necessary to ensure continuing prosperity.

Such is the broad policy, vast in scope, limitless in vision and continuity, which considerations of every kind require of the United Nations. In the final analysis, only such a policy will be able to inject new strength into democratic institutions throughout the world, counteract the sentiment of the States whose progress has been retarded and set the United Nations itself on firm foundations.

Clearly the task is a challenge to the constructive force of the world. It would be vain to try to close our eyes to the dramatic problems of the present day; better bring them into the open and courageously set out to seek their solution. Recognition of the existence of these problems is an initial step toward solving them; not to recoil from them is in itself a degree of progress. During the last seven years, the world as it existed on the morrow of the war has been left far behind. Other changes will be brought about by events. Our chances, however, of guiding these changes along the lines of world order, peace and prosperity depend not only on man's will but also on the grace of God.

New York, October 14, 1952.

1953

1953

By yielding to the USSR the initiative of fundamental decisions about timing, place and method for actions, the *containment* doctrine, taken literally, the United States was confined to a somewhat passive role. Consequently, Eisenhower and Dulles introduced the concept of "massive retaliation", according to which the American response to any event produced by the Soviet Union would not be proportional. Having detonated the first hydrogen bomb in the previous year and with its public opinion mobilized around the danger of Communist infiltration through the indictment and execution of the Rosenberg couple, the United States reserved from then on the option of reacting to developments favoring the USSR in the wide world arena by choosing on its own the location and by employing the methods it deemed adequate, not necessarily proportional to those used in he original action.

The American willingness to no longer "contain" Communist expansion in the world but effectively fight against it and "liberate" countries controlled by Communist governments was simultaneously announced. Although its effect was more rhetorical than practical, this policy, known as *roll-back*, found some significant appreciation in the context of the bipolar confrontation by instilling in the Soviet leadership the perception of an offensive determination on the part of the United States. The death of Stalin, the cease-fire in Korea and the start of the process of the establishment of Nikita Kruschev leadership did not alter significantly, however, the practical aspects of the Soviet-American

interaction. The Western reaction to the crushing of a labor union rebellion in the German Democratic republic was not very strong.

The Brazilian discourse at the United Nations reflects the uncertainties of the international panorama as much as the ambiguities of the internal political and economic landscape. Pro-Western rhetoric persists. Addressing the General Assembly, Ambassador Mario de Pimentel Brandão praised the United Nations for its functionality in the light of the dominance of the United States over the majorities at the Assembly. The USSR was held responsible for the lack of effectiveness of the Security Council due to its constant use of the veto.

Economic questions acquire growing emphasis. The enactment of the law that established Petrobrás showed the determination of the government to keep under State control those resources and economic activities considered as essential. Disappointed by the American bilateral assistance programs, Brazilian diplomacy would turn to upholding multilateral measures. In 1953 the concept of "collective economic security" was formulated together with the proposals aiming at the mitigation of the negative effects experienced in developing countries by virtue of international economic growth inequalities.

The statement also contains mention to two themes that would later become constant in Brazilian pronouncements: the reform of the Charter, which had been drafted too generally in 1947, and the "reduction of armaments".

In reality, the issue of decolonization still presented difficulties for the Brazilian discourse. The vehemence of demands for measures of support to development contrasts with generic formulations in favor of the conciliation between the nationalistic spirit of young nations and the so-called colonial order.

VIII Regular Session of the General Assembly of the United Nations 1953

Ambassador Mário de Pimentel Brandão [*]

Madam President,

Before making my statement, I wish to say how much my Government, my delegation and I myself have been gratified at the election of Mrs. Pandit as President of the eighth session of the General Assembly of the United Nations. Our satisfaction springs from two sources: first because of the fact that, as the head of the Indian delegation; she represents a country dear to the hearts of all Brazilians and one which has been a relentless worker for the cause of freedom and peace; and secondly, because of the fact that the President of this Assembly is a distinguished lady whose charming personal gifts are not second to her political experience.

I should like to add a word of congratulations to Mr. Hammarskjold, the Secretary-General of our Organization. His personal qualifications, as we have already come to know them in the short period since his election, are a guarantee for the good handling of matters pertaining to the United Nations, as well as for the creation of a better climate for understanding among the major Powers.

Year by year, the United Nations is widening its field of action. Political, economic, cultural and juridical imperatives, in short, all the

[*] **Mario de Pimentel Brandão**, Born in Rio de Janeiro, RJ, on October 9, 1889. Bachelor in Legal and Social Sciences from the Faculty of Rio de Janeiro. Secretariat Attaché, 1912. Minister Plenipotentiary, First Class, by merit, 1934. Acting Minister of State for External Relations from 11/06/1952 to 11/22/1952 and from 6/19/1953 to 7/1/1953. † Rio de Janeiro, in 1956.

free forces of international life, are transforming the General Assembly of the United Nations into a real world forum. In this hall are voiced the opinions of all geographic groups, as well as all political ideologies and all the yearnings towards the betterment of economic and social conditions of mankind, the strengthening of world harmony and the observance of the universally proclaimed principles of law.

Nonetheless, with the broadening of this field of action, we are faced with an upsurge of skepticism. Those who find fault with the practical results of the action of the United Nations contend that much more could have been accomplished; that the world is still divided into two opposing blocs, that certain major problems have been dealt with only superficially, and that hesitations and the alternation of progress and setbacks has done great harm to some endeavors of the Organization, which offered, at the start, promising possibilities. I do not deny that up to a certain point those criticisms might be well-founded. We should, however, point out that the Organization, owing to the very fact that it was born out of a profound political chaos, is handicapped by certain unavoidable imperfections and shortcomings. These imperfections and short-comings are the aftermath of the throes of the immediate post-war period. One of the highest juridical and diplomatic authorities in my country, Mr. Raul Fernandes, former Minister for External Relations, once remarked that nowadays the world is granted but a "moratorium of peace".

The danger to be averted is that this growing skepticism with regard to the action of the United Nations should succeed in contaminating minds that up to now have been inspired by constructive realism. In all truth – and this is my deep belief – it is now an established fact that world public opinion reposes its trust in the United Nations. If one were to draw up a brief balance of the activities and achievements of the United Nations, it would be immediately clear that its assets are already considerable. I should like to add that, if more has not been accomplished, the responsibility should not be placed entirely on the Organization; it has mainly resulted from political currents and counter-currents which have exerted great influence on the solutions to the problems under consideration.

In my opinion, it is necessary that sooner or later we proceed, in the prescribed order, with the revision of the Charter, so that the Organization may be in a better position to accomplish its aims to the fullest and thereby eliminate the criticisms that have been leveled against it. This revision should be undertaken in an objective and impartial manner, taking advantage of the lessons learned from the experience acquired in the course of the past years. If in fact the Charter of the United

Nations contains flaws and imperfections, and if we all are aware of their existence, why not tackle this problem and try to find a remedy for it? The Charter is not only a political and juridical document that serves as a guide and a code of discipline; the Charter is indeed the expression of a kind of political, juridical and moral plebiscite which voices the yearnings of our world.

The peoples of our time, those of big, small or medium Powers long for law and justice, both in the national and international fields. War has become more and more murderous and destructive, threatening the very existence of human society. It is probably this instinct of self-preservation in the human species that has inspired the creation of this political body. This instinctive will to live is, in fact, an irresistible force that cannot be ignored by anyone. The proof of this is that even those who voice the most violent criticism of the efficiency of our Organization are nevertheless most anxious to keep it alive.

If the government of a big Power, such as the Soviet Union, criticizes the actions of the Organization and repeatedly expresses its displeasure at the manner in which our problems have been dealt with by the United Nations, it would seem natural and, I should say, logical to expect this government to be, in theory or in practice, in favor of the revision of the Charter. May I indulge in the hope that the Soviet Union wilt eventually join with those who seriously consider the possibility of carrying out the revision of the United Nations Charter so as to make it a better tool in the political and juridical fields?

As the representative of a peace-loving nation, earnestly devoted to the juridical rules and moral principles which should guide international society, I should like to stress that our main wish is that the work of the United Nations may grow from year to year in order to afford better protection to sacred human rights and to mutual respect among nations and in order to strengthen the ties among all peoples.

The division of the world into two ideologically opposed blocs and the cultural, economic and political antagonisms which have resulted from this split have not been strong enough to undermine the foundations of the Organization. On the contrary, this unfortunate division has acted as a true catalyst. It has actually enhanced the power of endurance of the United Nations.

We are in truth not creators but interpreters of the profound aspirations of mankind. It is our mission to seize the main currents of world public opinion, which seeks the betterment of the economic, social and moral conditions of the individual and the perfecting of the international community. The present Minister for External Relations of

Brazil, the eminent professor, Dr. Vicente Rao, who represented Brazil at the General Assembly in 1950, has already emphasized the paramountcy of the juridical order over transitory issues which arise as a result of the desire of certain Powers for expansion.

The present session of the General Assembly is required to consider the serious political and economic questions on whose solution rests the assurance of lasting world peace. Among these problems, I wish to refer to the reduction of armaments, economic aid to underdeveloped countries, technical assistance, human rights and the ironing out of the conflict between the nationalistic spirit of the young nations and the so-called colonial order.

It is absolutely necessary that the United Nations should give the greatest amount of time and attention to the gigantic economic problems that distress vast regions of most of the underdeveloped countries. It is indeed advisable to note that collective security of an economic nature should coexist with the classic idea of collective security in the political and juridical domains. Although it is already outlined in the Charter, this concept deserves to be thoroughly explored, thus permitting a practical solution designed to allow underdeveloped countries to meet the pressures resulting from an imbalance in the economic levels and the rate of economic growth of the different nations.

In this particular field, the work of the United Nations is bound to bring immediate results. Underdeveloped countries look forward to a swifter increase in their *per capita* income through increasing productivity, both in range and in depth.

It is a matter of importance that, thanks to their excellent experts and executive organs, the United Nations and its specialized agencies will gradually and indefatigably not only pursue the technical assistance activities, but also establish schemes of international cooperation for the financing of economic development. This policy cannot fail to be implemented, and it will lay the foundations for a firmer world economic order.

It is my country's heartfelt hope that peace will prevail in Korea. Need I say that peace is indeed the main goal of the United Nations? The tragic lesson learned in Korea will not have been learned in vain. Let us not relent in the noble striving for peace and the strengthening of peaceful and fruitful relations among all the nations of the world.

New York, September 15, 1953.

1954

1954

The deterioration of the internal situation in Brazil experienced dramatic acceleration in 1954. Groups in the armed forces and sectors of the civilian opposition denounced Communist infiltration in the Vargas government. The ABC policy, as the proposal of an understanding between Argentina, Brazil and Chile, was branded as an instrument of leftist leaning aimed at containing the influence of the United States in the hemisphere. The internal debate in Brazil remained subordinated to the logic of the East-West conflict.

The month of August would come to be considered unlucky in the Brazilian political chronicle as a result of developments taking place in 1954. Entangled in a "sea of mud", according to his own words, President Vargas committed suicide in August, leaving in his final will letter a nationalistic profession of faith which would influence decisively the course of internal and external policies of Brazil. The nationalism of Vargas' letter would also be responsible for a certain linkage that came to be made in the popular Brazilian unconscious mind between the suicide of the President and American pressure against Petrobrás and State intervention in the economy.

The international panorama was full of tension. In 1954 the armed struggle for the independence of Algeria began; the French, defeated at Dien Bien Phu, were expelled from Indochina; the Federal Republic of Germany removed the constitutional hindrances to its rearmament;

and the United States overthrew the nationalistic government of Jacobo Arbenz in Guatemala.

In addition to the instability of the Brazilian internal scene following Vargas' suicide, the international tension dictated prudence in the pronouncements of the country at the United Nations. In his statement, Ambassador Ernesto Leme did not refrain from ascribing responsibility to the USSR, mentioned by name, for the paralysis of the Security Council and for the lack of progress on disarmament. Between the lines of the criticism to the Soviet Union for the repeated use of the veto it is possible to discern the latent dissatisfaction of Brazil for not having been included as a permanent member of the Council. From the 1953 Assembly on, when the issue was brought forth for the first time in the speech by Ambassador Pimentel Brandão, the reform of the Charter would figure in the Brazilian pronouncements always in tandem, implicitly or explicitly, with the question of the procedures and composition of the Security Council.

By that time, the Brazilian discourse also contained tough assertions in favor of human rights and fundamental freedoms. On the other hand, decolonization continued to be belittled and seen from a paternalistic angle, as a question of frank and constructive cooperation linked to the preparation of dependent peoples for auto-government or independence, a process that Ambassador Leme significantly called "the task of civilization".

IX Regular Session of the General Assembly of the United Nations
1954

Ambassador Ernesto Leme [*]

Mr. President,

The Ninth Session of the General Assembly has indeed an arduous task to perform. But let us be optimistic; the Assembly will do its duty in spite of all the present difficulties.

As I have already pointed out in the Security Council, we are on the road towards general peace. An armistice has been signed in Korea, a truce has been concluded in Indochina, peace has been restored to Guatemala and, for the first time in a long, long period, no war is raging on our planet.

It is true that a number of questions remain to be settled. At this very moment representatives of the great Powers, meeting in London, are seeking ways and means of establishing such close cooperation as will ensure calm and happiness for Europe. Furthermore, in his speech yesterday, Mr. Vyshinsky affirmed the Soviet Union's determination to endeavor with the rest of us to come to some agreement on the question of atomic weapons and disarmament in general which would provide the basis for a convention that would include also the international control proposed by the Western Powers in the plan they submitted to the Sub-Committee of the Disarmament Commission and to the

[*] **Ernesto de Morais Leme**, Born in Bragança Paulista, SP, December 30, 1896. Bachelor and Doctor in Legal and Social Sciences from the Faculty of Law of São Paulo. Rector of USP in 1951. President of São Paulo Literary Academy between 1971 and 1974. Permanent Delegate of Brazil to the United Nations with the rank of Ambassador (1954-1955). † in 1986.

Commission itself. The agenda of this session includes also an item entitled "International cooperation in developing the peaceful uses of atomic energy", proposed by the delegation of the United States, which will be submitted to the First Committee for consideration.

We have, therefore, no grounds for pessimism. But we must remember that freedom, like peace, demands constant vigilance. The United Nations is still far from being the splendid edifice of which its founders dreamed. Under the auspices of this Organization, which was designed to be used in the service of peace, we are seeking to attain a political ideal, although we have not yet achieved it. International negotiations whose objectives are precisely those which are to be found in the Charter are, in fact, being conducted outside our Organization. It would have been vain, however, to hope that perfection would be achieved in less than ten years.

The experience we have acquired, since the San Francisco Conference and the results which United Nations efforts for the maintenance of peace and for economic and cultural development have achieved are, however, such as to enable us to have confidence in the work we have already done and in the work which we still hope to accomplish. The need to set up the United Nations, expressed for the first time in the Moscow Declaration of 1943, was consecrated at Dumbarton Oaks and, with the signing of the Charter, the Organization became a reality.

The General Assembly is the supreme organ of the United Nations. The powers vested in it are proof of the importance which has been attached to it. Side by side with the General Assembly, the Security Council has been assigned an executive role, and the Charter has placed upon it the lofty responsibility of the "maintenance of international peace and security". In discharging its duties the Security Council shall act "in accordance with the Purposes and Principles of the United Nations". A basic principle of the Charter is set forth in Article 2, paragraph 1, which recognizes the "sovereign equality of all its Members". That is the principle which was defended by Mr. Ruy Barbosa, the Brazilian representative at the Second Peace Conference in 1907. This legal equality of all Members of the United Nations conflicts, however, with Article 27, paragraph 3, of the Charter, under which the permanent members of the Security Council are given the right to exercise the veto on all questions of substance. That, as Mr. Basdevant has said, is a right granted to certain States to use a negative vote to prevent the Security Council from taking a decision; it is in fact the power of preventing the United Nations from taking the most important decisions.

At the San Francisco Conference the Brazilian delegation accepted the principle of the veto. It was necessary to draft the Charter and secure its adoption, which would not have been possible if this principle had not been recognized. The Chairman of the Brazilian delegation at the fifth session of the United Nations General Assembly clearly explained our attitude in this connection: we placed our full confidence in the great Powers to which this privilege was granted, for we were convinced that they would not abuse it.

The experience which we have acquired since the earliest meetings of the Security Council have now convinced us, however, that this Council will never be able to discharge its duties satisfactorily so long as one of its permanent Members is able to nullify the other Members' efforts to maintain peace and security. The sixty vetoes which the Soviet Union has exercised against decisions of the Council show clearly that the matter will have to be closely studied when the Charter is revised in 1955. We must begin our work now. If it is not yet possible to abolish the right of veto, it will undoubtedly be necessary to regulate it by reserving its application to exceptional cases.

Brazil is a member of a regional organization which does credit to the nations of our hemisphere. The Organization of American States fits into the structure of the United Nations, but its origins are earlier and its history goes back, in fact, to more than a century before the adoption of the Charter at San Francisco. The Treaty of Rio de Janeiro finally completed the ties of solidarity which unite the peoples of our continent.

When my delegation proposed to the Security Council that the question of Guatemala should be submitted to the regional organization, it did not wish to imply that the Security Council could not deal with the matter. It was obviously necessary, however, to await the results of the inquiry and the measures decided upon by the regional organization before asking the United Nations to find a final solution for this problem. We still think that regional organizations cannot fail to make United Nations action more effective and to enhance the prestige of the Charter.

Our obligations towards the peoples of our continent cannot make us forget the duties which all States owe to the peoples of the whole world. The ties are closer and more intimate between neighboring countries, but only the solidarity of all nations can bring happiness to mankind as a whole.

The Brazilian delegation is convinced that the political progress and social well-being of the peoples are fundamentally dependent upon the development of their potential resources. As contemporary

experience proves, we cannot really achieve this objective, within the framework of the modern State, without a large measure of participation by all the Members of the community of nations. The destiny of man has willed that the economic factor shall be the constant by which political thinking is governed – we might almost say preponderantly governed. It necessarily follows that the well-being and security of the individual and of communities are condemned to feel to a considerable extent the repercussions of defects in the economic system. In point of fact it will not be possible to establish and maintain peace unless care is taken, in formulating the principles upon which peace rests, to impart to the economies of the underdeveloped countries the dynamism which will enable them to benefit in the future from the vigor and enterprising spirit of our age.

We are today called upon to study programs of work relating to the financing of economic development technical assistance, land reform and the establishment of a world food reserve. My delegation is prepared to make a contribution to these studies in the belief that all the efforts which are coordinated here may lead us, if not to concrete results, at least to the firm hope – even to the certainty – that the work of the Ninth Session of the General Assembly will really constitute a valid contribution to the solution of these problems.

There is no doubt that the question of the economic development of underdeveloped countries will play a preponderant part in the work of the Second Committee. This is, in point of fact, a problem which retards that social and economic stabilization of international life which, in the spirit of the Charter, is a condition of peace. The agenda items relating to economic questions show that we are trying to free the peoples represented in the United Nations from the anxiety which weighs on their Governments in their efforts to create social well-being. It is essential that we should succeed in this task if we are to prevent mankind from losing faith in its own creative ability.

We are certain, therefore, that we shall be able to devote ourselves, without ever giving way to disheartenment, to laying the foundations for such international cooperation as is likely to lead us in the fairly near future, once we have set up the machinery by means of which it will be possible to integrate the characteristics and the differing types of national and regional economic development, to that lofty level of civilization which the United Nations envisages. This instrument must be sufficiently well designed to be able to be applied smoothly, and without disturbing the equilibrium of world economy, to the general task of maintaining

peace, a task whose purpose will always be the spiritual and moral betterment of mankind.

With regard to social, cultural and humanitarian questions, and more particularly to the drafting of the covenants on human rights, my country has given, and will continue to give, its support and cooperation to the work of the Third Committee, which, though it may appear to be vague and idealistic, is of unquestionable value in the gradual achievement of the purposes of the United Nations.

I should like to mention in particular the questions concerning freedom of information, refugees, and the unwarranted existence of forced labor, which is assuming immense proportions in many parts of the world. The concern we feel for these questions is in the tradition – indeed I will go so far as to say that it is of the essence – of our democratic, Latin and Christian culture. Respect for human dignity and for men's fundamental freedoms is in our view a necessary condition for the peaceful coexistence not only of individuals, but also of nations. Our position in this field is founded on a moral rather than on a political concept. The violation of freedoms and fundamental rights, wherever it occurs, constitutes, as it were, an attack on and a threat to the integrity and dignity of each one of us as an individual. it also threatens the foundations of the rights and freedoms in each of our countries

The United Nations will also have to consider the complex problems relating to the provisions of Chapters XI, XII and XIII of the Charter which founded out Organization. I do not think it necessary for us to stress further the importance which my Government attaches to the role which this Organization is called upon to play in the colonial field. Under the Charter, all the Members of the United Nations have collectively stood surely for the application of the principles and the attainment of the purposes assigned to the action of the administering Powers through the provisions regarding Non-Self-Governing Territories. In carrying out this duty, therefore, we must give our frank and loyal cooperation to the Member States which have assumed responsibility before the international community for the political, economic and social development of peoples which have not yet attained a full measure of self-government.

This cooperation may sometimes take the form of rather severe criticisms of the policy practiced in certain fields by the colonial administrations. This conscientious examination of problems must not, however, be regarded as having any intention other than the constructive one of frank cooperation in the accomplishment of the "task of civilization,"

the paramount purpose of which is the preparation of dependent peoples for self-government or independence.

In this field, honest criticism is a mark of our confidence in the administering Powers. If we sometimes fail to agree with them in the interpretation of principles, we sincerely believe that collaboration between administering and non-administering Powers is always possible in the United Nations. This exchange of ideas will always be useful provided that questions are considered on their merits and that our attitude towards each other is not determined by any factors alien to the objective which we are all seeking to achieve, namely the welfare of the dependent peoples.

In view of the importance the Charter attributes to the Secretariat, the Brazilian delegation has always been particularly concerned with the problems of its organization and functioning. Although we believe that the Secretary-General is primarily responsible for dealing with such questions, we have never denied him our firm support and cooperation in his efforts to develop to the highest degree of efficiency the administrative machinery through which the political, economic and social purposes of the United Nations are to be carried out. At this session, as at the last, we are prepared to examine in a constructive spirit the Secretary-General's administrative and budgetary proposals, particularly his plan for the reorganization of the Secretariat and its work, and to provide him with the necessary means to bring about more and more changes, so that the Secretariat may become an effective and economic instrument in the service of the United Nations.

With regard to legal questions, the Brazilian position at several international conferences has already revealed our way of thinking. Brazilian jurists have for long been concerned with the question of the codification of international law as will be shown by reference to the work of Mr. José Hygino and to the "Draft Code of International Public Law" by Mr. Epitácio da Silva Pessoa. Nevertheless, we must face international facts. The representatives of Brazil will accordingly propose measures which take those facts into account and are therefore somewhat less than ideal rules: they will be rules which are likely to be accepted by the greatest number of States. Political, economic and social problems are not the same everywhere. We need to find a formula that will cover them all. It is better to confine ourselves to modest remedies rather than to choose others which may be closer to the ideal but could not be generally acceptable.

Together with the United States and other countries, Brazil has submitted to the General Assembly the questions of the continental shelf and the economic development of fisheries, both of primary importance.

If we cannot complete our examination of these questions at this session, we shall doubtless be able to make some progress, so that we may submit the most satisfactory drafts possible to the tenth session of the General Assembly.

Two more very delicate problems have also been submitted to the Sixth Committee: that of defining aggression and the establishment of international criminal jurisdiction. How shall we find a suitable formula for the first? *Omnis definitio periculosa est.* Will it be possible to overcome the technical and institutional difficulties in order to allow of the establishment of the second? We think not.

Brazil's attitude on the subject of racial discrimination remains unchanged. That is for us an obligation under our constitution. We shall always do everything in our power, within the limitations of the Charter, to prevent any kind of discrimination with regard to respect for the fundamental freedoms of all "without distinction as to race, sex, language or religion".

In the First Committee, we shall have to examine the report of the Disarmament Commission [DC/551] concerning the "regulation, limitation and balanced reduction of all armed forces and all armaments". The problem has been considered in all its aspects in the Disarmament Commission. I stated my Government's views there too. But no positive results were achieved. It is regrettable that no agreement can be reached on a subject that concerns not only France, or the United Kingdom, or Canada, or China, or the United States or the Soviet Union, but the entire human race. All States realize that some way of agreement must be found if the whole world is to be given the right to live free from fear and if mankind is to achieve peace and happiness.

The United Nations listened eagerly to President Eisenhower's appeal in his historic speech of 8 December last. The Disarmament Commission worked unremittingly to reach a general agreement on the prohibition of the manufacture and use of atomic and hydrogen weapons and the reduction of armed forces and conventional armaments in a proportion to be determined. It might have been successful if the question of method had not arisen. The Soviet Union refused to conform to the program of international control established in the Franco-British proposal of 11 June 1954 and so the Commission's report to the General Assembly simply passes the question from one organ to another.

In his speech in the general debate yesterday, Mr. Vyshinsky announced to the Assembly, on behalf of his Government, that he was prepared to participate in an agreement on disarmament, involving the

creation of an international control organ responsible for supervising the observance of the rules of whatever convention might be adopted. We are delighted to hear this. My delegation will study the proposal put forward by the representative of the Soviet Union with interest, in all good faith and in the belief that it is sincere.

It was Russia which, in 1899, convened the Powers to the first Peace Conference. The single idea of the reduction of armaments was the basis of its original program. At that time, the world had not yet been exposed to the threat of nuclear weapons. We do not believe that the Soviet Union will wish to be less pacific than the Tsar's Government. One single gesture on its part may shed luster upon its place in history or may jeopardize its future, together with that of the entire human race.

I call upon you to outlaw, with mutual safeguards which I hope it will be possible to provide, both the manufacture and the use of atomic and hydrogen weapons. Let us study the use of atomic energy for peaceful purposes; let us seek to discover in this natural force all the rich possibilities for human welfare which may lie therein.

Brazil has been concerned with this problem for some years. Considerable progress has been made in the faculties and laboratories of our universities, and the National Research Council has been encouraging scientific work in all possible ways. Our country will bring to the international organ to be established the contribution of its natural resources and its labors.

The results obtained by science in the use of atomic energy for peaceful purposes are already very impressive. Scientists of all nations must unite their efforts in a task which will safeguard the future of the universe. Atomic energy as an instrument of destruction must be abhorred, but its emergence as an instrument of peace, of that peace which is the highest aspiration of humanity, of which the Gospel speaks when it blesses the work of the peacemakers must be acclaimed.

The Brazilian delegation is taking part in the work of this session of the General Assembly in the hope that we may this year achieve considerable progress towards the purpose which we have set before us. We hope that when the session is over the people of all nations may see in our efforts a pledge of the love which we bear them and the contribution of our experience to the cause of civilization and peace.

New York, September 21, 1954.

1955

1955

Developments following President Vargas' suicide would put to the test the resistance of Brazilian democratic institutions. The year went by in an emotional climate. In October, the election of Juscelino Kubitschek, with João Goulart in the ticket, reignited antagonisms from the Vargas period and divided the armed forces. A preemptive coup by the Minister of War, General Henrique Teixeira Lott, and the proclamation of the state of siege allowed the interim President, Nereu Ramos, to hand over power to the President-elect. In his capacity as President of the Supreme Court, Minister Nereu Ramos had assumed office after the deposition of the President of the Chamber of Deputies, Carlos Luz, who in turn had assumed the Presidency of the country due to the alleged impediment of Vice-President Café Filho for reasons of health.

Brazil was going through a precarious political situation. Consequently, Brazilian diplomacy avoided any rapprochement with the Soviet Union and the socialist countries, seeking at the same time to regain a higher level of trust and cooperation with the United States. Availing itself of the relatively calm conjuncture in the hemisphere in the years prior to the rise of Fidel Castro, Brazil sought to come closer to the United States. The U.S., however, concerned over the global panorama in which the USSR was being threateningly perceived as capable of catching up with the United States in the arms race, paid little or no attention in Latin America to questions that were not expressed in ideological terms or of acute crisis.

From 1955 on the practice of summit meetings between the U.S. and the USSR, which had been initiated during the war and then discontinued for ten years, was resumed. After detonating its first hydrogen bomb and establishing the Warsaw Pact, the Soviet Union started to accept progress in talks on arms control. A peace agreement between Austria and the USSR allowed the withdrawal of occupation troops from that country. The international panorama was becoming more dangerous and more complex. At the Bandung Conference, Asian and African counties met and demanded the speeding up of the decolonization process. It became necessary to establish more effective communication mechanisms between the great powers; in July 1955 the so-called Big Four (U.S.A, URSS, France and Great Britain) met in Geneva. At the close of the year Khruschev and Bulganin visited South Asia and the Soviet Union launched a strong diplomatic offensive aimed and increasing trade and cooperation with Third World countries. These were concrete steps that would enable the USSR to get rid of the continental policy inherited from Russia and project itself in the world as a superpower.

Delivered a few days before the October 3 elections, the statement by the head of the Brazilian delegation to the tenth session of the General Assembly of the United Nations, Ambassador Cyro de Freitas-Valle, remained chiefly on the conceptual sphere. It disclosed a world view rich in analytical categories, displaying at the same time a pronounced professional value. It is a short speech, in which the Brazilian ambivalences regarding the so-called "colonial question" are again evident in the proposal of an adequate interval in order to permit the institutions of colonized countries to ripen and develop fully, avoiding premature actions. Reticence already appears in relation to the Human Rights Pacts, whose transformation in radical or idealistic declarations, according to the Brazilian diplomacy of the time, should be avoided at all costs.

X Regular Session of the General Assembly of the United Nations
1955

Ambassador Cyro de Freitas-Valle [*]

Mr. President,

May I be allowed to come to this rostrum to present my respectful compliments to my friend, the President of the General Assembly, a distinguished statesman of Chile, a country which I have just left and for which I have the greatest admiration.

Brazil has always addressed the General Assembly of the United Nations with faith and frankness. Once again we are together in this ball, this time at a moment when new horizons seem to be dawning before our eyes, and the whole of mankind longs to be freed from the somber threat that haunts its path. The anniversary celebrations of San Francisco, where disagreements lost their edge, were followed by the four-Power conference "at the summit" in Geneva, where the virtues of frankness were stressed. Now, as a result of that most welcome meeting, the Secretary of State of the United States of America and the Foreign Ministers of France, the United Kingdom and the Soviet Union will shortly join their efforts to face with courage and determination the problems that still keep them apart. Peace cannot be brought about a *coups de miracles*, as Mr. Spank has said with his usual insight. If, however, the answers to the problems to be examined in Geneva should

[*] **Cyro de Freitas-Valle**, Born in São Paulo, August 16, 1896. Bachelor in Legal and Social Sciences from the Faculty of Law of São Paulo. Second Secretary in 1918. Minister Plenipotentiary, First Class, by merit, in 1938. Acting Minister of State for External Relations from 5/4/1949 to 6/20/1949. † Rio de Janeiro, November 7, 1969.

not suffice to bring to light the miracle of peace, they will at least restore the confidence of the world in the days to come.

It is a fact that the old-timers of the United Nations can never forget that many difficulties have been successfully solved within the framework of the Organization. It is enough to recall the outstanding record of the Security Council in London, where within one single month many issues of major importance were settled. It is enough to bear in mind the critical situations dealt with by the General Assembly with firmness and vision, particularly in the years 1947, 1949, 1950 and 1951. And I am mentioning but a few examples. Hence it would not be out of place to deplore the fact that it should have befallen our Organization to be somewhat bypassed in the last few years. Nevertheless, we welcome what has been successfully accomplished outside these halls, and we crave for more.

The Conference on the Peaceful Uses of Atomic Energy, convened as a consequence of the momentous initiative taken before the General Assembly by the President of the United States of America, provides the most recent evidence of the merits of making ample use of our Organization. That Conference made abundantly clear not only the benefits that mankind will derive from atomic power but also the apocalyptic threat that hangs over humanity if the force of the atom be diverted towards destruction. We saw scientists from 70 countries some of them closely connected with the forging of atomic weapons working hand in hand, exchanging relevant information freely and openly on the benefits that may come to the world from this epoch-making discovery. This is highly comforting and has a touch of chivalry seldom seen in the international relations of our time.

But ten years ago, the fervent hopes of men and women emerging from the horrors of war were focused on the United Nations. May Almighty God permit that this Organization of ours be enabled to pursue unhampered its endeavor towards securing a just and lasting peace.

I am inclined to believe that the world will never regain its balance unless the security of Europe is assured. This inevitably leads us to the problem of the unification of Germany. It is not merely a question of giving to the German people – whose qualities we all acknowledge – what is their due. We must also give Germany its full share of responsibility in the maintenance of peace. The continuance of the present division of Germany cannot but be detrimental to the much desired political and economic stabilization of Europe. This unhappy state of affairs is also bound to keep alive a dangerous potential source of unrest. We trust that the unification of that nation, coupled with a comprehensive world disarmament program

embracing the great Powers, would only discourage any aggressive spirit that still may linger in Germany.

Now that the tension in international affairs is on the wane, we can more dearly discern controversies that beset relations between peoples and nations alike. I refer to the so-called colonial question. Almost all the American nations achieved their independence through insurrection, and to this day they derive pride and strength from their valiant struggles and feats of arms. It is only natural, therefore, that their sympathies flow to those who are demanding independence. This sentiment, however, springs from the heart and should not overcast the mind. May I recall, gentlemen, the words of Napoleon: "Le coeur d'un homme d'État doit être dans sa tête".

Thus it would appear that the role of the United Nations is to avoid premature actions which, once adopted, may one day be sorrowfully regretted. Real independence is the fruit of the natural growth of political institutions, founded on a sound economic and social structure. Let the people mature and their institutions develop fully. Then independence will be a blessing; otherwise it will be just a dangerous illusion.

The political maturity of the countries represented at the Bandung Conference was emphasized by the very fact that, while firmly stating their position on many controversial issues, they took into account the realities of the international situation and the problems that the necessity to coexist creates for every nation.

In the Far East, we are gratified to note that the efforts of the Secretary-General towards the liberation of the United Nations airmen so arbitrarily detained by the Government of Peiping have met with success. To Mr. Hammarskjöld goes our gratitude. The United Nations is fortunate indeed to have as its principal official a statesman whose great ability is matched only by his modesty.

I know of no other problem so vital for the United Nations as that of the admission of new Members. The deadlock, that might have been broken long ago, deprives the Organization of that universality which should be one of its characteristics if Article 4 of the Charter is to be properly observed. If the new spirit of understanding and mutual concessions could be made to prevail among all the members of the Security Council, I trust that many States would be recommended to the General Assembly for admission to the United Nations.

The delegation of Brazil suggested in San Francisco in 1945 that the United Nations Charter might be reviewed automatically every five years and that no veto should apply. Although not adopted at the time,

our proposal was to a certain extent met by Article 109, which directed the General Assembly to consider, ten years thereafter, whether it was advisable or not to hold a conference for the purpose of reviewing the Charter. It would appear, however, that the international scene today did not warrant much hope that enough support would be forthcoming for the text that might result from such revision to ensure its approval. This applies not only to its adoption in terms of votes, but also to the more protracted process of ratification. This being the case, while acknowledging the desirability of reviewing the Charter, it would be wiser, in the opinion of the Brazilian delegation, to take now a decision in favor of holding that conference, referring to the next session of the Assembly the task of setting a definite date for it. To our mind this would render it possible for Member States, then guided by a stronger spirit of harmony, profitably to review those provisions of the Charter which, in the light of experience, have proved unsatisfactory.

In the field of human rights, Brazil had not the opportunity to participate more actively in the drafting of the proposed covenants, as it was not represented in the bodies which undertook this task. My Government would, however, like to point out that any transformation of such covenants into radical and whimsically idealistic declarations ought to be avoided. It is only too clear that the very States which have traditionally upheld those same fundamental rights will be prevented from subscribing to declarations of this kind.

Before closing my remarks, may I be allowed to draw the attention of the General Assembly to the need for a greater effort to correct the tremendous disparity in economic levels amongst the various regions of the world. This is, as a matter of fact, one of the essential purposes of our Organization. We cannot ask, of course, that all countries be equally wealthy. But countries like my own, whose main source of income from the production of basic commodities, are affected not only by fluctuations of supply and demand, but by the rising production of similar goods in colonial territories, the output whereof has been increased partially by virtue of financial aid granted for the benefit of the colonial Powers themselves. As a matter of course, the standards of living in colonial territories determine a cost of production which brings the price of commodities to a level so low as to impair the competitive ability of traditional producers. It is urgent that through technical assistance and appropriate financial machinery we strive for the elimination of the economic and social grievances that affect the harmonious relations between peoples.

Before I leave this rostrum, I beg to inform the General Assembly that the Government of Brazil has decided to receive those prisoners of the Korean War still in the custody of the Indian authorities, subject, the fulfillment of minimum immigration requirements and their willingness to live among our people.

New York, September 20, 1955.

1956

1956

The two first years of the Kubitschek Administration would not produce significant changes in the external policy of Brazil. Facing a diffuse and to a certain extent conflictive internal context, the government prioritized the feasibility of mobilizing projects aimed at the development of the country. The nationalistic rhetoric was kept. The objective was to benefit national capital without antagonizing foreign investment.

The creation of the Development Council at the start of his term, President Kubitschek signaled the emphasis to be pursued by his Administration. Striving to calm down sentiments in the armed forces after the episodes of Jacareacanga and the arrest of General Juarez Távora, the President would announce the purchase of the aircraft carrier Minas Gerais at the end of the year.

At the international level, important developments took place in 1956. Soviet repression crushed an anti-Communist uprising in Hungary. The Suez crisis and the Arab-Israeli war complicated the Middle Eastern panorama. Khruschev started the "de-Stalinization" process by denouncing at the XXI Congress of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union the crimes committed by his predecessor. The inevitability of the conflict between capitalism and communism was somewhat balanced by the concept of "peaceful coexistence". The ideological fervor started to give way to pragmatic accommodation between the United States and the Soviet Union. The Soviet leadership seemed willing to transplant to the

social internal sphere the wealth generated by the formidable economic-industrial development of the previous years.

The government of the United States reacted with initial caution to the transformations taking shape in the USSR, ascribing to the announced plans by Khruschev the intention of deceiving the West.

In practice, international developments still followed the Cold War mechanisms. The Brazilian statement did not deviate from the postulates of the confrontation. Once again the Brazilian delegation was headed by Ambassador Cyro de Freitas-Valle, who emphatically condemned the USSR for the repression of the uprising in Hungary.

In consonance with the line sketched in previous years, the Brazilian speech dedicated a significant paragraph to the unfair divisions between developed and underdeveloped countries.

Besides, it contained an important statement of position on questions linked to the Arab-Israeli conflict, affected at the time by the situation in Suez. It was a precise and balanced formulation, which would serve as a model for further expressions by Brazilian diplomacy.

XI Regular Session of the General Assembly of the United Nations
1956

Ambassador Cyro de Freitas-Valle [*]

Mr. President,

I count it a great privilege to be one of the first to express to you my congratulations on your unanimous election as President of the eleventh session of the General Assembly. Your services to the cause of peace, and especially your devotion to our United Nations, have long qualified you for the high office to which you have been elected and which, I feel certain, you will discharge with impartiality and skill.

I now turn my attention to the recent events in the Middle East which brought the world closer to a general war than it has ever been since the forces of Nazism were crushed by the power of the Allied armies. It is common knowledge that the alliance which it was possible to forge against the destructive might of fascist aggression could not be maintained in the years that followed the establishment of a wavering peace. This unfortunate circumstance is at the root of all the troubles which beset the world today.

The fact that the United Nations was never able to marshal sufficient military strength to ensure peace and security wherever a threat of aggression occurred or a breach of the peace was imminent has also contributed largely to the unsatisfactory state of affairs that endangers the

[*] **Cyro de Freitas-Valle**, Born in São Paulo, SP, August 16, 1896. Bachelor in Legal and Social Sciences from the Faculty of Law of São Paulo. Second Secretary in 1918. Minister Plenipotentiary, First Class, by merit, in 1938. Acting Minister of State for External Relations from 4/5/1949 to 6/20/1949. † Rio de Janeiro, November 7, 1969.

very life of every human being all over the world. That is why we rejoice in the establishment of United Nations Emergency Force that has been set up to enforce the resolutions adopted by the General Assembly on recent momentous occasions.

May I be allowed, at this juncture, to express the deep appreciation of my delegation to the initiative taken in this connection by the Secretary of State for External Affairs of Canada Mr. Pearson has rendered a great service to the cause of peace with justice. We also agree heartily with the proposals made by the Secretary-General – whose outstanding performance of his duties is a source of pride to all the Members of the United Nations – concerning the duties and functions of the Emergency Force. And we hope and pray that this new experiment in world diplomacy may yet prove to be the nucleus from which will emanate the strength that will lend to this Organization the physical power which it has so sorely lacked.

While I am dealing with the question connected with the situation in the Middle East, I must emphasize once again that no solution is apt to bring fruitful and lasting results if the very delicate and complex problems that lie behind the surface of the present crisis are not dealt with courageously once and for all. Two questions are of paramount importance in relation to the unstable peace in that troubled region of the globe. The first the situation brought about by the forcible seizure of the Suez Canal, and the other is the relations between the State of Israel and its Arab neighbors. Since the Middle Eastern problems are going to be discussed during the eleventh session of the General Assembly, it would perhaps prove of great relevance if the United Nations were to approve certain directives that might serve as a basis for discussion on theses two outstanding issues.

On the question of the Canal, a number of general principles have already been accepted by all the parties concerned. On behalf of the Delegation of Brazil, I want to stress that we shall favor a solution to that problem that takes into account the legitimate interests of the users of that international waterway but that would in no way impinge upon the sovereignty of Egypt. We should also like to emphasize once again that we could under no circumstances condone any action from any quarter that would bar the right of free passage through the Canal to any country for any reason whatsoever.

The bases for a lasting settlement of the state of belligerency that has been prevailing since the days of the General Armistice Agreements between Israel and the Arab countries are more difficult to envisage and

to formulate. A few principles, however, govern our attitude and, in our opinion, should be generally accepted.

First, Israel is a sovereign State with the same rights and obligations as those of all Members of the United Nations. Its desire to live in peace with its neighbors seems to us legitimate and conducive to a happy settlement of this thorny question. On the other hand, the grievances suffered by the Arab nations as a result of the emergence of Israel are only too easily understandable. Their reluctance to discuss peace with Israel on equal terms springs from these feelings of antagonism created as a result of the turmoil that has taken place in the Middle East since the Arab-Israel War. The period of time that has elapsed since those tragic days has not proved long enough to allow for the necessary moderation and clear-sightedness on the part of all the Powers concerned. We have, however, reached a crossroads on the general international scene that calls for immediate and decided effort to settle all the problems that might kindle the spark that may set off catastrophes of unforeseeable consequences. Great statesmanship is required now both from the Arab States and from Israel, and I feel confident that their Governments will prove equal to the tremendous task that confronts them.

It seems to my delegation that the greatest possible mistake we could make in this difficult moment would be to fail to examine the deep underlying causes of all those disturbing facts. By its quick and, decisive action, the United Nations may have prevented or postponed the dangers of military conflict, but it cannot be said that the great pressures that created the conflicting factors have been removed. It is up to us all, in the Assembly, to put utmost frankness at the service of world peace and try, through it, to point out the causes of disturbances that must be removed before the basis for a lasting and just peace can be found.

There are very obvious economic motives behind all the phenomena we are trying to understand. It seems quite clear that most of the political and military pressures that were brought to bear recently on the international scene have been fundamentally at the service of the most basic economic needs of the different participants. On the one side, we see less developed countries, whose peoples cannot accept underdevelopment any longer, in a frantic search for the means by which to accelerate their development process, entering different systems of military alliance in the hope of thus deserving a greater degree of help from the leaders or sub-leaders in those systems. On the other hand, we see the developed countries trying to perpetuate a system of international relationships that will guarantee for them in the future, as it did in the past, a virtual

lifeline of essential supplies to which their economies have become adapted through long periods and whose disappearance would entail readaptation hardships they are not psychologically or economically prepared to face. The very problems arising from the competition between the free enterprise group of nations and the centrally planned economies must be, in the long run, solved by the ability of each group to foster or speed up economic development.

With the President's permission, I shall now make a few remarks on the other event that has stirred the feelings of the whole world in recent week. I am referring to the action undertaken by the armed forces of the Soviet Union to quench and raze the legitimate aspirations of the gallant people of Hungary. During the debate that took place on this issue during the second emergency Special Session of the General Assembly, my delegation had the opportunity of express its opinion on this tragic event. I only want to add that we are convinced that those who lost their lives fighting in the streets of Budapest did not die in vain. Their cause, which is the cause of freedom, cannot be destroyed by the sheer weight of power. Among those countries which are closely linked to the Soviet Union, a trend has been set which is irreversible. The sooner the mighty Russian nation recognizes this fact, the better it will fare in the long run, for the real and loyal friendship of free nations has always proved a better guarantee of security than any other form of influence or domination.

I shall now say just a few words about two important international issues, one on the European scene and the other in the Far East. Unity in Europe is an indispensable element to world achieved without the reunification of Germany. Conditions in the modern world have changed so radically with the advent of atomic power that the danger of a recurrent German aggressive spirit is no longer an important threat to the security of the countries neighboring that once powerful patron. We recognize the special interests of the Soviet Union in the settlement of the German question, but we cannot admit that it would be in the interest of the Soviet Union to keep alive this issue and by so doing to block the natural peaceful development of progress in Western Europe. As regards the Far East, Japan has to play an increasingly important role in world affairs. To this end, it is urgent that Japan be admitted to the United Nations and that the maneuvers that have so long impeded that action cease forthwith.

I have already mentioned the formation of the United Nations Emergency Force as a highly commendable development of far-reaching implications for tin future effectiveness of United Nations action. It might be wise for the General Assembly to envisage certain practical measures

to ensure the implementation of resolution 377A (V) paragraph 8, in order that the armed forces of every Member State might have, on a permanent basis, one or more units always available to the United Nations. These units, the size of which would be left to the discretion of the Member State concerned, could perhaps someday fly the flag of the United Nations together with their own national flag. The psychological effect to be derived if this suggestion were accepted would tend to create, on a worldwide basis, a feeling of greater respect for our Organization, and the requisitioning of troops in obedience to resolutions adopted either by the Security Council or by the General Assembly would come to be regarded as normal procedure.

During its history, the United Nations has never before been beset by so many problems of a political and economic nature. May I express the hope flat, at the end of our labors, the world will say that the eleventh session of the General Assembly was worthy of the great hopes that mankind placed in it.

New York, November 12, 1956.

1957

1957

With the launching of the Sputnik, in 1957, the Soviet challenge to the scientific and military hegemony of the United States gained credibility. The possibilities opened by the intercontinental missile technologies changed strategic conceptions radically.

As a result of the decolonization process and the successive application of the doctrines of *containment* and *retaliation*, both the United States and the Soviet Union became extensively involved in the Third World. American clandestine operations aimed at overthrowing Soviet-leaning governments increased in number: Iran (1953), Guatemala (1954). In 1958 it would be Indonesia's turn. These trends, whose development in the 1960's would include Cuba (1961) and Santo Domingo (1965), were combined with support to non-Communist regimes in Southeast Asia threatened by internal revolutionary armed movements propped up by Moscow and/or Beijing. The direct involvement of the United States in Vietnam started in 1954.

In Europe, where concern over the strategic and ideological polarization of the world kept growing, a fundamental step toward the consolidation of a different power nucleus was taken: the Treaty of Rome established the European Economic Community. In Africa and Asia, the independence of Ghana and Malaysia pushed forth the process of decolonization.

Brazil entered a phase of growth after the initial instability of the Kubitschek government. The construction of Brasília was started and the

process industrialization gathered speed, opening up positive prospects for the country, despite frequent strikes.

In this context Brazilian diplomacy signaled some change in its views and perceptions of the world. Oswaldo Aranha presented to the Twelfth Session of the General Assembly a new Brazilian world view, no longer arising from the automatic positioning of the country in the international strategic scene, but rather a distinct evaluation of the national interest. Having become well-known among Brazilian leaders for the formulation of the policy of alliance with the United States, Oswaldo Aranha criticized the lack of cooperation for the development of Latin America. His words show frustration at the course taken by the global strategic evaluation and at the secondary role reserved for Latin America.

The 1957 speech is remarkable for its clarity, candor and argumentative strength and contains the elements that would provoke substantive transformations in the *weltanschaung* of Brazilian diplomacy. From then on, the axis of external concerns of Brazil started to shift from an East-West direction to concentrate in a North-South course. Brazil began to identify economic inequalities rather than politico-ideological polarities as structural elements responsible for the international tensions. Coming back to New York ten years after having presided over the General Assembly, Oswaldo Aranha made a pessimistic assessment of the state of the world and the accomplishments of the United Nations. There is a limit, he said emphatically, starting from which inequalities can threaten international community.

In the 1957 speech the conceptual foundations of the project which in the next few years would become the "Pan American Operation" already appear.

Oswaldo Aranha may possibly have been the first Brazilian representative to describe his country as situated in the European-North American universe, characterizing it instead first as Latin American and then as a member of the developing world.

XII Regular Session of the General Assembly of the United Nations 1957

Ambassador Oswaldo Aranha [*]

Mr. President,

It gives me a special pleasure to be the first today to applaud your election to the presidency of this session of the General Assembly, a tribute to your personal qualities and to your devotion to the United Nations, and to the constant and valuable support of your country to the tasks of our Organization.

It is ten years since I had the honor of being with you and, indeed, of presiding over the discussions in the Assembly. On returning, after a decade, it is with great emotion that I find here the same endeavor to serve our great ideal, inspiring my newly-met-fellow-workers as well as those among the old companions who, like myself, have returned to the scene of our joint labors. Ten years ago a hard war had ended, and in the United Nations our main concern and conversations were about peace. Today, when peace is needed as never before in order that mankind may survive, the talk is almost only of war. It is common knowledge that in that space of time, instead of disarming, the nations not only have continued to arm themselves at an increasing rate, but they have even created dreadful, weapons which a few great powers practically monopolize. It would seem that the grim privilege of casting the lot for war or for peace lies in

[*] **Oswaldo Euclides de Souza Aranha**, born in Alegrete, RS, on February 15, 1894. Bachelor in Legal and Juridical Sciences from the Faculty of Law of Rio de Janeiro. Minister of State of Justice and Internal Affairs from 12/30 to 12/31, when he was moved to the Finance Ministry where he stayed until 1934, and from 6/53 to 8/54. Minister of State for External Relations from 3/15/1938 to 8/23/1944. † Rio de Janeiro, January 27, 1960.

the hands of those who command the newly developed source of energy or who may command it in future. It might be feared, consequently, that conditions would be established which would permit the existence of world dictatorships under the very shadow of the United Nations, a complete negation of the spirit which brought about the rise of this Organization.

A new way of life is thus being imposed upon the peoples of the world. Instead of the promotion of security and mutual confidence between nations, and of growth in individual well-being and equality, we are still confronted by controls and obstacles to a full judicial, economic and social communion. As individuals and peoples, we run the risk of becoming today less free, less equal, and even less peaceful.

I hope my fellow representatives will forgive me if I seem rather pessimistic in comparing 1947 with 1957. But I can assure you that the people and the Government of Brazil continue to believe, as I do, that it is here, in the United Nations, that the peaceful solution of regional and world problems and conflicts can and must be achieved. Brazil represents a large part of the territory, the population and the natural wealth of the Americas. We are undergoing a phase of intense development. As a people, we have no aspirations that might surpass the bounds of our possibilities, of our frontiers or of our peaceful and pacifying traditions.

For more than a century, we have clung to the principles and commitments of Pan Americanism, which have welded our continent, not only into a single territory, but also into a single way of thinking, a single sentiment and even a united international attitude. Pan-Americanism has been integrated into the United Nations in order that it may be a servant of world peace. The organization of the continental family has endeavored always to serve the interests and the progress of the entire world. Of the many thousands of millions of dollars expended by America throughout the world in the years following the establishment of the United Nations, a very minor share was allotted to the countries on our continent. Our various Governments supported and even applauded the decision of an American nation to expend in aid to Western and Eastern Europe, and to Asia itself, larger sums in one year than it had done in an entire decade of cooperation with its sister nations on the continent. This attitude of the United States toward areas overseas did not impair the spirit of Pan Americanism. It was construed rather as a reaffirmation of its worldwide significance. It never was the purpose of the founders of our system to create a prosperous and happy continent disregarding

poverty and unhappiness elsewhere in the world. Only Governments that are not truly and intimately democratic can seek to promote a kind of welfare that is not for all.

It was for this reason that, in the middle of the war, the American countries gave support to the establishment of international agencies whose main objective would be to expedite the recovery of the devastated areas. To this end, they contributed the best of the resources at their disposal. The international financial organization created at the United Nations Monetary and Financial Conference held at Bretton Woods in July 1944, and in which all the American nations have a share, included the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development. It was given two equally important missions: one, that of reconstructing the war-torn areas, and the other, a long-range one, that of providing assistance to economically underdeveloped countries.

Today, we see not only that the nations which suffered the most under the impact of war are entirely reconstructed, but also that they have indeed surpassed their own pre-war levels, while the other nations actually, show a decrease, both in public and in individual revenue, when their demographic growth is taken into consideration. I do not mean to say that one economic level should apply to all nations alike, but rather that there is a limit beyond which inequality can jeopardize world communion. Returning, however, to the subject of recovery from war-wrought havoc, we see that some of the reconstructed nations have even initiated investment programs aiming at the economic development of other areas. It is an undeniable fact that the task of reconstruction was fully accomplished.

The moment has come, therefore, for the United Nations to give the necessary emphasis, through its specialized agencies, to the problems of development and of economic and social balance. In the specific case of the International Bank, for instance, it is imperative that development should benefit from the priority heretofore given to recovery.

I feel sure that the point of view which I have expressed in regard to this problem is not only that of my country but also that of all the American peoples. However, we are not a "bloc", nor do we want to be one. The American Republics are not led by aspirations of an exclusively continental nature. Ours are well defined ways of political thought, of living, of being, and of conducting international relationships.

I return today to your midst with the same mandate from my Government and with the same faith in our Organization. The problems which confronts such as the wider acceptance of the compulsory

jurisdiction of the International Court of Justice, the equality of nations, the self-determination of peoples, the emancipation of areas ender trusteeship, the regulation, limitation and balanced reduction of armaments and armed forces, as well as economic and social development, technical assistance and so many others should not be looked upon as being too great or too small, too difficult or too easy, or, still less, as insoluble. They are the same problems of mankind, ever cropping up, which man will have to solve if he wishes to survive. Most of these problems have arisen because of our lack of foresight. It is up to us to solve them. To men of good will, a mistake is temporary and may well serve as a stimulus to better thought and action.

The exacerbation of nationalism in the world, for instance, is an effect, not a cause. Lack of understanding, inequitable distribution of economic and financial resources and of production and surpluses: all these have created that and other justifiable forms of national and popular vindication. The less developed peoples, as well as those which, like Brazil, are in the process of development, should not really be blamed for the present trend towards mistrust, towards misbelieve in fair and rational world cooperation. It is natural that each people should wish to be the master of itself and of its own destiny, to live with and for all the others instead of depending upon them. It is not our wish to impoverish the rich or to weaken the strong. We want an equilibrium of power and a fairer access by all peoples to the instruments of prosperity and to the sources of the well-being of mankind if we depart from such an orientation, our work here will be in vain, and the problems of the world will multiply in pace with a trend towards an even more armed travesty of peace and an aggravation of misery, of hardship and of fear of those very conflicts which we have set ourselves to eliminate forever from the life of the peoples.

I am here to continue the series of efforts which you, Mr. President, and my predecessors have made during other sessions of the General Assembly. Those efforts are pledged, as they have been in the past, to the achievement of the purposes and objectives of United Nations, in order to help in the solution of all international problems, along the lines laid down by the Charter, as so ably summarized by the Secretary-General in his last report on the work of the Organization.

Such is our task, our mission and our duty, the best incentive for each and every one of us is the assurance that men and women in all regions of the world look upon the United Nations for guidance and aid, as the last hope for peace and security. It may not always be possible for

us to achieve our aims but the fact carries weight that our Organization can be present wherever might tries to masquerade as right. We may fall short of our task, but the United Nations must keep forging ahead.

I cannot believe that, even in this troubled world of ours, anyone could possibly wish to see the doors of this house closed without feeling that the shadows of war would be descending upon the nations to darken forever the relationships between peoples and the most cherished hopes of mankind.

New York, September 19, 1957.

1958

1958

As a result of a policy of establishment of a world network of security agreements, in 1958 the United States had assumed explicit obligations for the defense of more that forty countries. Implicitly, many others joined the fabric of external security woven by the U.S. during the Cold War years. The "Eisenhower doctrine" would be applied in Lebanon in that year: the United States would defend any country of the region if militarily threatened by a nation controlled by international communism. By then, the United States had effectively turned into a superpower. Able to act militarily in any part of the globe, America had extended its security area to the whole world. Any development, in any latitude, had direct or indirect interest to the United States. The Cold War assumed a threatening profile.

Something that might be called the beginning of Latin American insertion in the context of the East-West confrontation emerged at that time and took full shape in the following year with the rise of Fidel Castro in Cuba. In May 1958, Vice-President Richard Nixon visited several countries in the region and faced a hostile atmosphere, including physical attacks in Lima and Caracas. The frustration of the region at the attitude of the United States, generally perceived as one of aloofness and lack of interest, was visible. Brazilian diplomacy tried to utilize to its advantage that moment in international relations. At the time, Brazil had increased expectations of economic development generated

by the growth of the automobile industry, by the establishment of a communications infrastructure and by the construction of Brasília.

In his statement before the Thirteenth Session of the General Assembly, Foreign Minister Francisco Negrão de Lima extolled Pan American unity, which he characterized as a new movement in international politics which would promote the struggle against underdevelopment in a global scale. Negrão de Lima's speech would become the international christening of "Pan American Operation" (OPA in the Portuguese acronym). The diplomatic mobilization then conceived and implemented brought back a traditional trend of Brazilian diplomacy since the time of the Baron of Rio Branco to serve as a bridge between the United States and the remaining countries in the hemisphere. It offered mechanisms of dialogue and cooperation in order to make possible for the United States to perform a substantive role in the process of the region's development and at the same time to countervail the growing influence of Communism and of the USSR.

A remarkable feature of Minister Negrão de Lima's speech is the express linkage, perhaps for the first time in that solemn forum and by a high Brazilian official, between underdevelopment and the threats to international peace and security. Made at the time of the Cold War, this assertion unveiled a Brazilian perception significantly at variance with the strategic tenets of the United States. Latin American countries, said the Brazilian Minister, can no longer accept passively an unfair state of affairs and are determined to undertake an offensive aimed at increasing the value of deprived regions and the well-being of their population.

XIII Regular Session of the General Assembly of the United Nations 1958

Minister Francisco Negrão de Lima [*]

Mr. President,

I should first like to congratulate you, Mr. President, on the honor conferred upon you by the peoples represented here in electing you to the high office of President of the thirteenth session of the United Nations General Assembly. At this grave juncture in human affairs, your experience, your broad vision of the problems of the day and the trust with which you are regarded in the United Nations permit us to look forward with assurance to the success of our deliberations.

In taking the floor in this general debate with which we are beginning the thirteenth session of the General Assembly, I feel it would be appropriate for me to give the representatives of nearly all the countries of the world assembled here more information on the new international policy in which Brazil is engaged together with the other American States.

Although the movement to infuse new life into our continental unity, the Pan American Unity Movement, was of regional origin, my Government considers that it goes far beyond those bounds and takes on universal significance and scope, for its purposes correspond to the aspirations and needs of all peoples.

[*] **Francisco Negrão de Lima**, Born in Nepomuceno, MG, on August 24, 1901. Bachelor in Law from the Faculty of Law of the Federal University of Minas Gerais. Acting Minister of Justice, in September 1938, March 1939, August 1939 and from 1/17 to 3/19 1941. Minister of State for External Relations from 7/3/1958 to 8/10/1959. † Rio de Janeiro, October 26, 1981.

Surely the best way to achieve the aims for which States attend the meetings of the United Nations is to deal more intelligently and effectively with the difficulties which urgently require solution in the various parts of the world.

It is also obvious that it is easier to deal with matters with which we are closely and directly familiar than to attempt, as effectively, to settle affairs arising outside the areas to which we belong.

My Government felt that in view of the desires and needs of the American peoples made manifest on so many occasions, the time had come to take decisive and energetic action to put an end to the underdevelopment of the American continent. We felt that we could no longer close our eyes to the distressing conditions in which the populations of wide areas of our continent were living and so cruelly suffering from the evils of underdevelopment. We would have no moral authority for carrying out the international obligations imposed upon us by the United Nations Charter if we could not at the same time demonstrate our determination to correct those evils.

That is why the Brazilian delegation strongly and enthusiastically joined with those States which at the twelfth session of the Assembly proposed the establishment of an economic commission for Africa. We consider that we should offer the peoples of Africa the opportunity and the means of making a thorough study of their difficulties and the solutions required. A better knowledge of the needs of that continent will undoubtedly help to mitigate the political repercussions of primarily economic and social factors.

There can be no doubt that there is a clear connection between the underdevelopment of certain areas and the local frictions which are jeopardizing peace. Poverty and unrest are a breeding-ground for a policy of despair which once and for all may doom all attempts to establish international harmony. Thirteen years of United Nations experience have shown that underdevelopment is the greatest real threat to collective security, for it always serves as a weapon of mass agitation and of national resentment against more fortunate nations. This state of dissatisfaction leads some nations into the dangerous path of accepting ideologies contrary to their own political and cultural tradition in the illusory hope of finding a satisfactory solution of their problems. If those with the material means to remedy this situation do not hasten to do so, we shall soon see the collapse of those important values of civilization which are essential to the complete fulfillment of the principle of universality of the United Nations; for this will be the consequence of

the disintegrating effect of the growing feeling of despair in the hearts of the forgotten peoples.

Brazil wholeheartedly supported the idea of a joint and carefully planned program for the harmonious development of continental economies in the conviction that new prospects would thus be opened for the achievement of peace. Our eagerness to take the first steps in that crusade impels us to put the question herein universal terms. We do so because we are convinced that no one may raise the banner of hope who is not concerned with the anxieties and needs of his own people or who, on the pretext of serving the remote ideals of all mankind, neglects to bring relief to the urgent and immediate evils.

It is well to remember what has been said here time and again, namely, that technological development intensifies and aggravates the economic disparities between certain nations. It was with that in mind that the President of Brazil, Mr. Kubitschek, addressed to the President of the United States, Mr. Eisenhower, a letter which was immediately well received and provoked such a favorable response on the American continent. I should like to emphasize that, by taking that initiative, the Brazilian Government was not seeking political, economic or other advantages for Brazil alone. On the contrary, its desire was to serve the interests of all the nations of the continent, while at the same time remaining loyal to the principles of the United Nations Charter, the basic purpose of which is to promote the well-being of all the peoples of the world.

I think I have made it clear that in the mind of President Juscelino Kubitschek the earnest desire for Pan American unity, despite being a regional movement, is also one which is a part of the general struggle against underdevelopment. The economic problems which the Pan American movement hopes to settle are neither new nor different from those being dealt with by the various organs of the United Nations. On the contrary, for some time now, the United Nations has been examining those matters in great detail and in hundreds of studies, solutions and recommendations, which unfortunately have not yet been put into practice. And the reason they have not been put into effect is that there has been lacking, until now, the creative spirit born of a determined public opinion convinced of the inescapable necessity of victory in the battle against underdevelopment.

In view of the favorable response to that idea as shown in statements emanating from government circles and in the press of the countries which make up the great American community, we believe

we can assure this Assembly that there is a readiness in our continent to go beyond the passive acceptance of an injustice and to launch a joint irreversible offensive for the economic betterment of the areas which have been abandoned and for the welfare of their peoples.

We also believe that the improvement of the general living conditions of peoples everywhere resulting from the realization of plans such as we are now supporting will undoubtedly bring about a relaxation of prevailing political tensions, thus releasing funds now being used for the sterile purpose of an armament race in order that they may be applied to speeding the process of the economic and social emancipation of mankind. We shall thus have progressed to an era in which the tremendous power now being diverted to increasing the potential for destruction will be directed towards peaceful competition between the highly industrialized countries for the leadership and rapid improvement of the economically underdeveloped areas.

These days, when scientific conquests far exceed the dreams of our ancestors, when the great Powers are attempting to conquer the polar wilderness and outer space, man must not forget himself; he must rediscover in himself the centre and purpose of his achievements. The economic salvation of man gives a meaning to his life and allows for the complete fulfillment of his personality that is the supreme benefit it has to offer mankind.

Since I have the floor, I should not like to neglect this very special opportunity, in the name of my country, to proclaim our firm conviction that the human spirit will achieve a balance, harmony and understanding among peoples. For this, there must be solidarity among all men of goodwill who accept the principles of the United Nations, for the United Nations has successfully staved off so many dangers, and has behaved with calm and serenity at the gravest moment when our hopes appeared on the verge of being crushed.

New York, September 18, 1958.

1959

1959

As President Kubitschek's term drew to a close, the first movements of the process of his succession and the acceleration of inflation provoked instability. In May, the visit of Fidel Castro to Brazil generated mistrust in American circles. To give satisfaction to nationalistic groups, the President announced in July, in a speech at the Military Club, the severance of relations with the International Monetary Fund. The creation of SUDENE (Superintendency of Northeastern Development) at the end of the year showed the determination of the government to promote the development of the Northeastern region under the patronage of the State. A few days before a military uprising, quickly controlled by legalist forces, had taken place at Aragarças.

On the international level, the Sino-Soviet split had started to become evident since 1958. Contacts between the U.S. and the USSR intensified. In September, Khruschev made a long journey in the United States. The Soviet leader took pains to create seductive images in the American society. At the level of the superpowers the scenario seemed to evolve in a positive climate. The Soviet leadership would propose the concept of peaceful coexistence in 1959.

Following developments in Cuba, however, the hemispheric countries would be called to reaffirm their loyalties in the context of the East-West confrontation. In tune with Latin American military leaders, the United States showed signs of concern with the eventual progress of

Soviet influence in a region that until then occupied a marginal position in the context of the Cold War.

Brazilian diplomacy saw the opportunities brought about by that moment as favorable for the reformulation of hemispheric relations. Essentially, it was a question of encouraging the United States to turn its views to the regional scene. The Pan American Operation (OPA) was conceived as an instrument of dialogue and cooperation aimed at engaging the United States in the process of stability and growth of Latin America.

In his statement before the Fourteenth Session of the General Assembly, Ambassador Augusto Frederico Schmidt, Special Advisor to President Juscelino Kubitschek, presented vigorously the Brazilian proposals. His diagnosis of the international situation represents a step forward in the gradual path of Brazil away from the ideological confrontation. The benevolent hope that in the traditional Brazilian discourse always used to soften the demands for international cooperation, gave way, in Ambassador Schmidt's words, to expressions of impatience and displeasure. The problems of underdevelopment could no longer be postponed while advanced nations exhibited material and scientific progress.

The intention of the Brazilian delegation was not, however, to express resentment. Brazil was mustering its own resources to overcome underdevelopment. What was not understandable – and Ambassador Schmidt's speech put the question in rather hash terms – was that simply because they owned more resources, some countries considered themselves capable of determining exclusively which views of the world were the correct ones. Instead of striving to prepare for war, highly developed countries should in fact strive to cooperate to eliminate underdevelopment.

The vehement and substantive speech of Ambassador Schmidt concluded with a presentation of the objectives of Pan American Operation and an exhortation to combat poverty, sickness and ignorance. He asserted that the apathy of the international community for those problems is a crime against reason, an attack on civilization and an act showing lack of political wisdom, with incalculable consequences for world peace.

XIV Regular Session of the General Assembly of the United Nations 1959

Ambassador Augusto Frederico Schmidt [*]

Mr. President,

The pride which I feel in speaking at this moment in the name of Brazil is enhanced, Mr. President, by my gratification at being the first to express to you our deep feeling of pleasure at your assumption of the highest office of the General Assembly. I do not wish this tribute to be a mere act of courtesy. I want rather to express to you in the warmest terms the admiration and the esteem which my delegation feels for so eminent a person as Victor Andrés Belaúnde, an outstanding figure in American humanist and legal scholarship, a constant champion of the most noble causes, a speaker of unequalled gifts whose eloquent voice has, since the memorable days of San Francisco, never ceased to captivate and sway the United Nations. The high office to which you have just been appointed, Mr. President, is a token of the confidence all of us have placed in your experience, your wisdom, your talents as a diplomat and your vigor. We can be sure that under your enlightened guidance the General Assembly at its present session will perform its duties in a worthy manner.

At a moment when technological progress and men's determination have made possible a new advance in the conquest of outer space, I feel

[*] **Augusto Frederico Schmidt**, Born in Rio de Janeiro, on April 18,1906. Advisor to the Presidency of the Republic in the Kubitschek administration, charged mainly with directing OPA (Operation Pan America). Headed with distinction the Brazilian Delegation to the Fourteenth Session of the General Assembly of the United Nations and was President of the Committee of 21 at the Bogota Conference, in Colombia. † Rio de Janeiro, February 8, 1965.

that the best course I can follow in this speech is to draw attention once again to the dangers inherent in the ever increasing neglect of the human being. Let me say first that I am well aware that the cause for which I speak, the improvement of mankind's condition, is not which at the moment commands much interest. This is no doubt a time of wonderful technical achievements, but in spite of all that has been said here and elsewhere, the human problem has not been given the priority it deserves. The millennium of man, it seems, still lies in the distant future. What is needed to elevate man to his proper status is a spiritual policy which we have not yet begun to formulate, let alone practice.

In the present age, the nations represented here are living at different stages of development. We have discovered a means of reaching mutual understanding in our exchanges here of words and ideas, but this intermingling of different stages of development has no precedent in the history of mankind. The moon has been reached; artificial satellites and planets are being created; but at the same time many communities, many millions of human beings are starving in conditions as backwards as those of the most distant past. While the prospects offered by science are growing as if by magic before our eyes and while populations are expanding, human poverty, too, continues to grow.

After the relaxation of international tension which followed the visit of the Vice-President of the United States, Mr. Nixon, to the USSR, we had the impression that a new phase was about to begin, and that it might be possible at last to give fresh impetus to the struggle against the poverty which prevails over so large a portion of the world; we already had a feeling, not exactly that a period of calm had set in, but that there was less apprehension than there had been when suddenly we heard of the grave incidents in Asia. Before those incidents there had been grounds for believing that the two greatest Powers were ready to come to an understanding, and the Brazilian delegation had been about to propose to the United Nations a new attitude and even a new course to follow; but then those sudden incidents made us all fear that we should have to wait a little longer for that stability which the most highly developed nations regard as indispensable before at last, using but a modest portion of the sums allocated for military purposes, the peoples can declare war for, and not against, mankind, war against underdevelopment, against the slavery to which two thirds of mankind is subjected.

Once more it seems that peoples urgently needing international cooperation to solve their problems are faced by the grim reality of perpetual procrastination. Some countries, like my own, merely need

help to intensify their arduous efforts to develop themselves; but others need an initial impetus to wrench them out of the unnatural stagnation in which they live.

These countries know perfectly well how much time and patience will be needed if, before genuine solutions rather than mere palliatives can be offered, they must wait until the two concepts of life which now divide the world are finally reconciled.

These words from my delegation are intended to express our impatience and weariness in the face of perpetual threats which so seriously delay far-reaching decisions that could free the majority of our fellow men from a bondage that has lasted far too long. But this impatience and weariness are not mingled with despair. We genuinely believe that a day will come when maturity, born of political education and not of technical progress, will remove the causes of this cold war which gives rise to so much depression and discouragement and which, however "cold" it may appear to be, is still marked by some cleverly spaced episodes of blood and violence.

But this hope is for the distant future, and the present situation cannot be accepted with resignation; the least one can do is to appeal to reason and self interest, since the present time is not opportune for invoking more noble or exalted ideals.

The purport of this appeal to reason is that our system – the system that my country, which is the proud defender of democracy and freedom, has adopted – shall no longer continue to harbor within itself such serious contradictions. And it is serious indeed that we should be putting forward solutions for mankind's problems while tolerating the continued existence of inhuman living conditions over such vast areas of the free world.

If we have to wait until the two extremes are reconciled and until the echoes of conflict cease to ring out in this building, then succeeding generations will go on dying of hunger in many parts of the world, and people will go on constructing instruments of death which soon become obsolete, owing to the insane rate of development in science applied to the service of death and destruction.

I wish to state here as clearly as I can my delegation's point of view. We firmly believe that, in so doing, we are best serving the cause of democracy and that of the United Nations, which should truly reflect the various aspects of contemporary anxiety and must, if it is to survive and go on playing its role, avoid rigidity, immobility and formalism. The United Nations is not a talking machine or a prayer wheel.

The Brazilian delegation is not adopting an unrealistic attitude of recrimination or resentment. Our country is doing all it can to shake off the yoke of poverty. Its prospects, its natural resources and its determination will enable it one day to become a fully developed nation.

My delegation's position is based mainly on the justifiable fear that the very efforts which countries with the heaviest responsibilities are making to maintain peace and security may prevent them from obtaining a sufficiently broad and clear view of the serious dangers inherent in the present sufferings of mankind. The fact that certain countries have powerful resources, are familiar with certain problems and possess valuable knowledge does not necessarily mean that they can view the world situation in all its aspects or obtain a wider vision of the future. We could give countless examples of the shortsightedness of splendid civilizations and empires which, with all their wealth and all their knowledge and in spite of their proud claims to eternity, finally tumbled into the abyss of history. Peoples do not learn lessons from history; the experience of nations, like that of men, however many object lessons it may offer, apparently cannot be handed down.

The best way for the more highly developed countries to serve democracy is not ceaselessly to prepare for a war which will never take place, at least not in the way they expect or envisage it, while the evils of underdevelopment continue to undermine and enfeeble the world. Everyone now knows that mankind is divided into two groups: the first, ever diminishing in numbers, which enjoys a prosperous and comfortable life, and the second, growing ever larger, which is deprived of food and education and condemned to premature death. It is no longer a secret that the real war is the war which is ravaging ever wider areas of the underdeveloped regions. This is now a dangerous and disconcerting fact, a truth which is proclaimed from the rooftops, but never inspires any efforts to produce a remedy.

The Brazilian delegation wishes to recall the underlying principle of the new international policy adopted by Mr. Juscelino Kubitschek, the President of the Brazilian Republic. More than a year ago a regional movement was launched among the twenty-one American Republics. Its main objective is to secure recognition of the overriding need and extreme urgency for joint action by the countries of our continent to foster a more rapid and harmonious development of their economies.

The principal features of this policy – known as Operation Pan America – were made known to the United Nations by the Minister of Foreign Affairs of Brazil at the opening of the thirteenth session of the General Assembly. Operation Pan America aims at strengthening the

economic basis of Pan Americanism by the adoption of a body of vigorous and coordinated measures designed to eliminate obstacles impeding the development of those Latin American countries whose economies require a powerful stimulus if they are to overcome their backwardness and advance to an era of industrialization, full utilization of natural resources and expansion of trade. Only in this way will it be possible to raise the level of living of the Latin-American nations and thus place two-thirds of our continent in the best position to defend our civilization's highest values. The political thesis underlying Operation Pan America has been defined by the President of Brazil in the following terms:

> We have always been prepared, as have been the other countries of the continent, to assist in the great task of maintaining international peace and security. We adopt a similar fundamental attitude towards the perils confronting mankind today. For this very reason, and because the common heritage of civilization is at stake, we wish to be more than mere bystanders. Our contribution will be valuable only to the extent that it expresses our desire to analyze frankly the great problems of common interest, to state our views freely and to seek out the solutions best adapted to the needs of the hour. We wish to work successfully as a team and not to remain indefinitely bound by an attitude of passive assent. I should like, however, to reaffirm that our efforts will have no significance, will acquire no momentum and will fail to produce the desired results unless they are construed as the end product of the unanimous opinion of the continent.

The continent's opinion on the usefulness and appropriateness of Operation Pan America is not open to question. Several concrete steps have already been taken and references to the matter by the continent's statesmen are becoming increasingly specific. Just last month, as he was leaving for Europe, the President of the United States, Mr. Eisenhower, stated that the nations of the free world should "cooperate in helping solve one of the most pressing problems of our time, that of assisting to advance the cultural, health and living standards of the almost 2.000 million people in the world who are citizens of the newly developing or underdeveloped countries".

This same thought, which is not simply humanitarian but which is based on a clear insight into events and a prudent sense of political reality, has been expressed by another eminent Head of State, General de Gaulle, who at a recent press conference expressed the view that the highly industrialized countries should, irrespective of their political beliefs, join their efforts and their material and human resources in order to provide

effective aid to the people of underdeveloped areas. Emphasizing that such a policy would be more likely to resolve world problems than any purely political formula or compromise reached by the great powers, General de Gaulle declared: "The only cause worth fighting for is the cause of mankind". These are words which merit much meditation.

Thus there is no difference of opinion on the necessity and urgency of combating underdevelopment. Why do we not act more forcefully in this field, thereby rightfully defending our civilization and our political heritage, and proving the sincerity of purpose of democratic cause? Why do we not raise this campaign from the limited tactical plane to the plane of broad strategy based on a correct and comprehensive understanding of the situation? Why should we not adopt a creative policy under which potentially wealthy areas of the world might be developed? What is preventing the leading nations of the world from acquiring a loftier and broader view, instead of obstinately fixing their gaze on the wall of what is immediately before them? What prevents us from putting an end to the seething confusion that has spread throughout the world? Those who think that the fight against underdevelopment is nothing more than a work of charity have been and are tragically mistaken. This fight is a chapter in the defense of freedom throughout the world and it is to our detriment that it has not been considered as such, for it is a problem which has moral ramifications, rendering its solution more difficult both for the realist and the strategist. How can we explain why the cause of man has been the most scorned of all causes? Perhaps a reason lies in the immaturity, in the extreme youth of the human race. René Grousset wrote: "Scratch a civilized man and you will find a caveman".

The lack of solidarity, the absence of feeling before the spectacle of underdevelopment, the lack of an instinctive desire for self-defense against and of comprehension of that phenomenon's destructive force, are so much evidence that the caveman is not so different from those who boast they are members of a refined civilization.

My country does not intend to alter its position or the prudent and firm line it has always taken in the deliberations of our organization. A founding Member of the United Nations, Brazil has always been an ardent defender of the purposes and principles of the Charter. Prompted by feelings of prudent optimism with respect to the more relaxed atmosphere which seems currently to prevail in the direct relations between the great Powers, it will never fail to give its support to any Initiative taken in good faith, whatever its origin, so long as that initiative shows promise

of restoring a minimum of confidence in international negotiations and of leading to a full discussion of the problems and solutions upon which the maintenance of peace and security by this Organization depends. We founded this Organization to abolish war for ever and we hope that it will not remain at the sidelines but will direct the course of events for the welfare of the peoples of the world.

To this attitude, which is the logical consequence of Brazil's history and its international activity, Brazil adds today as a matter of highest priority, the policy of international cooperation in the field of development, which is the policy of the future and the policy of hope.

We are profoundly convinced that, as the Brazilian Head of State has stated, apathy in the face of the problems of poverty, disease and ignorance in a world which has at its disposal every imaginable scientific and technical resources, is a crime against man's mind, an attack upon our alleged civilization, an unpardonable moral offence and an act of political imprudence which will have incalculable consequences for the peace of the world.

May these words of warning be heeded while there is still time.

New York, September 18, 1959.

1960

1960

The American obsession with the Cuban question would completely dominate the hemispheric agenda from 1960 on. Meeting in San José and later in Bogotá, Latin American foreign ministers reiterated the democratic postulates of their governments and together with the United States examined formulas to promote regional development. Brazil would also try to play a leading role in the process, but the difficulties of the dialogue with the United States finally foiled the initiatives. Brazilian attempts to moderate American positions collided with what was then perceived as an unwavering Cuban decision to look for an alliance with the USSR, something which in the prevailing regional panorama was seen as a threat to the integrity of the Inter-American system.

The positive developments of the previous year in the relationship between the United States and the Soviet Union would be nullified in 1960, with the episode of the shooting down of the American spy plane U-2. For that reason the Summit Conference of the Four Great Powers in Paris was cancelled, as well as the programmed visit of President Eisenhower to the USSR. While reiterating his objectives of "peaceful coexistence" with the United States, Khruschev adopted an aggressive posture. That would be the interpretation given to his frequent tirades about the destructive capabilities of Soviet missiles, his shoe wielding at the Plenary of the General Assembly of the United Nations and the support lent by the USSR to Cuba and several armed national liberation movements which had sprung up in Africa. Khruschev seemed to believe in intimidation as

a means to force the United States to negotiate with the Soviet Union on the basis of equality.

On the eve of the election of Jânio Quadros and in the midst of an electoral campaign politically and ideologically charged, testing the limits of the weak Brazilian democracy, there were scant possibilities open to the creativity of Brazilian diplomacy at the United Nations. In the Kubitschek years, the country had grown at an average rate of 7 percent yearly. Industrial production increased by 80 percent. Nevertheless, the Brazilian internal panorama remained highly instable due to internal political polarities, nurtured by the global strategic confrontation.

In his statement before the Fifteenth General Assembly, Foreign Minister Horácio Lafer would still strive to keep alive the Brazilian policy for Latin America. However, it was not possible for him to mask the disappointment of the Brazilian diplomacy with the frustration, due to American lack of interest, of its expectation to reinvigorate hemispheric cooperation. Brazil had already reestablished commercial links with the USSR in December 1959. At the United Nations, it would start to defend ideological plurality for the first time. Horácio Lafer even employed the expression "peaceful coexistence" despite its Soviet connotation. The principle of non-intervention also would appear formally in this speech for the first time in the Brazilian external policy lexicon. The ideological cleavages that characterized the world at the time were considered inevitable. On the other hand, in Minister Lafer's speech Brazil made for the first time a correlation between disarmament and development, by proposing the convening of a conference aimed at establishing a system to ensure that savings generated by the process of arms reduction would make up an international development fund.

Together with the economic emphasis and the attention given to the question of disarmament, two constant concerns of Brazil at the United Nations, Minister Lafer did not refrain from reiterating the adherence of Brazil to the Organization, as expressed, in particular, by the participation of its armed forces in peacekeeping operations in Suez and Congo. The mention to Congo also allowed Minister Lafer to affirm the interest with which Brazilians followed the awakening of its "African brethren" and to speak in unequivocal terms in favor of the consideration of the question of racial discrimination by the General Assembly.

XV Regular Session of the General Assembly of the United Nations 1960

Minister Horácio Lafer [*]

Mr. President,

I am deeply gratified and honored to be able to congratulate you, in the name of Brazil, upon your election to the presidency of the fifteenth session of the General Assembly, our fifteenth session will, no doubt, be one of the most important held by this Organization; and the guidance of its activities requires a dependable helmsman of acknowledged capability and impartiality, as is the case with Your Excellency, to whom I wish to renew my tribute.

Only a short time ago the American nations held in Costa Rica one of their most important conferences of foreign ministers. The most significant outcome of this conference was the affirmation of solidarity of the countries of this continent with regard to the principles and ideals that have formed the basis of our peoples' aspirations.

Nineteen nations of this hemisphere solemnly reaffirmed that the regime accepted by the American Peoples as compatible with their traditions and collective aspirations is that regime characterized by the free expression of thought, by free elections, by the separation of powers, by the limitations upon the terms of elective office, and by respect for civil liberties and human rights. At the same time, these nineteen nations declared that they attached quite as much importance to the need for

[*] **Horácio Lafer**, Born in São Paulo, SP, May 3, 1900. Bachelor in Law from the Faculty of Law of São Paulo. Finance Minister from 1/31/51 to 8/24/53. Minister of State for External Relations de 8/13/1959 a 1/31/1961. † Paris, June 29, 1965.

economic development of their peoples as to these political aspirations. It was with this preoccupation in mind that the President of Brazil, Juscelino Kubitschek, proposed the plan now known as Operation Pan America. Its basic aim is to lay the foundation of a close economic solidarity among the nations of the continent, so that, in the spirit of the ideals of peace, freedom and democracy which characterize our political philosophy, it may be possible to foster the economic and social progress of Latin America as speedily as possible.

After the close of the Costa Rica conference, the American nations assembled in Bogota, where the nineteen countries of the continent again accepted collectively a plan for social progress submitted by President Eisenhower, as well as measures to promote their economic development, within the objectives of Operation Pan America. Thus, the Latin American countries reaffirmed their desire to solve their dramatic problems of economic growth without sacrificing the ideals of freedom and respect for human dignity. Only two abstentions were recorded, and we hope that these will shortly disappear.

What is the real meaning of this consensus of opinion among the American countries in the United Nations? It means that America has its politico-social policy defined and adopted, and staunchly defends it. But this definition does not exclude respect for the ideas of others, particularly since intransigence is impossible today.

Indeed, peaceful coexistence of peoples is an imperative in our time. The development of nuclear weapons has ruled out war as an alternative instrument of policy. Faced with the inadmissibility of resorting to war as a solution, the world is confronted with the necessity of settling through negotiation those differences that separate nations. The only feasible path leading to a solution of the problems of our age is that of permanent negotiation, the persistent determination to continue to negotiate. The United Nations is not a super-state, but is, rather, an affirmation that the world must live in a continuous, patient, constant state of negotiation. It is a mechanism that offers maximum opportunities for meetings and lines of compromise. Although it is true that this process of negotiation may always entail the risk of a stalemate, it is equally true that it is the only means for arriving at solutions that will assure the survival of mankind.

Nonetheless, to attain this state of peaceful coexistence that we are all seeking, a basic premise, a point of departure, must be fixed. This premise is the acceptance by each one of the reality, just or unjust, of nations with regimes, ideologies, and organizations, not as we would wish them to be, but as they are today. This acceptance must be accompanied

by the pledge of non-intervention, direct or indirect, by one ideology in the sphere of another. How can we aspire to disarmament, cessation of the cold war and unrest, if there is fear that some countries wish to destroy or dominate others? So long as the principle of the *status quo* of the present political geography among the existing politico-ideological organizations is not accepted, we shall waver between the cold war and the prospect of catastrophe. In this connection, a relevant role can be played, vis-à-vis the major protagonists in the current political scene, by the lesser, anti-war Powers, which can become the impartial interpreters of the world's desire for peace. Attempts to modify the order existing today will merely delay the establishment of an understanding which is indispensable if the world is to look forward to disarmament, peaceful coexistence, and an end to the cold war. The stalemate in to efforts to achieve disarmament stems from the mutual confidence. Why not negotiate this departure right now?

The problem has another aspect, which the President of Brazil has constantly stressed economic development can consolidate peace among nations. The world spends at least $100,000 million per year on armaments, while the industrialized countries have in the last ten years spent on $40,000 million on aid, assistance, investment, etc., for the underdeveloped areas of the world. It is inconceivable that armaments, garrisons, and armies should be done away with; this Virgilian scene is chimerical. But the arms race can be brought to a halt, by applying the resources thus saved to economic development. Why, then, not adopt in a special conference a system whereby the Powers would pool their savings effected by an arms reduction and them into a United Nations international development fund? It would be very difficult to devote, in addition to the large sums turned over to this fund, an equivalent sum to armaments as well. It would mean paying twice. Brazil supports the efforts to achieve international disarmament by realistic means in technically studied and effectively controlled stages. The accumulation of funds through decreases in expenditures for arms, linked with a percentage of resources that more highly developed countries could lend to this fund would instill life into the field abandoned and forgotten by the international Bank for Reconstruction and Finance. The United Nations will win everyone's heart the day it enters upon the path of ample, generous programs of cooperation that will promote the social well-being and economic progress of nations.

In the United Nations' fifteen years of existence we have not succeeded in creating genuinely instruments of economic cooperation nor has national peace been consolidated. But the United Nations is,

nonetheless, humanity's great hope and constitutes, with all its serious limitations, the best instrument for diplomatic negotiations and the most perfect mechanism for maintaining the peace that we have been able to devise to date. The vigor, energy and speed with which the Security Council acted in the crisis involving the Congo are proof the Organization's real possibilities. With the Council paralyzed by the veto, an emergency Special Session of the General Assembly was immediately called under the provision of the "Uniting for peace" resolution. At that session, which ended two days ago, the Assembly approved without a negative vote the resolution that will make it possible for the United Nations to continue its activities in the Congo without disruption or delay. And it behooves me here to say a special word of praise and encouragement to the Secretary-General of the United Nations; Mr. Hammarskjold, who, with patience, courage, devotion and impartiality, has faithfully interpreted and forcefully expressed the yearning for peace which lies behind the anxiety with which the people of the world look upon the dangerous and delicate situation in the Congo.

Brazil, through officers of its air force, is participating in the effort being made by the United Nations to maintain law and order in the Republic of the Congo. Bound by cultural and historic ties to the peoples of Africa, conscious of the geographic affinities and the heritage of blood which link us with the nations of the black continent, the Brazilians follow with extreme interest the awakening of their African brothers. And here we extend our sincere and wholehearted welcome to the States newly admitted to the United Nations. In Suez, also, with hundreds and hundreds of Brazilian soldiers, we are paying the price of peace in the hope that the Middle East may reach a peaceful solution of coexistence, in a spirit of mutual respect and self-determination.

If peace hinges upon the criterion, as we have pointed out, of a previous, preliminary, basic understanding, economic development has yet to find the means to attain it.

It is encouraging that one of the items to be considered by the General Assembly is that entitled "Economic development of underdeveloped countries", a problem that has been of concern to us since the establishment of the United Nations. Some important steps were taken with the creation of the Special Fund at the thirteenth session of the General Assembly and that of the Committee for Industrial Development at the Twenty-Ninth Session of the Economic and Social Council. But there still remains on our agenda the question of establishing a development fund with resources for financing and expanding the economy of the

underdeveloped countries where over a billion human beings await the social justice to which they are entitled. We are certain that the capital development fund will win full acceptance in the Assembly.

The Brazilian Government, together with various other countries, this year sponsored the request for including in the agenda of this session the item referring to racial discrimination. Brazil has always supported all recommendations presented in the United Nations opposing the policies of segregation based upon differences of race, color, or religion, which are repugnant to the conscience of the Brazilian people and are clearly condemned by the Charter. Brazil submitted a draft resolution to the Council of the Organization of American States expressing repudiation of any and all forms of racial discrimination and segregation, a proposal which was adopted unanimously by the American States. In this connection, I wish to recall that Brazil subscribed to and ratified the Convention on the Prevention and Punishment of the Crime of Genocide approved by the General Assembly of the United Nations. Racial persecution is contrary to the spirit and the purposes of the United Nations, and Brazil, with the civilized world, most vehemently condemns it.

This session opens in an atmosphere of anxiety. Public opinion is fearful lest the men responsible for their Governments may not find the formulas conducive to peace. Antagonisms are strong and deep-rooted. Allow me to conclude with the earnest hopes of the people of Brazil, and I trust of the entire world, that the wisdom of the statesmen present here may find the way, not to unify thought and action – an impossibility – but to allow each one in his sphere to respect his fellow man and make possible coexistence with a just peace.

New York, September 22, 1960.

1961

1961

At the end of the 50's and start of the 60's the international situation was particularly tense. It was the period of confrontation which starting from the Cuban revolution (1959) and on to the erection of the Berlin Wall (1961) would reach the apex with the missile crisis in 1962. Today, with the benefit of hindsight, one can understand that historic moment as the maximum tension point which made possible the ensuing process of détente. At the time, however, the perception was of an unusual and imminent danger of war. By the logic of the confrontation, the situation required cohesion among the blocks: ideological, political and economic solidarity were urged.

In this context President Jânio Quadros was inaugurated in January 1961 and sought to utilize external policy as an essential element for social change of Brazil. The "independent external policy" opened in Brazilian foreign relations a period fundamentally characterized by "non-alignment" with the United States and by the search for associations with Third World countries. The main lines of the new external policy of Brazil were expounded in an article signed by President Jânio Quadros in the magazine *Foreign Affairs*. The President made clear that without renouncing its enrollment in the Western world, Brazil would start to emphasize also its closeness to the developing nations. In a dramatic expression of the new way in which Brazil viewed itself, the President affirmed that since it was separated from North America and Western Europe because of poverty, Brazil could hardly share

ideals with the societies of those developed regions of the world. He concluded reaffirming that since Brazil was not part to any bloc, it would preserve absolute liberty to take its own decisions. Undoubtedly, this meant a break with the diplomatic conduct observed until then by Brazil, which identified essentially with the Western cause and the leadership of the United States while pointing out the international inequalities and resisting *a priori* alignment.

The Cuban revolution had brought about the threat of the multiplication of hotbeds of armed subversion in other countries of the region. In response, the United States would develop, in accordance with the doctrine of *flexible response*, intense action to prevent such eventuality and combat guerrilla outbreaks. Consequently, the concept of hemispheric security stemming from the Treaty of Rio de Janeiro would be reformulated so as to establish a new "division of labor": the United States would assume primary responsibility for the regional defense in case of external aggression, while the armed forces of Latin American countries would be reequipped and indoctrinated to play a more proactive role in the maintenance of hemispheric peace and internal development. The practical result of that policy would be the proliferation of military regimes in several countries of the region, including Brazil.

In 1961, however, Brazilian external policy followed a different path. In consonance with the new direction, the delegation of Brazil to the Inter-American Conference in Punta del Este refused to participate in the blockade against Cuba. In parallel, contacts were initiated with a view to the reestablishment of relations with the USSR and at the same time there were manifestations of sympathy for the admission of the Popular Republic of China in the United Nations.

While Brazil asserted its own line of external action, the prevailing trend in Washington advocated a hardened attitude with regard to Latin America. Shaken by the Bay of Pigs episode, President Kennedy took up combative positions and demanded solidarity from the hemisphere in the East-West confrontation. By creating a Latin American Task Force, the Kennedy administration expressly linked its mandate to the ideological confrontation, urging its members to develop policies which would galvanize Latin American forces in directions compatible with American interests and prevented the extension of the Sino-Soviet influence to the region. That Task Force would be the forerunner of the "Alliance for Progress", a project through which the United States would recover some of the main purposes of the Pan American Operation (OPA) without however admitting it.

In the light of the prevailing context in the world and hemispheric panoramas, the "independent external policy" of Brazil was negatively received in the United States. Also internally, the conservative forces, the same that had supported Jânio Quadros' candidature, started to see in the course of external policy threats contrary to their interests. The award of the Great Cross of the Order of Cruzeiro do Sul to Ernesto "Che" Guevara, Minister of Industry of Cuba, who visited Brazil in August, provoked a strong reaction. By then, the process of elaboration and implementation of Brazil's external policy, nurtured by the serious internal divisions which would lead to March 1964, was still overcast with the ideological constraints it intended to overcome.

Upon assuming the government in September 7, President João Goulart was the target of ill-disguised mistrust in Washington, although his powers hade been curtailed by the establishment of a parliamentary system following the extemporaneous resignation of President Jânio Quadros.

The independent external policy, however, would be reaffirmed in the statement delivered by Foreign Minister Afonso Arinos de Mello Franco at the Sixteenth Session of the General Assembly two weeks after the inauguration of President Goulart and of the Council of Ministers headed by Tancredo Neves. It is a piece of remarkable clarity and unique conceptual wealth, in which the determination of Brazil to overcome the barren cleavages of the ideological confrontation and assume an independent position in the international scene is clearly expressed. Minister Afonso Arinos affirmed the validity of human and social rights; demanded solidary action in favor of development and disarmament; proclaimed, eschewing previous qualifications and ambiguities, the adherence of Brazil to the process of self-determination and the anti-colonial and anti-racist orientation of Brazilian foreign policy; expressly requested self-determination for Algeria and Angola; called for respect to Cuba's sovereignty and to the principle of non-intervention and stressed the right of Brazil to maintain relations with any country, regardless of its ideology or political regime.

It must be remarked, however, that despite all these affirmations of independence in the international arena, the Brazilian government declined to join the Non Aligned Movement, whose first meeting took place in 1962.

XVI Regular Session of the General Assembly of the United Nations 1961

Minister Affonso Arinos de Mello Franco [*]

Mr. President,

Before beginning my statement, may I be permitted to extend to Mr. Slim my Delegation's most sincere congratulations on his election as President of the General Assembly for this Session.

I would also wish to pay tribute to the memory of Mr. Dag Hammarskjöld. As Secretary-General of the United Nations he raised the status of his office to a remarkable degree by his competence, impartiality and courage. His death, which has deeply affected us, has proved that his conception of duty embraced even the final sacrifice. Brazil, which once again has the honor of opening the Assembly's general debate, deems it necessary to state its position on the most important issues in the current international situation.

The main problem is the problem of peace. An atomic war, because of its unpredictable consequences, would be a disaster for all, and is, therefore, improbable. But even the "cold war" jeopardizes the future of mankind, not merely because of the expense involved in the arms race, but also by reason of the universal insecurity which destroys confidence in the present and hope for the future.

[*] **Affonso Arinos de Mello Franco**, born in Belo Horizonte, MG, on November 27, 1905. Bachelor in Law from the University of Rio de Janeiro. Politician and academic. Minister of State for External Relations from 2/1/1961 to 8/25/1961 and from 7/17/1962 to 9/13/1962. † Rio de Janeiro, August 27, 1990.

The most disturbing feature is the fact that, far from uniting under the influence of these dangers, the peoples tend increasingly to draw apart from one another. The world has never been so divided by struggles for power and by ideological conflicts. The equilibrium between the destructive forces of the dominant Powers has led the world towards an impasse. The stubborn clinging by these same Powers to their political positions threatens to convert the impasse into general catastrophe.

The peaceful unarmed nations watch the development of this threatening situation without belonging to the small group that decide on war or peace but they constitute Nonetheless the great majority that will suffer from disastrous results of war. It is thus entirely natural that countries like Brazil should be led to adopt an independent position on the world stage, with the rightful purpose of exerting their influence to reduce tensions, resolve disputes and gradually consolidate peace. Such a position of independence does not mean the abandonment of the values inherent in our traditions, or of our international obligations. Brazil is not prepared to discard the Christian and democratic features of its national personality, or to forget in the future, any more than it has forgotten in the past, the pledging of its word in international instruments. But countries like ours, although not armed for war, can constitute powerful factors for peace. Full awareness of their political maturity obliges them to direct their own destinies. Independence cannot be dissociated from solidarity, which, without independence, would be tantamount to subordination. But subordination is incompatible with responsibility, and responsibility is a necessary element in any international action.

In domestic affairs, political decisions are taken on the basis of authority. That is a prerogative of sovereign power, inherent in the institution of the State. In international affairs, on the other hand, political decisions can be taken only through a process of agreement. The modicum of authority existing at the international level transcends the sovereignty of States and rests with the international organizations.

Fully conscious of these facts, Brazil practices and encourages direct and peaceful negotiation for the settlement of disputes between States, and also collaborates without reservation in the work of international organizations. We have no commitment, no interest, no aspiration that can prevent us from acting in conformity with the highest purposes of the United Nations.

International action should always be undertaken in good faith which does not mean that it cannot be flexible. The relatively homogeneous ideological and institutional patterns that characterized

the States members of the international community when the number of sovereign peoples was still small are now a thing of the past. The contacts of our time are between States of a far larger international community, in which the most disparate forms of government are present.

It is clear that Governments should be tailored to men, not men to Governments, and that the ideal which merits our constant support is the universal existence, under all types of government, of laws that reflect human freedom and dignity.

This conviction and the resulting action do not, however, impose on us a rigidly doctrinaire policy in international affairs. Such a policy would involve inevitable collision with countries where such conceptions are unknown or countries where they are applied in a different way. This would rule out persuasive negotiation, the only method of securing the gradual recognition of human rights. It must thus be concluded that, in this field as well, peace is a prerequisite for the establishment of justice.

Furthermore, human rights are not confined to individual rights. True, individual rights are necessary to the assertion of man's spiritual dignity. But human rights are also social rights. Brazil, thus, recognizes that rights which we once regarded as being confined to the individual sphere should be extended to the social sphere. Human freedom and world peace necessarily depend on social progress.

The world is not divided merely into East and West. This ideological cleavage makes us forget the existence of yet another division, not ideological, but economic and social – that between the Northern and Southern hemispheres. But although "rapprochement" between the East and the West is attainable by ideological compromise, the immense contrast between North and South can be reduced only by planned action for effective aid by the developed countries of the North to the underdeveloped countries of the South.

The most important political event of the twentieth century is national self-assertion. Scores of nations have been transformed into new States. Pacifism is therefore no longer the supra-national doctrine that it once was. Pacifism today merges with respect for nationalism. Either peace will be built on the basis of acceptance of the self-determination of peoples, or nationalism will be converted into a pretext for wars that will lead merely to greater economic and ideological enslavement.

Brazil maintains that under present world conditions peace can be won only through plain respect for the principles of true self-determination – the ideal framework within which to negotiate the solution of differences between States, irrespective of their social and political structure.

We are well aware that this result will not be easy to achieve, but we hope that it will be possible, for it is the only formula likely to end the "cold war" and remove the threat of total war. Self-determination means the end of colonialism – whether in colonies overseas or in colonies close to the parent State – and the end of political, economic, ideological or racial oppression; the victory of peace. But self determination, to be genuine, presupposes the free exercise of the people's will, in the only possible form – namely, the expression of the will of the majority.

The Brazilian people have given practical proof that it is unswerving in its loyalty to the representative principle, which alone can guarantee political freedom. Authoritarian democracy neither seduces nor convinces us. My country has recently resolved one of the greatest institutional crises in its history, without sacrificing its democratic and representative principles – as the whole world has witnessed.

Brazil is following very closely the development of the Cuban situation. It continues to maintain that respect for sovereignty, based on the principle of non-intervention, is a compelling obligation in international life and an essential condition for the restoration of continental harmony. Considering, therefore, that Cuba alone can forge its own destiny Brazil expresses its conviction that, thanks to this process, the democratic ideals and principles which inspire Pan Americanism and owe so much to the political culture of the Cuban people will prevail.

The liberation movement of the former colonial peoples will experience no retreat. Brazil, itself a former colony, is building a new civilization, in a land that is largely tropical and is inhabited by people of all races. Its destiny thus imposes on it a line of policy that is unalterably anti-colonialist and anti-racialist.

Our brotherly relations with Portugal and our traditional friendship with France cannot prevent us from taking up a very clear position on the painful differences that colonialism in Africa is raising between the United Nations and these two countries to which we owe so much and with which we still have so much in common.

We think that these two States should bring about self-determination in Algeria and Angola. Nothing will prevent the liberation of Africa. It seems clear that that continent has no desire to fall under the influence of any of the existing blocs. It wishes to assert its own personality, that is, to win its freedom. My country will always lend its aid to the African countries in this legitimate effort of theirs. It hopes that the new African States will guarantee complete respect for the rights of their citizens and of the foreigners living in them, including,

naturally, the nationals of the countries which colonized Africa. This has been Brazil's attitude ever since its conquest of independence.

We must not forget that, while the world today is witnessing the liberation of non-European peoples, it is also witnessing the reverse and deplorable process of the oppression of other peoples in the very heart of Europe. The problem of Berlin is inseparable from that of the self-determination of Eastern Germany. The exodus of the refugees is proof of this type of neo-colonialism.

The German nation has the right to constitute a single State, by a democratic process guaranteeing the free expression of its people's will. Application of the principle of self-determination can have no other consequence. The United Nations cannot agree that any Power, on the basis of a *status quo* deriving from a position of strength, should permanently obstruct that development.

Brazil hopes that the leaders of the Soviet Union and of the United States, moved by the desire to maintain peace, can reach a compromise which will lead to a peaceful settlement of the Berlin problem.

The logical sequence of anti-colonialism is anti-racialism. Brazil cannot but deplore the survival of racialism in various parts of the world, especially in South Africa where the problem is assuming tragic proportions from the historical and human standpoint. My country will support any action which the United Nations may take to put an end to racial discrimination.

The struggle between the East and the West is essentially ideological in character. The present division between the United States and the Soviet Union is caused neither by economic rivalry nor by a fight for markets. It is a clash between two political philosophies, each of which maintains the primacy of its own concepts in relation to the destiny of man.

Although its own ideological position is clearly defined, Brazil, in its international relations seeks always to be guided by Article 1, paragraph 2, of the United Nations Charter, which states it to be a purpose of the Organization "to develop friendly relations among nations based on respect for the principle of equal rights and self-determination of peoples, and to take other appropriate measures to strengthen universal peace". Hence, ideological differences *per se* will not prevent Brazil from maintaining relations with any other people.

Furthermore, Brazil believes that the United Nations cannot shirk the open discussion of questions which concern it or are submitted to it by one or more of its Members. My delegation accordingly favors

discussion of the question of the representation of China, which, despite its undeniable importance, has long been evaded.

Brazil's political philosophy is basically democratic in nature. We are not neutralist in the sense of belonging to a "third group", although we often find ourselves in agreement with the group of countries so described.

For that reason we shall continue to advocate world disarmament, utopian though it may, as at present, seem. Brazil is convinced that the United Nations must be the focal point for the discussion and of world disarmament. Financial savings resulting from disarmament can help to solve the problem of countries' underdevelopment, and contribute to the strengthening of peace.

Unfortunately, the only advance achieved in this field – the voluntary suspension of nuclear tests – has just been brutally cancelled out by actions which can only be regretted. Brazil, like other peaceful nations, cannot but protest against this new menace, and urges immediate negotiations with a view to restoring and, if possible, consolidating the *de facto* truce through the conclusion of a treaty.

The resumption of atomic testing is all the more grievous in that the resuming Power is the very one which had placed itself at the head of the world movement for the cessation of nuclear weapon tests.

It is our constant endeavor to strengthen the United Nations, as the main instrument for peace in today's world. We shall, therefore, strongly oppose any proposal likely to reduce the effectiveness or power of action or, in particular, to break up the unity of the Secretariat.

Brazil has remained steadfastly faithful to the American community throughout its evolution.

Independence and democracy were achieved by our countries at different times and in varying degrees. These basic prizes, however, do not represent the close of our development. They are the instruments for further achievements – above all, economic progress and social justice. Brazil, without claiming any special position of prominence or desiring the creation of blocs, does not forget the community of ethnic and cultural origin which links it to the other Latin American countries and it will always be at their side in the struggle for the advancement of their peoples.

Brazil is convinced that the United Nations, despite all its weaknesses, is the only body which can hold the balance between the contending camps and make peace secure. Eschewing all considerations of interest or prejudice, Brazil will, within the United Nations, dedicate

itself to the cause of the self determination of peoples, the struggle against every form of colonialism and racialism, the social advancement and progress of the underdeveloped countries, democratic freedom within the framework of true coexistence, and peace among men under the protection of God.

New York, September 22, 1961.

1962

1962

By the end of 1961, the Brazilian government had reestablished diplomatic relations with the USSR. Besides the evident political significance of that decision, it was also justified by the economic-commercial interest.

Visiting the United States in April 1962, President João Goulart tried to revive the channels of bilateral understanding and cooperation. In a speech before the American Congress, the President reaffirmed the democratic nature of the reforms he was implementing and expressed the strong interest of Brazil in receiving new foreign investments. The presidential contacts in Washington were positive but did not change the attitude of the Kennedy administration.

Throughout the year, developments in Brazil would take a nationalistic course, generating a gradual intensification of the internal and external pressures underwent by the country. The Commission on the Nationalization of Public Utilities Companies was created; Eletrobras was founded; a 13th salary law was approved; a new, more restrictive profit remittance law was enacted; the General Labor Command was constituted; in Brasília, the National Agrarian Reform Council was established; a plebiscite was called to extinguish the parliamentarian system of government; and a Triennial Plan for Economic and Social Development was approved.

At the Seventeenth Session of the General Assembly, Minister Affonso Arinos again spoke for Brazil. This time his statement took a

clear doctrinal tone. It showed the concern of the Brazilian government to explain its foreign policy decisions in a logical and transparent manner, on the basis of a coherent world view devoid of proselytizing or of politico-ideological connotations. It was a long speech, professionally and elegantly crafted, in which Affonso Arinos, having presented in the previous year the changes introduced in the external policy of Brazil, now focused on more general issues, such as the reform of the Charter, disarmament and economic development.

A few weeks later the Cuban missile crisis broke out. Brazil would support the United States and vote in favor of the blockade of the island at the Organization of American States (OAS).

XVII Regular Session of the General Assembly of the United Nations 1962

Minister Affonso Arinos de Mello Franco [*]

Mr. President,

Before I begin my statement, Mr. President, allow me to present to you, on behalf of the delegation of Brazil, our most sincere compliments on your election to the Presidency of this Assembly. We are sure that thanks to your background as a jurist and humanist and your experience as a diplomat and statesman, you will serve brilliantly in this capacity.

I shall also take this opportunity to express once more the deepest feelings of the delegation of Brazil on this first anniversary of the death of the Secretary-General, Mr. Dag Hammarskjöld. This is not the time to eulogize him here, but his stay on earth was marked by an admirable life entirely devoted to the loftiest subjects of culture and to strenuous work for the furtherance of peace in the world.

Having once again been entrusted, as has become customary, with the honorable task of opening the work of the General Assembly, the delegation of Brazil wishes to reaffirm its trust in the high aims of the United Nations. Article 1 of the Charter, despite its conciseness, is rich in great prospects. Its references to international peace and security, the development of friendly relations among nations based on equal rights and the self-determination of peoples, international cooperation

[*] **Affonso Arinos de Mello Franco**, born in Belo Horizonte, MG, November 27, 1905. Bachelor in Law from the University of Rio de Janeiro. Politician and academic. Minister of State for External Relations from 2/1/1961 to 8/25/1961 and from 7/17/1962 to 9/13/1962. † Rio de Janeiro, August 27, 1990.

with a view to the economic, social and cultural progress of mankind, and the safeguarding of human freedoms through the abolition of all discrimination because of sex, race or religion, trace for the future a program of ideas and action so vast that its ideal realization would merge on the horizons of thought into a kind of Golden Age.

It is true that the realism that must characterize the activities of statesmen and diplomats, which are restricted by the modest limits of what is possible, oblige us to recognize that the facts of life overshadow the edifices of reason or feeling. It is equally true that this same realism requires from rulers an energetic, patient and continuing study of the paths traced by the Charter, because in these times the only alternatives are the progressive building of peace or the possibly sudden destruction of human civilization.

We should therefore regard the fundamental objectives of the United Nations as the culmination of the slow effort of human progress, a culmination which because of the realities of life can only take place in the distant future, but which is Nonetheless real and necessary. We should also think of the Charter as consisting of two parts: one, basic and permanent, whose purpose is to define and fix the aims and the ultimate goals of the United Nations; the other, circumstantial and transitory, which establishes the processes and mechanisms needed to achieve these goals.

As far as definitions are concerned, the Charter remains valid and up to date, and will remain so in the foreseeable future. But the part which lays down the means of action is without any doubt out of date, since it was conceived and formulated to meet the exigencies of a historical situation which largely has disappeared. With regard to the political situation in general, we need only recall that the San Francisco Charter dates from before the atomic and space age and that it was drafted at a time when the two most powerful nations in the world were not yet divided by what we have come to call the "cold war". As for the United Nations itself, it is hardly necessary to recall that in 1945 it consisted of only fifty-one founder Members, of which Brazil was one, whereas during the sixteenth session of the General Assembly there were already 104 Members, or roughly twice as many.

In the various attempts to amend the Charter which have been made since 1946, specific or partial objectives were sought after, with the exception of proposals based on Article 109 that a general conference of the United Nations should be held for the purpose of reviewing the whole of the basic statutes of the United Nations.

In view of the fact that the United Nations has acquired a truly universal character, serious Consideration should be given to the need to review the Charter. It should be adapted to the universal reality, which it represents today far better than in 1945, at least by the increase in the membership of its major councils, which has enabled dozens of new Members, particularly African-Asian Members, to be represented. The competence of its two principal bodies, the General Assembly and the Security Council, together with their procedural methods, should also be examined with the object of adopting amendments which appear necessary in the light of theory and experience and of the development of the international situation.

The achievement of a lasting peace remains the supreme task of the United Nations, and here the most important problem is still that of disarmament. Brazil has the honor of taking part in the Conference of the Eighteen Nation Committee on Disarmament which meets at Geneva and which was established by General Assembly resolution 1722 (XVI), on the proposal of the United States and the Soviet Union.

As is known, this Conference is working on the drafting of a treaty of general and complete disarmament and on the preparation of a special instrument prohibiting nuclear weapon tests. As far as this latter task is concerned, in addition to the plenary Conference there is the Sub-Committee on a Treaty for the Discontinuance of Nuclear Weapon Tests, consisting of three members: the United States, the United Kingdom and the Soviet Union. The Geneva Conference functions by authority of the General Assembly and thereby represents an expression of the thinking of the whole international community, and not simply the interests of the group of great Powers which possess the secrets, the resources and the destructive potential of the nuclear age.

Unfortunately, despite the goodwill of all and the enlightened efforts of some, the Conference of the Eighteen Nation Committee on Disarmament has achieved but poor results during its recent work. The so-called security interests of the great Powers have made real progress in practical and theoretical negotiations almost impossible.

The central problem is that of the establishment of trust between the two opposing blocs. This factor is inseparable from the question of the effective control of disarmament measures, which itself depends in a certain sense on trust. It has not been possible to break this vicious circle, despite all the attempts of the eight countries which are members neither of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization nor of the Warsaw Pact.

These efforts found expression in particular in the presentation of the Eight Nation Joint Memorandum, which represented an attempt to escape from the impasse of the negotiations on the prohibition of nuclear tests. The Eight Nation document and the Joint Statement of Agreed Principles constitute, in our view, the two most constructive documents which have emerged during the past twelve months from the discussions and negotiations on disarmament. Yet, although they were drafted in such a way as to form a basis for understanding and negotiation, the two blocs have in fact used them as a battleground on which they have erected opposing fortifications, each maintaining that he was its sole master. The eight countries naturally cannot choose between the two opposite interpretations of their Memorandum, since that would defeat the whole purpose of the document, and they watch with concern the work of logical construction by which the two great blocs are trying to divide suggestions formulated with the declared purpose of uniting. They should bear in mind, however, that the progress of nuclear science is of such a nature as to oblige them to review their ideological positions, by virtue of the impact of the development of military technique on attitudes which are becoming daily more obsolete.

In the opinion of Brazil, the problem of nuclear disarmament stands apart from the general framework of disarmament, and the specific question of nuclear tests should be the first to be considered in the sphere of nuclear disarmament. We are convinced that our chances of progress in the field of general and complete disarmament will be very slender if we do not even succeed in coming to an agreement on the more immediate question of a nuclear test ban.

At Geneva, Brazil spoke in favor of concentrating efforts on the question of atmospheric, underwater and outer space tests. The joint Anglo-American proposal to ban these three types of tests has shown that our position offered some practical possibilities which we could not neglect. In addition, the submission of this proposal has brought out the fact that the divergences between the two camps at the present time are centered exclusively on the question of underground tests. We like to believe that, even in this sector, a perceptible widening in the area of agreement can be hoped for.

Brazil, deeply concerned at the nuclear threat, which is the greatest and indeed the only one that weighs upon the whole of mankind, reserves the right to consider introducing, at this session of the Assembly, a draft resolution which conveys its concern and is such as to merit the support of the vast majority of delegations undoubtedly

more interested in the immediate cessation of all nuclear tests than in competing for military power.

Brazil also intends to ask the General Assembly to give its support to the Eight Nation Joint Memorandum of April 16, 1962 as a basis for further urgent negotiations between the nuclear Powers.

Faithful to its position at the Geneva Conference, Brazil proposes that absolute priority should be given in our deliberations to the question of prohibiting nuclear tests as the most urgent item on our agenda. We shall make proposals to that effect either in plenary meeting or in the First Committee as appears most appropriate. In addition, my delegation considers it most important that the Foreign Ministers of the United States, the Soviet Union, the United Kingdom and France should look into the possibility of holding immediate conversations in New York with a view to eliminating those differences which still divide us from our ultimate objective: the prohibition of all nuclear tests.

Brazil also favors, in principle, the establishment of denuclearized zones in the world, provided that proposals to that effect are not merely made for the purposes of the cold war, from which we have always held aloof. Latin America might form such a zone. In addition, Brazil maintains its proposal of June 12, 1962 for the establishment of a special technical committee within the framework of the Conference to study the scientific aspects of control. We are, in fact, daily more convinced that the political negotiations on disarmament cannot go on developing in a technical vacuum. Without intervening in the political negotiations, which would proceed simultaneously, the work of the special committee would enable any decisions that might be adopted to be based on specific and solid foundations.

Apart from the vital importance of disarmament to the strengthening of peace, we must not forget what it represents from the point of view of future economic and social progress for all peoples. The fearful burden of military expenditure is not only an obstacle to the achievement of a better level of living for the peoples of the great Powers, but also a drain on the technical and financial resources of the entire world which might be channeled into aid to the underdeveloped countries and thus enable hundreds of millions of human beings to enjoy a better life. The research that has been carried out in that connection, including some by the United Nations, is basic and should encourage the leaders of the great States to begin to think of their historical responsibilities, not only towards their own peoples but to the whole of mankind.

The problem of the uses of outer space is also linked with the question of disarmament. Soviet science and American science have achieved astounding successes in this field, which deserve our unbounded admiration. Nevertheless, the United Nations must exert its influence to see that progress in outer space does not become a new source of dangers and threats but on the contrary is used in the service of humanity. In this connection, the General Assembly adopted resolution 1721 (XVI) which lays down certain principles regarding the peaceful uses of outer space. One of them, proposed by Brazil, states that space exploration should benefit all countries irrespective of the stage of their economic or scientific development. In this connection, we consider that the use of telecommunications satellites should be subject to international regulation, so that these powerful means of dissemination may be used solely in the service of peace and culture.

The role of the United Nations in the historical process of the liquidation of colonialism is in accordance with the letter and the spirit of the Charter. The principle of the self-determination of peoples is one of the foundations of the whole edifice. The principle whereby the administering Powers accept as a "sacred trust" the obligation to lead the dependent peoples towards self-determination, as laid down in Chapter XI of the Charter, was Vigorously endorsed by General Assembly resolutions 1514 (XV), 1541 (XV) and 1654 (XVI). No artifice or expedient can obscure its meaning. Brazil, through its ethnic and historical formation as well as its political and cultural tradition, is a nation deeply imbued with anti-colonialist feeling. Nothing can deflect us from this line of action, and we shall do all in our power to ensure that, without prejudice to the peace and freedom of any State, and without violence of any kind against any Government, the United Nations continues to use every available means to liquidate the last vestiges of colonialism.

Our century has been and still is a spectator of the great historical process of the liquidation of colonialism and the awakening to independence of dozens of peoples once slumbering in servitude. We hope that the last decades of the twentieth century will be marked by a worldwide drive for the economic advancement and social progress of the former colonial peoples and the other underdeveloped nations, who between them make up the greater part of mankind. Just one year ago, in this same Assembly, I said:

> The world is not divided merely into East and West. This ideological cleavage makes us forget the existence of yet another division, not ideological, but economic and social, between the Northern and Southern hemispheres.

> But although rapprochement between the East and West is attainable by ideological compromise, the immense contrast between North and South can be reduced only by planned action for effective aid by the developed countries of the North to the underdeveloped countries of the South.

Despite the praiseworthy efforts of the United Nations, the Governments of some developed countries and the international agencies for technical and financial assistance, we are forced to admit that the situation of the underdeveloped peoples is growing worse rather than better, for in most cases the rate of development lags behind the increase in population. Moreover, the logic of the economic development process itself, including the result of the action of the regional trade organizations grouping the developed countries, means that the less advanced countries, which are not parties to such agreements, have no choice but to stand by and witness a gradual decline in the value of their raw materials and commodities on the international market, so that they are forced to work ever harder only to earn less.

This phenomenon, which is taking place in Brazil, is common to the whole of Latin America, and we may note with apprehension that the value of the external aid granted to our continent during the past ten years has been far less than the loss suffered through falling prices for its products on the international market. For all these reasons, Brazil is warmly in favor of the "United Nations Decade for Economic Development" proposed by U Thant, our distinguished Secretary-General. We note with satisfaction that the proposed means and methods of action are based upon concepts and objectives that have persistently been advocated by the underdeveloped countries and constitute as a whole a body of doctrine that is not only realistic but inseparable from the sound observance of the general principles of the Charter.

The implementation of such a program must not, however, be impeded by the dichotomy which still subsists between the good intentions voiced by all and the real behavior of some. We must also eliminate the dangerous duality of the "aid policy" formally recognized by all as essential to a better international equilibrium [resolution 1710 (XVI)] and the "trade policy" adopted by certain countries, which, through preferential tariffs, is already bringing about results opposed to the higher aims which we are trying to achieve during the proposed "Development Decade". If such a discrepancy were to continue, we fear that, contrary to all our hopes, the underdeveloped countries might become real international pensioners. This is a result which no country

could accept passively as long as there remains – and we believe that there does still remain – a climate and a possibility for agreement over and above purely commercial considerations. In this connection, we are in favor of holding as soon as possible an international trade conference where, far removed from the pressures of the cold war, the problems of the commodity-exporting countries could be placed in their proper perspective and definitively solved.

The international ideal is to secure peace and prosperity for all peoples. Peace is based on disarmament and prosperity depends on technical and financial assistance to the underdeveloped countries. Neither disarmament nor development can really be achieved on the basis of the cold war and competition between ideologically hostile blocs. Brazil, which is a Western Christian country with a long democratic tradition, has no intention of departing from its traditional values. At the same time, precisely in order to remain faithful to those values, Brazil does its best to help to remove the differences that exist between the world blocs because it is on that that disarmament and development must depend. Apart from the implementation of regional plans such as, for example, the Alliance for Progress, we would like to encourage non-partisan international assistance to the underdeveloped countries for the implementation of national development plans.

It is with this idea in mind that we have pressed for the establishment, within the United Nations family, of an industrial development agency. We are also in favor of bringing the patents system up to date, so as to permit a genuine transfer of technological knowledge to the underdeveloped countries and of establishing machinery for the international stabilization of commodity prices in order to prevent the constant drain to which the trade relations of the producing countries are subjected.

Sovereignty is a pre-condition for the liberty of States within the international community. The sovereignty of each State is limited, therefore, only by the general interest of the community, within which all States are juridically equal. The principle of non-intervention derives from this. But the liberty of peoples is another postulate of international coexistence. It can be secured only in so far as nations are free to choose their own destinies both internationally and internally. Hence, the principle of self-determination. Brazil recognizes and practices both principles, and strongly desires that they should constitute the political objectives of all Governments. Non-intervention and self-determination are not mutually exclusive but rather complementary. In the light of these

concepts, properly applied, the most serious problems of our day, such as those of Germany, Cuba and South East Asia, can all be solved. We know very well that in this field it is easier to express opinions than to act. Nevertheless, if our deeds always match our words with no holding back and as far as conditions allow, we shall surely progress towards the desired solutions.

In concluding, I wish only to reaffirm Brazil's trust in and loyalty towards the United Nations. I should like to thank the Secretary-General, U Thant, for his recent visit to my country and I venture to express the hope that he will continue to fill the high post of which he has shown himself worthy. I should also like to take this opportunity of welcoming the new Members of the United Nations. The need for the universality of our Organization becomes more apparent every day. Outside the United Nations there seems to be no solution for the future of mankind.

New York, September 20, 1962.

1963

1963

The 1962 missile crisis represented a watershed in the global strategic scenario. From then on, areas of cooperation and of converging interests would be progressively identified, with a view to eliminating the risk of a nuclear holocaust. This period of international relations became known as of "coexistence" or *détente*. Its initial landmark was the establishment of direct communication between the White House and the Kremlin, the so-called "red telephone", in June 1993. Next August, the Moscow Treaty banning nuclear tests in the atmosphere, outer space and the seabed was signed. This was the first of a series of instruments that would be negotiated between the United States and the Soviet Union with a view to a more rational and safe management of the arms race. The Moscow Treaty also had the symbolic meaning of marking the recognition of the URSS as a counterpart of similar power in the nuclear field, an acknowledgement which would open the way to the acceptance of the concept of strategic parity.

In Brazil, the contradictions which would lead to the deposition of President João Goulart in the next year were growing. Once the presidential system was reintroduced, President João Goulart undertook to consolidate his leadership and bring about the fundamental reforms he considered essential for the success of his program. A series of disagreements with the political forces represented in the Congress and with the armed forces ensued. Strikes grew in number and an uprising

by petty officers gave rise to fears regarding discipline and unity in the armed forces.

In the light of the signs pointing to the sharing of international power between the two superpowers – and certainly concerned about the intensification of internal conflicts in Brazil – Foreign Minister João Augusto de Araújo Castro delivered an important statement at the Eighteenth Session of the General Assembly, doubtlessly the most extensive, coherent and convincing explanation on the independent external policy. The main points in the text are an objective view of the international reality and a realistic appraisal of the role that Brazil could play in the world. An international panorama divided by conflicting ideologies and by nuclear arsenals already capable of destroying the world many times over, offered few diplomatic opportunities for a country like Brazil. Free from the limitations that two decades of alignment had imposed, Brazil intended to enhance in the external field options for diplomatic action able to overcome the constraints of the bipolar cleavage.

The objective of this new diplomatic operation was the same as always, in fact the most constant element in the external projection of Brazil: gain support and widen spaces for the development of the country. The alliance with North America had not yielded the expected fruit, and the attempts at intermediation in Latin America through OPA had been co–opted by the United States by means of the Alliance for Progress, with doubtful benefits for Brazil. The Brazilian diplomacy would then stress the elements that linked it to the Third World and resorted to calling with renewed emphasis and vigor for changes in a political and economic international order that did not provide it with an appropriate share and was perceived as prone to perpetuate the divisions in the world.

Ambassador Araújo Castro started from the premise that the ideological confrontation had become the central standard with which to gauge the international order. A conceptual struggle taken to Manichean extremes, he said, had produced extremely serious risks to the survival of mankind. It was necessary to identify fundamental affinities that would function as factors of cohesion among countries wishing to overcome the constraints of ideological confrontation. According to the formulation developed in the Brazilian statement, such affinities would be summarized as the well-known three D's: Disarmament, Development and Decolonization.

Each one of these issues was closely examined in the speech, based on the convenience of mitigating the ideological confrontation and fertilizing the international system through the access by small and medium-sized countries to the centers of decision (decolonization) and their economic and social emergence (development) in a context of international peace and security (disarmament).

The Minister assured that his country was willing to play its role. Reiterating that Brazil could not accept the label of neutralist in its external policy, that it unequivocally belonged to the inter-American system, and that it would never relinquish freedom, even in the name of progress and economic development, Castro sought to delink the new external course of Brazil from any ideological constraint. He did not refrain from making a strong exhortation for the strengthening of the United Nations and consequently of international security, mentioning the need to reform the Charter as a means to reach that goal.

The statement ended with a convincing analysis of the elements needed for the revitalization of the Charter: to adapt it to the reality created by the nuclear threat, which meant that security could no longer be conceived in individual terms but had to be placed at the collective level through development; and to adjust the mechanisms needed for decolonization to the realities created by the acceleration of the process.

XVIII Regular Session of the General Assembly of the United Nations 1963

Minister João Augusto de Araújo Castro [*]

Mr. President,

I should like first of all to express, Sir, my personal satisfaction and that of the Brazilian delegation at your election as President of the eighteenth regular session of the General Assembly of the United Nations, and to convey to you our pleasure that this important office has been conferred upon your country and yourself, whom we have long regarded as an embodiment of intelligence, culture and integrity and a model of experience in everything relating to the United Nations. Your election, honoring Venezuela and through it all the Latin American countries, is an honor to my country also.

Eighteen years of intense diplomatic and parliamentary activity mark the existence of the United Nations. Today, as in the days of San Francisco, the objectives of the Charter, designed to build a healthy, brotherly and peaceful community, continue to guide all States collectively and each one individually. However, today, as at the time of the founding of the Organization, Member States, individually or in groups, continue to differ in the conception of the ways and means of implementing the objectives of the Charter.

[*] **João Augusto de Araújo Castro**, Born in Rio de Janeiro, RJ, August 27, 1919. Bachelor in Law from the Niterói Faculty of Law.Third Class Consul, public selection process, 1940. First Class Minister, by merit, 1962. Minister of State for External Relations from 8/21/1963 to 4/1/1964. † Washington, December 9, 1975.

This difference in concepts has its roots in the specific historical and social development of each Member State. Yet, the Charter – reflecting the reality of this fact – has from the very outset not only recognized this difference in concept, but moreover has acknowledged the need for the United Nations to operate efficiently in the very climate of conceptual differences. The world in which we live is fertile in ideas, theories, conceptions and schools of thought and the United Nations was not created to proclaim either the everlasting validity or the final rejection of any of them. Our unity of peaceful purpose must necessarily be based on the inevitable diversity of our opinions. If the United Nations is to keep its universal character, it will have to continue to be representative of all the ideas and conceptions of mankind.

It cannot be overlooked, however, that differences and divergences in the concept and the practice of achieving the aims of the Charter, from the very first days of the Organization, were situated in terms of ideological struggle, which were not only contradictory but, in fact, antagonistic to each other. The years we have lived through, here and in the world at large, in the shadow of this conceptual struggle carried to a Manichean split, do not appear to have been particularly rewarding to anyone. And, what is even more disquieting, power politics have launched our world into the costliest armaments race in history and into an even more catastrophic prospect for the whole human race-collective thermo-nuclear destruction, ironically graded to distinguish between those who shall perish in the first minutes and those who are to succumb months or years later to the worst forms of degeneration of life. This would be indeed an absurd price to pay for intolerance and obduracy. Absolute truth cannot be proclaimed over the ashes of nuclear desolation. We must show more humility, if we want to save our lives. Inflexibility and fanaticism are extremely dangerous in the atomic era.

The world of 1963 is not the pre-atomic world of 1945 and it is not in vain that we have been living through eighteen years of history in the nuclear age. The accession to the Organization of a large number of new Members, mainly from Africa and Asia, was from every point of view profoundly beneficial to the whole of international life. By reason of their problems, their aspirations, their needs and their aims, these new Member States, objectively situated outside the two poles of the cold war, by the impact of their presence, their number and their arguments compelled all Member States to live and to interpret the reality of the international scene in a completely new light. It is therefore legitimate to affirm that, on the international scene and within the Organization which is its reflection,

there is a relative obsolescence of the polarization of the world into two great ideological groups. Ideas are important but no idea can survive the spirit which inspired it.

Not all is East or West in the United Nations of 1963. The world has other cardinal points. These words, which have dominated international politics until quite recently, may eventually be referred back to the realm of geography. The waning of the ideological conflict and the progressive removal of political implications from the expressions "East" and "West" have also had certain consequences – both political and semantic – with regard to the concepts of neutralism and non-alignment. These concepts have weakened in their consistency as the poles which supported them became less and less rigid. We must not lose sight of how much the world has changed since last October and we must explore all possibilities of negotiation which have been opened with the recent signing of the limited nuclear test-ban treaty.

Let us cast a look about us in this hall and ask ourselves whether the world represented here can really be adequately described by such hasty generalizations and rigid classifications. Three broad categories cannot cover the whole range of ideas, concepts and trends of the whole mankind. Mankind is richer and far more complex than its classifiers. The realization of this fact may complicate political problems and make it necessary to revise certain books and pamphlets of political propaganda, but we also are allowed to hope that the world in which we live will thus become less dangerous and less explosive. Sociologists and political theoreticians will have more to do, but statesmen and diplomats may possibly work within a climate of increased trust.

In the contemporary world and in the United Nations we are witnessing the emergence not of neutral or non-aligned blocs, nor of a third political ideological Power, but of affinities – affinities less stable perhaps, but more effective in terms of tactical objectives shaped on the basis of common demands. What we are witnessing is in fact the emergence of a parliamentary grouping, within the United Nations, of small and medium Powers which unite, beyond or outside the scope of ideologies or military alliances, to conduct a continuous struggle around three fundamental themes: Disarmament, Development and Decolonization. It is easy to define the meaning of the terms of this trinity. The struggle for disarmament is the struggle for peace itself and for the juridical equality of States that strive to place themselves beyond the bounds of fear or intimidation. The struggle for development is the struggle for economic emancipation and social justice. The struggle for

decolonization in its broader sense is a struggle for political emancipation, for freedom and human rights. This is the great movement which unfolds itself here, a movement launched by small and medium Powers which can no longer accept the anachronistic Manichean method of analyzing world problems. On the contrary, they want the United Nations to adapt it self to the world of 1963, a world in which they must live, under the stress of great dangers but on the threshold of wonderful prospects. This parliamentary grouping, though still in the process of defining itself, transcends the terms of the old division of the world into West, East and neutral. This movement, initiated under the sign of disarmament, development and decolonization, demands only the fulfillment of the promises already contained in the United Nations Charter.

Each nation, large or small, will always be the best judge of its own defense and security requirements. My country, for example, has never accepted the label of neutralism for its independent foreign policy. Our position is perfectly clear. Brazil belongs to no bloc, but is an integral part of a system, the Inter-American system, which we conceive as an instrument of peace and understanding among all members of the community of nations. Brazil, like most Latin-American and African-Asian countries, cannot however remain alien to that parliamentary grouping which embraces a great majority of the 111 Member nations and thus provides the Organization with a renewed impetus. And yet, in a spirit of sheer political realism, we must admit that the recommendations of this majority, with regard to each one of these three fundamental themes, are left, with noticeable frequency, unimplemented.

The armament race goes on unchecked despite reiterated resolutions of the world Organization. An immense part of mankind is still vegetating under humiliating conditions incompatible with human dignity, and millions of human beings are still deprived of freedom and human rights under degrading forms of political or colonial oppression. This is due – let us have the courage to say it – to the existence and survival of a power of veto, of an invisible veto, in the General Assembly. This invisible veto, of which very little is said and heard, may prove, in important questions such as Disarmament, Development and Decolonization, even more frustrating and dangerous than the negative aspect of the principle of unanimity which has hampered the functioning and impeded the effective action of the Security Council. It is this invisible veto which prevents the adoption of certain draft resolutions or, as is much more often the case, which prevents the implementation of resolutions already adopted. And it is against this invisible veto that

the efforts of the nations which have common aspirations and claims, aspirations to peace, to development and also to freedom, must be directed. Because, in the struggle for peace and development, man cannot jeopardize freedom.

In the fulfillment of the mandate of mediation which was entrusted to it by the General Assembly, Brazil has acted in the Eighteen-Nation Committee on Disarmament with the strictest realism. Disarmament, as we have stated in Geneva, is a central problem, and all the other political issues are contained and reflected in this problem. Compared to the problem of disarmament, any other problem, difficult though it may appear – and we mentioned the Berlin problem as an example – seems to be relatively easy to solve, because whatever its solution may be, each party has an approximate idea of what it can gain or lose, and also because this solution may not necessarily be final and irrevocable if the means and the possibilities to alter it remain available. Disarmament is the problem of power, and traditionally problems of power have been solved by the use of power itself. The challenge of Geneva consists precisely in attempting to solve this problem of power by negotiation and by means of persuasion. This is no easy task, and an elementary sense of reality induces us to admit that we are still far removed from the conclusion of a treaty on general and complete disarmament. With regard to the text of that treaty, we have hardly gone beyond the first paragraphs of its preamble. And in the meantime enormous resources which could have been utilized in the fulfillment of a better existence, appear as factors of threat and destruction. The present arms race, which proceeds at a mad pace, is primarily responsible for the scarcity of resources available for the great tasks of economic development. How can one speak seriously of cultural progress when the human race is engaged substantially in preparing and perfecting the means of its own destruction? The only technology worthy of respect is the one that leads to life and freedom.

The eight mediating countries in Geneva – Brazil, Burma, Ethiopia, India, Mexico, Nigeria, the United Arab Republic and Sweden – bear a great diplomatic responsibility in this question of disarmament. These countries were not acting as a "political bloc", but as a "diplomatic group" which, in a spirit of mediation, was trying tenaciously to broaden the sparse areas of agreement between the two Power blocs. Acting always in response to world public opinion, these nations have made a decisive contribution through their efforts which allowed the Eighteen Nation Committee on Disarmament to secure its first major positive step, the treaty banning nuclear tests in the atmosphere, in outer space and under water, recently concluded in Moscow. Brazil has

always upheld the view that the nuclear Powers, without waiting for the conclusion of a treaty for general and complete disarmament, should proceed to formalize agreements whenever views are found to coincide. For this reason we have always given priority to the question of nuclear testing, the non-dissemination of nuclear arms, and the prevention of war by accident. It was in this context that, perceiving the continuing difficulties in the matter of detection and verification of underground tests, Brazil addressed the following question to the nuclear Powers:

> It has been implied that a nuclear test ban is difficult to attain because the great Powers cannot or do not wish to agree on the intricate question of control, a problem which is based on confidence. It is well known, however, that the main divergences and discrepancies do lie in the problems of detection and identification of underground tests, as the international control required for atmospheric and outer space tests does not appear to present so many insurmountable difficulties. Why, then, not concentrate our efforts on this question of atmospheric and outer space tests which are the most dangerous, actually and potentially, and the ones which have a most disturbing effect on mind, body and nerves? Why not, along the lines of the eight nation joint memorandum, further explore the possibility of an agreement on the question of control of atmospheric and outer space tests and at the same time start a discussion on the adequate methods of detection and identification of underground tests?

This question, first formulated on July 25, 1962 and reiterated on August 17, 1962, met at first, however, with nothing but silence on the part of the three nuclear Powers which constituted the Sub-Committee of the Eighteen Nation Committee on Disarmament. It was only on August 27, 1962 that the great Powers began to move forward with the submission of the joint Anglo-American proposal on the partial banning of nuclear tests. I mention this fact here not to enhance the contribution of my country to the cause of disarmament, but to indicate that, in the fulfillment of their mediation role, the eight non-aligned Powers at Geneva must run the risk of misunderstanding and criticism that often result from tactical motives prevailing at a given moment.

My country has welcomed with enthusiasm the signature of the Treaty of Moscow, and my President, João Goulart, in his message to President Kennedy, Chairman Khrushchev and Prime Minister Macmillan, expressed Brazil's gratification at the constructive spirit in which the United Kingdom, the United States of America and the Soviet

Union had conducted the negotiations. My Government was one of the first to sign the treaty which has been submitted for ratification by our Congress. For Brazil the partial treaty has not only the great merit of immediately eliminating the deadly effects of radiation, but also the symbolic value of demonstrating that a common effort of the great Powers to resolve their differences is always possible and viable. In that sense, Brazil has welcomed the partial treaty as one of the most auspicious events since 1945 and as a starting point for agreements ever more far-reaching and creative. The words which I am about to add must therefore not be interpreted as indicating any lack of enthusiasm in respect of that treaty.

Without wishing to attenuate the impact and the high significance of the limited test-ban treaty, which reflects an idea which we have defended since the very first days of the Geneva Conference, we cannot refrain from regretting that the Moscow meeting was held outside the province of the Eighteen Nation Committee on Disarmament. We see no logical or plausible reason for this development, since we cannot admit the possibility that the nuclear Powers had wished to segregate the remaining members from the solution of a question which was a matter of common interest. Inasmuch as there existed in Geneva a Sub-Committee on Nuclear Tests made up solely of the three nuclear Powers, that Sub-Committee, under the rules of the Conference, could have met in any place and at any level of representation; why, then, did the three nuclear Powers not wish to give the Moscow Conference the character of a meeting of that Sub-Committee? This would have had the great merit of placing the subject matter within the context of general and complete disarmament and of serving as a starting point for the future work of the Committee. World peace and security cannot be the object of exclusive negotiations of a directorate of great Powers, no matter how great and powerful they may be. To a common danger of death and destruction, common responsibility must be the counterpart. And it is this responsibility that the non-nuclear Powers wish to assume.

Just as we formulated our question on July 25, 1962, Brazil is formulating today, from this rostrum, the following questions addressed to the three nuclear Powers: What are the real difficulties which keep us from a final solution on underground tests? Why not recognize that, with reference to this question, the opposing viewpoints have been narrowed down to a point where anyone of the parties could accept the opposing point of view without making, in fact, great concessions? Why not explore, by common agreement, the possibility of broadening immediately the area of agreement reached at Moscow by the additional banning of underground tests above an established range of detectability?

The Sub-Committee on a Treaty for the Discontinuance of Nuclear Weapon Tests of the Eighteen Nation Committee on Disarmament, when it meets again, could perhaps explore immediately the possibilities of a gradual and successive treatment of the question of placing nuclear testing under a ban. It is possible to envisage, for example, in a first stage, the immediate prohibition of underground tests to a limit currently detectable by the monitoring systems of the parties concerned and, in a second stage, to commence, within a maximum period of one year, to suspend those tests above a certain limit of, say, 4.75 kilotons, or the most technically feasible limit on that occasion. This scheme, of course, involves technical and scientific aspects that can be revised and modified during the discussions to be held by the nuclear Powers, which certainly are technically better qualified through their well-known familiarity with explosions.

It is evident that in all these cases a meeting of minds is indispensable on the part of the nuclear Powers which, on the other hand, cannot continue to ignore the reiterated manifestations of the General Assembly. In advancing these suggestions, I am aware that we may face again some instances of the lack of understanding encountered in the past.

Brazil, jointly with Bolivia, Chile, Ecuador and Mexico, will continue its efforts aimed at the conclusion of a unanimous agreement bringing into effect the "denuclearization" of Latin America, while we formulate the hope that similar agreements may be concluded elsewhere to cover as great an area of the world as possible. With regard to the "denuclearization" of Latin America, my delegation, which has submitted this question as a specific item on the agenda, would like to indicate that we are not proposing that Latin America be declared a denuclearized zone by the General Assembly. Brazil proposes that Latin American nations, as sovereign nations, should consider the possibility, by the most appropriate ways and means, of concluding a treaty under which they would commit themselves not to manufacture, store, receive or test nuclear weapons. This is the sense which we attach to the proposal of the five Latin American countries, recently reaffirmed by a joint declaration of April 29, 1963, signed by the Presidents of Bolivia, Brazil, Chile, Ecuador and Mexico. In this matter, my delegation will maintain the closest contact with all Latin American delegations.

In the same spirit, the Brazilian delegation to the Disarmament Committee recently aired in Geneva the idea of a multilateral non-aggression pact which would establish a reciprocal machinery linking the greatest possible number of States parties to that pact, under which they would pledge not to commit aggression against any other State, regardless

of its geographical location. This idea seems to us much more reasonable and dynamic than the previous idea of a non-aggression pact between the members of NATO and the Warsaw Pact. The Charter is universal in spirit. Peace should prevail among all members of the international community and not only among those States that are committed to specific military alliances. The idea of a pact limited to a certain category of States is founded on the old East-West patterns, the predominance of which, as I have said, appears to be on the wane.

Brazil continues to favor the idea that a technical committee be established within the framework of the Eighteen Nation Committee on Disarmament to study solutions for the problems of control, without which it will not be possible to advance decisively towards general and complete disarmament. We continue to believe that political discussions cannot permanently move within a technical void. We do not conceive of disarmament without control.

The second series of considerations which the Brazilian delegation deems necessary to submit is related to economic and social development. The problem of economic development in the present demographic and economic condition of the world tends to become, in our opinion, of an urgency equal to that of disarmament, with a fundamental difference: that while disarmament will become a process prolonged in time, its inherent dangers diminishing with the gradual conquest of each step towards peace, economic development will generate pressures more and more unbearable to the structure of human societies unless urgent measures are taken to intensify and to speed it up. Just as we are bound to link collective security to general and complete disarmament under international control, by the same token we are compelled to join together, as twin concepts, the ideas of collective political security and collective economic security.

Under present conditions, two-thirds of mankind are living at a subsistence level and suffer all the social and economic hardships inherent in underdevelopment. Alongside those two-thirds of mankind, the minority of the world population, beneficiary of the increased productivity resulting from industrialization, has attained high levels of economic prosperity and social well-being.

The key to the understanding of the problem that confronts us – the international community – is not, however, merely the existence of the income gap between developed and developing countries. The crucial factor is the widening of this gap, which will be increasingly more difficult to bridge if present trends are not reversed. It is within this context of gloomy facts and prospects that we must endeavor to understand the

efforts of the developing countries to meet the requirements of social progress and economic justice. These requirements, which correspond to the most legitimate human aspirations, cannot be repressed indefinitely, and it is with a view to fulfilling them that the domestic efforts of each developing country must be supplemented by those of the international community.

While the struggle for economic development has to be conducted on several fronts, the United Nations, by the universality of its scope and in conformity with the letter and spirit of its Charter, has a vital role to play in redeeming the great majority of the world population from the subhuman conditions in which they are submerged. In the view of my Government, the activities of the United Nations in the field of economic development must concentrate on three main priority areas: industrialization, mobilization of capital for development, and international trade.

Without wishing to minimize the importance of integrated economic development, there is today a unanimous conviction that industry represents the most dynamic sector of the economy of the developing countries and that most capable of ensuring, in a brief historical period, both the diversification and economic emancipation of these countries. The classical doctrine of international specialization of labor, that condemned the countries in the periphery to the immutable position of suppliers of primary products, is already obsolete and has been replaced by a theory that is more compatible with the realities of the present day world. Conceived, however, in an epoch in which this doctrinal evolution was not yet fully crystallized, the United Nations family has for a long time occupied itself marginally with the problems of industrialization and given almost exclusive emphasis to other sectors such as agriculture and public health. It is true that resources devoted to industrialization have shown some increase in recent years. The rate of growth of these resources is nevertheless minimal when compared with the needs of developing countries and the financial capabilities of advanced nations, as was clearly indicated by the Advisory Committee of Experts that has recently examined the United Nations activities in the field of industrial development. According to the report of the experts, the current institutional framework is inadequate and must be urgently replaced by a new framework more in harmony with the general aspirations of developing countries for accelerated industrialization. The Brazilian Government considers that the establishment of a specialized agency

for industrial development would contribute decisively to the fulfillment of that aspiration.

The second priority area is the transfer of capital to the developing countries from the developed countries, where such capital is abundant. The mobilization of international financial resources is one of the essential prerequisites for the gradual attainment, by developing countries, of levels of welfare comparable to those of developed nations. Nevertheless, the flow of financial assistance should be genuinely geared to the needs of developing countries both from the quantitative point of view, in the sense that the total volume available be proportional to their capital requirements, and from the qualitative point of view, in that the condition of loans must take into consideration the structural difficulties in the balance of payments of these countries. The significance of soft loans has been convincingly emphasized by the former President of the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development, Mr. Eugene Black, who stated that unless the aid mixture had a larger component of funds on concessionary terms, "the machinery of economic development would be loaded with foreign debts until it sputtered to a halt amid half-built projects and mountains of discarded plans". The inadequacy of international finance in terms consistent with the economic peculiarities of developing countries may compel these countries to adopt emergency solutions of an unorthodox nature if economic stagnation or retrogression and wide-spread social unrest are to be avoided.

It is now universally acknowledged that economic assistance should not involve any non-economic element. Assistance granted in this manner has the advantage of clearing the political atmosphere, both nationally and internationally, of a needless ingredient of controversy. Furthermore, it is entirely in harmony with the long-term interests of all sovereign countries, both capital-exporting and capital-importing, and should be encouraged in every possible way by the increasing utilization of multilateral channels. In this connection, regional programs of assistance play a prominent role, and all efforts should be made to intensify and enlarge the scope of these programs. As a decisive step in this trend towards multilateralism, and while giving due importance to all existing sources of assistance, it is essential that the United Nations be endowed with its own financing body, thus enabling the Organization to enter the field of capital assistance to developing countries.

It has been with this in mind that the Brazilian delegation has advocated in the past and continues to advocate the establishment of a United Nations capital development fund, open to all Members of the

United Nations and the specialized agencies. The new organ, already established in principle, would be capable of extending loans and grants and would be administered in such a way as to give each Member country equal voting power irrespective of the size of its contribution. A substantial portion of the resources released by general and complete disarmament could be diverted to the capital development fund. So long as Comprehensive disarmament, so anxiously desired by mankind, is not forthcoming, a small percentage of current military outlays should be placed at the disposal of the fund. The diversion of only 1 per cent of the resources at present devoured by the armaments race would represent not less than US$ 1,200 million annually, a sum that would enable the fund to start operations on a scale surpassing current expectations. We fervently hope that the US$ 120,000 million spent on armaments every year will never be actually utilized in war. We fervently hope that future generations may be in a position to say that those were wasteful expenditures for senseless purposes. Why, then, would it be too bold to request the sacrifice, or the saving, of 1 per cent of human folly for the social redemption and development of all mankind?

Furthermore, in order to mark the presence of the United Nations in the field of capital development and in order to permit the Governments of Member States to keep under continuous and systematic review the total flow of capital to developing countries, the General Assembly might envisage the establishment of a standing committee of the Economic and Social Council similar to the Committee for Industrial Development and other subsidiary bodies.

The third priority are – which, at the present stage, is also the most important one – must receive special attention in the context of the economic and social activities of the United Nations. It is an unfortunate fact of life that international trade has contributed so far only marginally to the economic development of low-income countries, especially in recent years. In some cases, it has actually worsened the relative position of developing countries and, through the mechanism of the deterioration of the terms of trade, widened the gap of income levels between developed and developing countries. The United Nations Conference on Trade and Development has been called precisely because the present structure of international trade is adverse to developing countries and is based on a set of principles and operational rules that in most cases are geared principally to the interests and peculiarities of industrialized countries. This Conference means the living presence of the United Nations, with the universality of its outlook and its concern with the problems of

development in the field of international trade that so far have been outside the scope of the world Organization. It means the political will to revise what must be revised, to reformulate obsolete principles, to set up new rules of international behavior, to create conditions for a new international division of labor based on the correlation of trade and development, and finally to bring into existence the institutional framework required to implement the decisions of the Conference. The disappointment of those expectations would represent one of the most painful failures in the history of the United Nations. The Conference must justify the legitimate hopes of all underdeveloped countries which are counting on the understanding of the advanced countries that have by far the heaviest responsibilities for bringing order and purpose into the inchoate universe of international economic life.

At the close of the Conference, and as a crystallization of a long process of political decision and extensive interaction of ideas, the Brazilian Government believes that a declaration on the achievement and preservation of collective economic security should be proclaimed. The declaration, which has already been foreshadowed by the joint statement of developing countries in Geneva, would be a political act of great significance, perhaps one of the most important events ever to take place under the aegis of the United Nations. The declaration would no doubt find its place beside the two other documents of which we are justifiably proud: the Universal Declaration of Human Rights and the Declaration on the granting of independence to colonial countries and peoples. This declaration would not propose ideal solutions for establishing collective economic security. On the contrary, it would involve proposing, on the basis of clear-cut and objective premises, a set of principles which would serve as long-range goals to be reached by the United Nations in this sphere. Consequently, it would involve defining a common ground for certain economic notions about international economic life, from which easier chances of agreement maybe derived when discussing practical problems or objectives related to the economic organization of the international community. The analogy which lends itself best to the definition of these objectives is the Universal Declaration of Human Rights. In a synthetic body of basic precepts related to the most complex theme of all – the human being – we find a concentration of a whole program for the future aimed at shaping the human being of tomorrow out of the human being of today. Would it, then, not be possible to add to this Declaration yet another one which would deal with the second most controversial topic in the social world of our day: economic relations among nations?

In proposing this declaration, the Brazilian delegation does not overlook the difficulties to be overcome. Our task is all the more difficult as we do not have in mind a mere rhetorical document. General agreement around vague propositions is no substitute for a sincere willingness to cooperate in the promotion of the social and economic advancement of developing countries. A grandiloquent text unrelated to the practice of international economic relations would serve no useful purpose and indeed might have detrimental effects. For the preparation of this document the Conference should draw upon the valuable legacy of ideas that the United Nations family has been building up over the years, including the draft declaration on international economic cooperation, now under study by an *ad hoc* Working Group of the Economic and Social Council. The very concept of collective economic security was born out of this network of studies, explorations and cogitations. This complex system must now be codified in a declaration that would represent a collective expression of faith in a comprehensive ordination of the international economic process which would provide guidelines for international action against underdevelopment. The Brazilian delegation wishes to express its sincerest hope that we may, when we celebrate the jubilee year of the United Nations in 1965, have already proclaimed the declaration on the establishment and preservation of collective economic security.

After this survey of the tasks facing the United Nations in the promotion of economic development, one point should be stressed. This high degree of development achieved by a small number of countries does not necessarily imply the perpetuation of underdevelopment elsewhere. It is obvious, on the contrary, that the economic and social security achieved by some is in danger if all do not attain this economic and social security. We are on the verge of the reconstruction of a new international community, where the continued existence of economic and social underdevelopment will be a risk for all. We live within a system made up of reciprocal causes and effects. Just as peace is indivisible – because peace involves an element of interdependence and its consolidation requires the cooperation of sovereign unities – so the economic and social development of mankind, which is the condition and expression of peace, should be indivisible. We are not dealing with abstractions. We are confronted with hard realities that require prompt and decisive action.

It may be stated without exaggeration that mankind has reached the final stage of the colonial process with the same features which have characterized it during the last five centuries. And, consequently, it may be acknowledged that the colonial process is a historical and sociological

archaism the remnants of which are sources of tensions and political friction in the Contemporary world, which can and must be finally eradicated and liquidated.

What is most striking, however, in this comprehensive process is the fact that, until completely liquidated, the remnants of colonialism constitute the main obstacle of the economic development of the former colonies which have now become sovereign States. With very few exceptions these sovereign States have been encountering enormous obstacles in their development as a result of a trade pattern which has vitiated the economic means available to the former colonies; their semi-colonial economic status has perpetuated itself.

The liquidation and eradication of the historical and sociological anachronism of colonialism is, accordingly, a process of the highest interest for the defense of the economies of all former colonies, irrespective of the various phases of their political emancipation and of the continents where they may be located.

It is generally accepted today that total decolonization is the essential objective pursued throughout the world, wherever territories or peoples are involved which are dependent to any degree. This objective, within the context of the United Nations, does not stem only from a quantitative element, namely, the voting predominance of the new Member States, but also from a qualitative factor: the fact that the anti-colonial thesis has in its favor all the ethical, economic, demographic, social and political motivations. Only reasons of power and state relations can explain postponements, since the so-called technical motivations, such as cultural development, capacity for self-government, national viability, lack of preparation of leaders and other related arguments, militate in fact against the colonial thesis, because whatever was left undone during the past decades can hardly be expected to be accomplished in the few remaining years. And if nothing was done, this was due to the willingness to do nothing intrinsically related to the colonial problem.

As early as the eighth and until the fifteenth session of the General Assembly in 1960 – the African Year of the United Nations – decolonization was making enormous strides ahead, year after year, in a growing and cumulative movement, the theoretical preparation of which was due, to a large extent, to the action of Latin-American delegations. This movement received an extraordinary impetus as a consequence of the Second World War, when the peoples of the dependent territories in Africa and in Asia played a very important role, not sufficiently emphasized to this day. The Second World War generated conditions for national independence which,

if impeded, would have jeopardized the precarious peace of the world. Within the Organization of the United Nations, after resolution 1514 (XV) containing the Declaration for the granting of independence to colonial countries and peoples had been approved in 1960, the Organization began to fail in its determination to implement the principles embodied in the Declaration for the liquidation of colonialism, which, though verbally required as immediate, met with difficulties previously foreseen by some observers, if not yet officially mentioned in the debates.

Brazil recognizes that the residual elements of colonialism are still offering resistance and still require, for a certain time, concentrated efforts and great wisdom. Nevertheless, the decolonizing movement can be peacefully completed within the framework of the United Nations Charter and General Assembly resolutions. The Special Committee of Twenty-Four on the implementation of the Declaration deserves the support of all the Members of the United Nations. The powers which in the past had possessed a colonial empire have all heeded, almost without any exception, the voice of the new times. The remaining points of resistance to this process require increased efforts on the part of the United Nations in order to achieve its rational and harmonious solution. This is, therefore, an appropriate moment for the Special Committee, at the resumption of its work, to pass in systematic review each one of the continents, without omitting the American continent and its territories dependent on extra-continental powers. As long as there remains a dependent territory, there will be a source of international misunderstanding inherent in this type of international relations which is both obsolete and anachronistic. Such is the lesson of our times.

Brazil views the struggle for decolonization as comprehending all the aspects of the secular fight for freedom and human rights. Brazil stands against every form of colonialism, be it political or economic. For the same reason, Brazil regards with extreme caution the emergence of alternative forms of political colonialism already defined as neo-colonialism. It would thus be desirable that the organs that are now entrusted with the problems of decolonization within the framework of the United Nations turn their attention to this new phenomenon of the modern world, the dangerous implications of which I have no need to emphasize.

The United Nations would be one more failure and the most bitter one in the long history of the hopes of the human race, and would betray its purpose and destiny if it does not face, with all the urgency and determination required by our times, these three sources of vital international problems: Disarmament, Development and Decolonization.

However, as we are advancing towards the attainment of those objectives, we recognize the inescapable need of strengthening this Organization so as to allow it to adapt itself to the tasks resulting from its own duties and commitments. This task of regeneration has been dynamically stimulated by the insight and wisdom of our Secretary-General, U Thant, whose qualities of thought and action are complemented by an exact comprehension of what the United Nations ought to be in this world of nuclear dangers and underdevelopment, of great challenges and yet of great prospects.

The positive achievements of the Organization cannot be challenged, no matter how sceptical its critics. However, the mere acknowledgement of these achievements does not suffice in, itself, because the process and the pace of history are being accelerated and along with that the urgency of the collective needs. The Organization reflecting the pressures of these Collective needs, and as a tool devised to deal with them, cannot allow them to reach the critical explosive point. It is therefore necessary continuously to infuse vitality into the Organization, first by considering what should have been done, and then considering what should be done.

Here it is appropriate to formulate certain questions in the light of the text of the Charter itself. Why were so many articles of the Charter never applied? Why, for example, was Article 26 not applied? Why was Article 43 never institutionalized in connection with Articles 45, 46 and 47? Why was no action taken as outlined in Articles 57 and 63 and why was it not recognized that, despite the expenses involved, it would have had considerable advantages in respect of the organic structure of the existing specialized agencies as well as of those which it would be appropriate to set up by reason of superior collective interests? Why, on the other hand, are we not endeavoring to supersede completely Chapters XI, XII and XIII of the Charter by the fulfillment *in toto* of its explicit objectives?

There is no reason to keep silent on the causes which produced these impediments. The Charter – apart from the enormous merits which accord to it the character of the loftiest diplomatic instrument so far devised by mankind carries the marks of the historical conditions which gave it life, namely the heritage of the Second World War. It reflects those conditions as an instrument of big-Power policy, a residue of the struggles terminated in 1945, so that its true objective, the establishment in a disarmed world of peace based on universal justice, was jeopardized by certain inherent imperfections in its origin, inevitable at the time but which today should be corrected and overcome. What can be said, for example, about Article 107 of the Charter today?

The effective application of the Charter is obstructed by the effective directorate exercised by the great Powers. Their action nonetheless could be deemed positive if it were kept within the real and literal limits of the Charter itself. Today, we all feel the urgency of a modernization and an adjustment of the Charter to the conditions of the present day world, in the very form outlined in Articles 108 and 109. Nonetheless, certain perfectly justified claims, such as the immediate increase in the membership of the Security Council and of the Economic and Social Council, the possible creation of new councils, the setting up of an effective machinery for the maintenance of peace objectives supported by an overwhelming majority of the Member States suffer defeat at the hands of the directorate of the great Powers, which insists upon conditioning the action of the United Nations to the unyielding play of power politics or of specific political solutions to a given question.

It was in this manner that the vicious circle was created in which the revision of the Charter was frustrated, as was the possibility for asserting the presence of the United Nations in the most significant acts of contemporary diplomacy. Indeed, is it not true that the nuclear test ban agreement was recently concluded in Moscow outside the framework of the United Nations?

There is no doubt that if this vicious circle is not broken and the invisible veto is not overcome with the cooperation and goodwill of all nations, including the great Powers of necessity, the Charter, though dynamic in character, will tend to come to a standstill. It is necessary that all Powers, all Member States, all States not yet Members but aspiring to membership in the United Nations, that all, in short, be imbued with what they claim to possess: the desire for peace. It is necessary for us to be able to overcome all the obstacles opposing human progress and freedom. For on our march towards progress, we are not prepared to forsake freedom.

The fundamental coordinates of the important task of revitalizing the Charter can, in our opinion, be outlined as follows: first, today the concept of security is inseparably linked to the concept of peace: without peace there will be no security for any nation, no matter how great the number of nuclear weapons it has in stock and the number of tests it has conducted. Therefore, the concept of security is truly collective and conditioned by collectively disarmed peace. The Charter, which was based on the concept of an absolute and individual security for each country, must reflect the new thermo-nuclear reality. Secondly, the economic concepts – which were practically absent from the Covenant of the League of Nations, where there was but one single

paragraph (Article 23, paragraph *e*) which referred to the "freedom of communications and of transit and equitable treatment for the commerce of all Members of the League" – appear in the Charter also at a level of extreme generalization, even though this represents a stride forward in the recognition of an international responsibility for the promotion of economic development. Today's world with its urgent needs certainly requires much more than these very broad generalizations. The efforts made in recent years to establish such international responsibility must be materialized within this Organization, which demands a Charter forcefully expressing the requirements of a world which must become dynamic in order to survive. Thirdly, the concept of colonial emancipation and the self-determination of peoples enshrined in the Charter is today a reality so firmly imbedded that it is necessary to speed up its ultimate practical effectiveness. The process of its application had indeed created the Organization we behold today, and its Charter, approved by fifty-one original signatory Member States, imposes itself upon the sixty new Members, who never had the opportunity to state their views on the new features required by the realities of the present day world. It is not possible to delay any longer the right of sixty States admitted since 1945 to express themselves on the nature and the objectives of an Organization of which they are a part and to which they bring a great creative force. This consideration makes it imperative to revise the Charter, in order to adjust it to the reality of the nuclear era.

At the San Francisco Conference, where the structure of the Organization was first built, Brazil was one of the first and most persistent defenders of the principle of the flexibility of the Charter, maintaining the thesis that its provisions had to be continuously subject to an organic process of revision. In that sense, the Brazilian delegation submitted an amendment under which the General Assembly was to proceed to a mandatory examination of the basic statute of the Organization every five years, in order to embody all the modifications suggested by experience. After citing an opinion according to which the revision of constitutional provisions is a question of experience rather than of logic, my delegation proceeded to say:

> Once a legal institution is created, it acquires a life of its own. Given sufficient time, the Organization will reveal the virtues and the defects of its structure, and indicate what adjustments are necessary to make survival possible and to bring about peace and justice.

As may be seen, there is nothing new or revolutionary in the idea of revising the United Nations Charter. The concept of the need of revision as well as of its process is provided for in the Charter itself.

My delegation, in conformity with the ideas just expressed in respect of the various questions pertaining to our organizational collective life, shall maintain, in the course of the period of work we are about to initiate, the closest liaison with all the other delegations. On the basis of such consultations and conversations, the Brazilian delegation reserves its right to submit, either individually or in association with other Member States, certain draft resolutions incorporating these ideas and geared to a new concept of the United Nations – the United Nations of today. I repeat, it is not in vain that eighteen years of history have been lived through a nuclear era. Disarmament, Development, Decolonization, these are the only alternatives to death, starvation and slavery. Because in everything and above everything the essential goal is to secure human freedom. In the final analysis man will have gained nothing if he loses his freedom – freedom to live, to think and to act. For progress and economic development my country will make every sacrifice, yet it will not sacrifice freedom. No idea will be acceptable to us if it brings with it the suppression of human freedom. But as security is today linked to peace, so is the concept of freedom linked to those of social progress and economic development. And we must advance rapidly for time is running short, both for the United Nations and for mankind.

New York, September 19, 1963.

1964

1964

The political changes that took place in March 1964 would bring about important consequences for Brazilian external policy. The prevailing view then was that developments in Brazil meant a serious blow to the international Communist movement and would alter the correlation of forces of the Cold War. Once again Brazil nurtured expectations of growing American involvement in its development project. The leaders of 1964 would look for cooperation, understanding and assistance, in order to turn Brazil, in the words of the time, into a stalwart of the cause of freedom in the world.

The formulation of Brazilian foreign policy reinstated a world view fundamentally different from the one that guided the period Quadros-Goulart. The central premise on which the independent external policy had been based was that the multiplicity of centers of power in the international panorama represented a positive factor that increased diplomatic opportunities for Brazil. Those who assumed government responsibilities in 1964, however, believed that the international scenario was still governed by bipolarity; consequently, a policy of alignment offered the best opportunities that Brazilian external action could hope for.

In a speech at the Foreign Ministry (Itamaraty) in July 1964, President Castello Branco explained in detail the new Brazilian external policy doctrine. Foreign policy should no longer be called "independent", said the President, because the concept of independence had acquired a

terminal value and lost its descriptive usefulness in a world dominated by the bipolar confrontation of power with a radical political-ideological divorce between the two centers. In this context, he concluded, the acceptance of a certain degree of interdependence becomes inevitable, whether in the military, economic or political fields. Nationalism, the President remarked, had changed into a disguised option in favor of the socialist systems. The Brazilian posture from then on would derive from the basic fidelity of the society to the Western democratic system. Such posture, he stated, would not however make Brazil pledge prior adherence to the attitudes of any of the two big powers. Each question would be examined in the light of the national interest and in each case a distinction would be made between policies aimed at safeguarding basic interests of the Western system and those meant to satisfy individual interests of the guardian powers of the Western world.

In this way the basic tenets that would guide Brazil's relationship with the United States were launched: divergences stemming from specific national interests or exclusively bilateral in character would be permitted, but Brazil would be subject to American leadership in anything that could be defined as part of the global context of ideological confrontation.

Thus, anachronistically, Brazil once again became part of the international scenario of the Cold War at a time when it in fact showed clear signs of change in the light of the initial movements of the process of *détente*. The explosion of the first Chinese atomic bomb and the growing involvement of the United States in Vietnam would make the need for accommodation between the U.S. and the USSR more dramatic. The emergence of Leonid Brezhnev's leadership finally made this understanding possible although the path was constantly strewn with ambivalent signals.

In his statement before the nineteenth Session of the General Assembly, Foreign Minister Vasco Leitão da Cunha expressed in a sober and objective manner the changes that had taken place in Brazilian external policy. He stated that some principles and positions previously assumed had become obsolete and once again extolled the unrestricted adherence of Brazil to the Western camp in an international context of confrontation. Quoting extensively President Castello Branco's speech at Itamaraty, Minister Leitão da Cunha expounded the doctrinal basis of the new postulates of external policy and then mentioned some of the main items of the agenda. He did not neglect to emphasize the themes of development and decolonization. On both issues he adopted a conciliatory tone, stressing the peaceful character that the process of independence

of the former colonies should have. Echoing the Cold War rhetoric, he stated that the principle of self-determination should be equally applied to Eastern Germany.

One must note the emphasis ascribed in Ambassador Leitão da Cunha's speech to peacekeeping operations and particularly to the proposal that they be the subject of a special chapter in the Charter, to be placed between Chapter VI (Pacific Settlement of Disputes) and Chapter VII (Action with Respect to Threats to the Peace, Breaches of the Peace and Acts of Aggression). This proposal, which would come to be known as "Chapter VI and a Half", would often reappear in Brazilian statements. In the light of the latent aspirations of Brazil regarding the Security Council, it had the additional advantage of calling attention the question of the reform of the Charter.

XIX Regular Session of the General Assembly of the United Nations 1964

Minister Vasco Leitão da Cunha [*]

Mr. President,

Allow me to offer you the warm congratulations of Brazil on your election to the presidency of the General Assembly. The unanimity of the choice made by the membership of the Organization in selecting you for this high office has particular significance. It testifies to the wide renown in which your name is held in the United Nations and the certainty that your statesmanlike qualities will enable you to guide the Assembly to the best advantage in this hour.

It is no coincidence that a distinguished representative from Africa presides over this session. In your person, the General Assembly looks with hope and confidence to the contribution that the young States of Africa bring to the grave issues that trouble the world.

I heard with great appreciation the inspiring words of your acceptance speech, reflecting how very well you grasp your duties and the duties before us. You mentioned the voices of Africa. In my country, this has a very familiar sound indeed. One of the classics of Brazilian literature is a poem entitled "Voices of Africa", composed by Antonio de Castro Alves, a champion of the cause of African freedom.

[*] **Vasco Tristão Leitão da Cunha**, born in Rio de Janeiro, RJ, September 2, 1903. Bachelor in Legal and Social Sciences from the University of Rio de Janeiro. Third Officer, public selection process, in 7/1/27. Minister of State for External Relations and Minister of Health from 4/6/1964 to 4/20/1964. Minister of State for External Relations from 4/20/1964 to 12/7/1965. † Rio de Janeiro, June 1984.

It bears witness to the imprint left by your people in the blood and in the soul of our people.

Now, as in every previous year, we are meeting to examine the vast field of activities of the United Nations and to attempt to arrive at favorable solutions for the great problems for which answers can be found through international cooperation. The honor I have in opening this debate is even greater as I can recall those days in a distant past when I took part in the work of the Preparatory Committee and at the first session of the General Assembly, in London in 1945-1946. It is thus very clear in my mind how much the international scene has changed during those nineteen years and how much has been accomplished by the United Nations in that span of time.

One thing has not changed, however, the main principles which guide us and which are embodied in our Charter. The loyalty of Brazil to these principles has not been altered either, for they are part of the political philosophy of our nation. The unswerving loyalty of my country to the aims and principles of the United Nations I reiterate here today with firmness and renewed confidence.

Brazil has now resumed the broad path of its genuine traditions, after a brief attempt had been made to divert it from them. In a great surge of national renewal, my country has regained all its possibilities for progress and order, allowing us once more, without denying the past, to face the future with confidence.

The cornerstone of both our international and national policies is the fullest possible exercise of our right to self-determination, by means of which the Brazilian people made a basic choice, which they uphold – that of spiritual and political loyalty to the system of representative democracy.

The President of the United States of Brazil, Mr. Castello Branco, in a recent speech defined the governing lines of our foreign policy as follows:

> We should not shape our attitudes on the basis of a homespun Machiavellianism or on a policy of extortion. On the other hand, we should not give *a priori* support to the attitudes assumed by any of the great Powers – not even by those Powers which form the bulwark of the Western world – for, in the foreign policy of the latter, a distinction must be drawn between the fundamental interests of the preservation of the Western system and the specific interests of a great Power. In short, a foreign policy is independent in the sense that the policy of a sovereign State must perforce be so. An independent foreign policy in a world increasingly characterized by the interdependence of

> problems and interests means that Brazil must have its own way of thinking and its own course of action, without subordination to any interest external to Brazil. The interests of Brazil coincide, in many cases and in widening circles, with those of Latin America, of the American continent and of the Western community. Acting independently, we shall not fear to lend our solidarity to other nations. Within the context of this independence and this solidarity, our foreign policy will be active, timely, and adjusted to the conditions of our times and the problems of our day.
>
> Regarding Africa and Asia, our purpose is not trade alone. Every element is present for brotherly cooperation and a broad understanding between Brazil and the peoples who have just recently attained their freedom and are prepared to maintain it. Cooperation, understanding, and harmony of interests, this is what we seek, with all countries and all peoples, with all due respect for the hierarchies compatible with national interests. These are basic principles of the Organization of the United Nations in which we participate so actively. Despite its shortcomings, the United Nations is, in today's world, the essential tool for the maintenance of peace. Without it nothing is possible.

Our position is clearly defined: the ties that bind us to the brotherhood of the Latin American republics form our first line of international solidarity. We are united with those nations by enduring links of geography and history, by common traditions and aspirations, and we shall do everything in our power to bring our continent ever closer together. Secondly, we can never act counter to the Western roots of our culture and of our institutions. This leads us to affirm our state in the preservation of the democratic way of life which the West seeks to uphold. Nor can we neglect our ties with so many other nations in Africa – which has contributed so much to the formation of the Brazilian people – as well as in Asia, whose needs for development are similar to our own, and with which we share ideals of liberty, progress and justice. All the new nations – and I consider as new nations all the developing countries – need to avoid being held back by ideas and systems of sheer conservatism; they have an overwhelming urge to achieve social and political evolution. As we on the American continent are doing, they are setting up regional communities which can contribute a great deal towards harmonizing and strengthening the efforts of individual nations, being at the same time a factor for world peace.

Inspired by its inter-American, Western and universalistic calling, Brazil wants peace, along with security and freedom. In order to free our generation, and those generations to come, from the threat of the scourge

of war that atomic terror renders even more awesome, Brazil lends its full support to the concept of a rational and controlled disarmament, which may give us the security that weapons cannot provide.

Brazil wants human dignity to be respected and guaranteed in all spheres. We should like the United Nations to contribute to the establishment of universal respect for the fundamental rights of man, eradicating once and for all every manifestation of racial discrimination which still afflicts some areas of the world.

Precisely because of this respect for human dignity, we desire for the whole of mankind minimum standards of material comfort and social well-being. To this end we regard it as indispensable that the more developed nations, in their own interests as well as in the interest of all humanity, participate in those measures intended to establish a higher degree of justice on the international economic level.

In our time, there is a well-defined awareness of the urgency of promoting a more equitable pattern of international trade to meet the needs of the developing countries. Brazil has cooperated actively with the countries of Latin America and with the other countries whose shared aspirations united them in the "Group of 75", and will do everything it can to ensure the continuity of the program of action outlined in the United Nations Conference on Trade and Development. The present session of the General Assembly, in our view, has sufficient perspective to take up the revision of the Final Act of Geneva. Brazil believes, however, that the best way to perfect the decisions contained in that Final Act is to begin to carry them out. With regard to the Conference on Trade and Development, it is imperative not to allow a repetition of the historic failure of the 1948 Conference on Trade and Development. We must at all costs prevent the Final Act of Geneva from becoming a mere declaration of good intentions, as has been the case with the Havana Charter.

The Assembly will devote its attention to other equally important economic issues. Among those considered paramount by my delegation, on which we will be prepared to put forth suggestions in the Second Committee, I should like to mention the establishment of a United Nations capital development fund and an agency of industrial development. Both these organs will address themselves to the vital needs of developing countries.

I venture, however, to say that the solution of the question of unfavorable terms of trade affecting those countries is quite as important as the maintenance of world peace. The former concerns the development of at least two thirds of humanity; it is a matter of justice in international

relations, which is one of the aims of the Charter of the United Nations, We would not be in step with the great world expectations of our time if, in this forum, we failed to deal forcefully with the serious question of the struggle for better and more equitable terms in international commercial relations.

We should like to see the exercise of the right of self-determination assured to all peoples by the elimination of the vestiges of colonialism, which is in its death throes.

The San Francisco Charter has already been called "The Charter of Decolonization". The epithet is an exact one, but it would be even more exact and richer in meaning if qualified by the adjective "Peaceful". Posterity will most certainly refer to Chapter XI of the Charter as the political instrument of liberation of colonial peoples through peaceful means, and will pay tribute to the wisdom, prudence and foresight shown by the statesmen who drafted that document. Through the gradual, orderly and peaceful implementation of the Charter and of the relevant resolutions of the United Nations, more than half of mankind has attained independence, thanks to the application of the principles of self-determination. In its wisdom, the Organization not only has become the propulsive force of the march of the colonial peoples towards independence, but also has provided a legal and political framework for the negotiations and agreements required for its peaceful evolution. Exceptions to this rule serve only to enhance the foresight and wisdom of the Charter. It is our duty to preserve and improve upon the experience acquired by the United Nations in the realm of decolonization. This experience enabled the United Nations and its Member States to carry out their obligations without increasing international tension. On the contrary, the pacific method of decolonization has generally served as an instrument for the maintenance of peace.

For these reasons, my delegation views with apprehension and strong misgivings the initiatives which would bring an element of violence to the application of the decolonization procedures provided in the Charter.

The exercise of the right of self-determination is, in our view, a broad concept which transcends the issues of colonialism. It is a right that all peoples should be able to exercise – and I am thinking particularly of the German nation, cut asunder by a demarcation line which has no justification, and subjected to restrictions inconsistent with the spirit of the Charter.

All these are matters of substance, incorporated into so many of the items of the agenda of the nineteenth General Assembly, and yet

I have the impression that, at this moment, we all share a fundamental feeling of concern – a concern of an instrumental nature. It regards the very future of our Organization, of its existence and the means which it must employ to attain its objectives. I refer to the veritable institutional crisis which faces us, owing to the opposition of some Member States to acknowledging the validity of their financial obligations in the question of peacekeeping operations.

The delegation of Brazil is fully aware of the implications of the problem. We know that it can threaten the very future of the United Nations as a universal institution and we are entirely prepared to lend our support to conciliatory arrangements conducive to settling the crisis, which might prove fatal.

My delegation, however, is not in a position to accept solutions which would entail forsaking those principles which are basic to the Organization since this would mean, in a different manner but with the same certainty, the end of the United Nations as we know it; that is, as a democratic institution, where rights and obligations are the same for all. The difficulties with which we are faced encompass more than a mere financial problem, more than a question of contributions which should be paid.

The peacekeeping operations which are at the root of this crisis constitute one of the most effective forms of United Nations action. Not foreseen by the Charter, their need was demonstrated by the realities of international life and they have become, little by little, a powerful tool in the achievement of the aims of our Organization.

It was in 1956, when an international force was set up in the Gaza Strip that this type of operation was undertaken for the first time, subsequently to be developed with the United Nations action in the Congo and in Cyprus. In all these instances, the purpose of the troops, acting under the aegis of the United Nations, was not to punish or to repel aggressors, but, by their presence, to prevent the outbreak of armed warfare and to ensure respect for the cessation of hostilities. Much more than a simple unit of observers, much less than an international army drawn up for battle, the Force never had the mission of making offensive use of its weapons, nor of assuming control of the region in which it operated. That control remained in the hands of the sovereign local authority whose consent was sought and obtained for the stationing of the troops. The objectives of the Force were not ordinary military objectives, but only those of assuring the maintenance of conditions of peace, which would pave the way for the necessary peaceful solutions by

means of the implementation of the recommendations of the competent organs of the United Nations.

It is possible to acknowledge that the peacekeeping operations have emerged as a new and vigorous concept, altogether different from the enforcement measures contemplated in Chapter VII of the Charter. As a living instrument the Charter was not incompatible with this development, but the difficulties which have so far arisen, and of which the question of financing is merely one aspect, seem to indicate that this new concept should be incorporated into the Charter as soon as possible.

This could be done by means of the inclusion of a new chapter entitled "Peacekeeping operations", which could be placed between the present Chapter VI and VII. We would thus have a graduated crescendo: "Pacific settlement of disputes", "Peacekeeping operations" and "Action with respect to threats to the peace, breaches of the peace, and acts of aggression".

Peacekeeping operations would thus be conducted on the territory of one or more States, members of the United Nations or not, at their request or with their consent. They would be undertaken by military contingents, preferably designated in advance and supplied chiefly by medium and small Powers; their only objective would be to preserve peaceful conditions, in contrast to operations falling under Chapter VII to be undertaken against the will of one or more States, transgressors of international order, to impose the will of the international community represented by the United Nations. This certainly does not exclude, during peacekeeping operations, recourse to coercive action in given circumstances and for a limited period of time. Such an amendment of the Charter could provide, in more precise terms, for a method of financing for both coercive and peacekeeping operations.

I am well aware that the ideas which I have just put forth are not easy to implement. We well know the difficulties encountered so far in attempts to adapt the Charter to the new requirements of the world. But the grave nature of these problems points to the absolute need for global political and constitutional solutions to be pondered. In this way it would perhaps be even easier to solve the immediate problems which face us and which, as I said, seem to threaten the very life of our Organization.

In that respect, the position of my country could not be clearer or more categorical; the people and the Government of Brazil see in the United Nations a form of international relations essential to the contemporary world. We do not even dare to think of the alternatives to the system of coexistence and negotiations which the United Nations represents.

What we wish to see is the consolidation and strengthening of its structure and machinery, since it is only through the United Nations that we can activate our ideals of peace, progress and development.

This is what Brazil thinks, and I cannot convince myself that other Powers – particularly those which hold a privileged position among us because of their economic and political importance – can or could insist upon courses of action which may lead to disaster.

May coming generations never be in a position to say that our actions were dictated by immediacy when it was our duty to be men of vision; may they never say at the crucial moment we lacked the courage and the wisdom to build the happier world which was almost in our grasp.

New York, December 3, 1964.

1965

1965

The political process initiated with the military movement of 1964 polarized Brazil. A series of strikes and demonstrations against censorship and against other practices that led Brazilian institutions on an authoritarian path ensued. In October, Institutional Act no. 2 abolished the political parties that existed in the country. In December, a Complementary Act instituted a two party system, creating pro-government ARENA and MDB for the opposition. Important liberal personalities who had supported the military movement would start to distance themselves from the government, which nevertheless, under the presidency of Marshall Castello Branco, kept to a liberal and democratic rhetoric.

Having severed relations with Cuba in 1964, Brazil signaled its syntony with the United States at the regional level by participating in the Inter-American Peace Force under the auspices of the American government to assure order in the Dominican Republic following the April invasion.

The statement of Minister Vasco Leitão da Cunha before the General Assembly commemorating the twentieth anniversary of the United Nations did not deviate from the one delivered in 1964. Detailed explanations of what had occurred in Brazil, however, were no longer necessary. Leitão da Cunha was thus able to focus on themes more closely linked to the agenda of the Assembly. He made a professional speech, with a pronounced technical content, dealing extensively with the problems of disarmament and the revision of the Charter. Passages making clear the

realignment of Brazil with the Western camp, however, were not missing. The Minister justified the intervention in the Dominican Republic as necessary to guide the people of that Caribbean country on the path of democratic normality and social progress; defended the self-determination and reunification of the German people; warned against the use of force or intervention from third countries in the decolonization process; when mentioning the intensification of the war in Vietnam, the Minister urged the Hanoi government to accept the constructive proposals made by the United States, perhaps to compensate for the decision of Brazil not to send troops to Southeast Asia.

On the other hand, the statement by Minister Leitão da Cunha expressed the reservations raised by Brazil to the contents of the Treaty Prohibiting Nuclear Weapons in Latin America, which was then under negotiation. The idea of the denuclearization of Latin America, originally proposed by Brazil, would meet the objection of the military leadership, which allowed the Mexican diplomacy to take the ownership of the initiative. Later, Brazil decided to sign and ratify but not let the Treaty enter into force. The instrument was signed in 1967 and became known as Treaty of Tlatelolco. The Brazilian decision stemmed from the policy, then put into effect, to retain the option to develop nuclear artifacts and lies at the origin of the position that the government would take later on regarding the Treaty on the Non-proliferation of Nuclear Weapons (NPT).

XX Regular Session of the General Assembly of the United Nations 1965

Minister Vasco Leitão da Cunha [*]

Mr. President,

On behalf of my delegation and the people of my country, may I extend to you, Mr. President, my congratulations for the distinction bestowed upon you. In our world, to earn the honor of being chosen President of the General Assembly of the United Nations is perhaps the highest recognition that can be conferred upon a statesman in acknowledgement of his endeavors on behalf of international peace and security. You more than merit this distinction, Mr. President. As a parliamentarian, as a Cabinet Minister and as Prime Minister, you have fought for peace untiringly, with tenacity and talent. In your person there is represented the great nation of Italy, cradle of Latin, heir and herald of the Mediterranean civilization. We, the people of Brazil, treasure the memory of your recent visit with President Saragat to our land, on which occasion you were able to observe the interweaving of our two nations, as several million Italians form part of the Brazilian people.

May I also pay tribute from this rostrum to our three new Members – Gambia, the Maldive Islands and Singapore – as they join the family of the United Nations. I should like to express my warmest wishes for their prosperity and complete success in their independent states.

[*] **Vasco Tristão Leitão da Cunha**, born in Rio de Janeiro, RJ, September 2, 1903. Bachelor in Legal and Social Sciences from the University of Rio de Janeiro. Third Officer, public selection process, in 7/1/1927. Minister of State for External Relations and Minister of State of Health from 4/6/1964 to 4/20/1964. Minister of State for External Relations from 4/20/1964 to 12/7/1965. † Rio de Janeiro, June 1984.

Once again the delegation of Brazil opens the general debate. This practice represents a tradition of interest in the great debate engaged in each year by the nations of the entire world – a debate in which they seek, in the divergence of their points of view, some common ground and some fruitful understanding as a basis for the hope of harmony and accord which inspired the United Nations Charter but which, unfortunately, has so frequently been frustrated by international events. It is with the same faith we have always held in the future of the United Nations that Brazil appears today before this universal forum. We are aware of the special significance of the work we now embark, upon as our Organization completes its twentieth year and is seeking to overcome perhaps the gravest crisis in its history.

After twenty years of activity, the United Nations finds itself confronted by a world which is perhaps as disturbed and uncertain as it was during the days of San Francisco, when the Charter was drawn up. Throughout the world, thinkers, philosophers, statesmen and scientists proclaim that civilization is in danger, that moral, spiritual and material values fashioned throughout history are menaced, and that the very survival of mankind is in jeopardy. Perhaps for the first time in history mankind really feels mortally wounded. There are those who, even more pessimistic, believe we are currently witnessing the twilight of our civilization, not by virtue of some historical process or some natural catastrophe, but by the political frustration of man, overwhelmed by the technology he has created himself. In a world in a state of trauma as the, result of an ideological conflict without equal, in a world dumbfounded by unprecedented economic and, social problems, could it be possible that the scientific revolution, applied to the art of war, may have endowed human beings with a power greater than men's ethical structure can bear? Could it be possible that the alleged imbalance, between technological and moral progress has divested man of his spiritual substance and transformed him in the fragile instrument of his own destruction?

Technological progress, which created thermonuclear weapons and which is pulling outer space into our world, has increased the feeling of insecurity among people and yet has not improved the living conditions of the large majority of mankind. The scientific revolution is contributing dramatically to multiplying the threats to peace and the threats to the very survival of our species. What is it that prevents nations from making the proper use of science? In my country, where the ethical and spiritual values are deeply rooted in our culture and in our history, we reject as an explanation that it is a feeling of disenchantment with, or lack of faith

in, the ethical principles of life and of man, as created and consecrated by Christian and Western traditions we received through our Portuguese heritage. In our view, a political crisis is involved, a constitutional crisis of mammoth proportions: man would seem to be incapable of meeting the problems of international organization at a crucial moment in history. This seems the fundamental problem of our times, the great challenge to the statesmen of the era.

Unless we create a community of nations working effectively for the political and economic equality of States, for their freedom, and for the supremacy of law in their mutual relations; unless there is an international community able to assure at one and the same time fundamental liberties to the citizens of each state and equal opportunity for economic and social development to each nation; unless we proceed with the task of decolonization begun in San Francisco by democratic, and hence by exclusively peaceful means; unless we forge instruments for the prevention and punishment of international aggressions; unless we place armaments under effective international control; in a word, unless we solve the basic problem of international organization – we shall have built this house on sand. And we, this house, our people and even our future as a civilization will be inviting total destruction.

We should constantly bear in mind the fact that the United Nations Charter, however flexible, represents a style of political architecture that, as in the case of certain modern weapons, has been superseded by reality just when the blueprint is completed. The Charter in fact preceded the cold war and even preceded the eruption onto the political scene of a recent scientific revolution, with its important repercussions on world politics and from which fundamental phenomena of our times derive: the thermonuclear era, the space age and the full development of the industrialized nations. The picture of the crisis is further complicated by two additional elements: first, the implementation of the Charter which accelerated the peaceful process of decolonization to a surprising tempo; secondly, the scientific revolution which multiplies wealth, and the population explosion which in a large number of non-industrialized countries multiplies poverty. On the one hand, man transforms outer space into humanity's youngest province, while on the other he becomes aware of his earthly poverty and realizes with anguish the uncertainties of a better future for his offspring.

In the context of these already grave problems, still other serious attritions and conflicts are emerging, luckily not yet so widespread as to render the threats to world peace even more ominous. Two great nations,

outstanding Members of this Organization, are today still plunged in a struggle of unforeseeable consequences. On the same long-suffering and troubled continent, the Vietnamese situation continues to represent one of the greatest dangers to the preservation of world peace. Brazil trusts that India and Pakistan will be able to find a peaceful formula for the final settlement of their controversies. And may I say that we congratulate both countries and the United Nations for the cease-fire which has already been obtained. In like manner, we dare hope that the Government of Hanoi will accept the constructive proposals made by the United States of America, as well as by the United Kingdom, the non-aligned countries and the Secretary-General, U Thant, to discuss the problems of Vietnam at the negotiating table, in search of a solution which would make it possible to free South-East Asia of the war which has for so many years been inflicting bitter suffering on the people of that region.

It is not the intention of the Brazilian delegation to sketch here the outlines for a revision of the Charter which would endow the United Nations with the instruments it needs to create the international community to which we have alluded. The task is not for one country alone, but for all of us. However, we could try to examine, in the light of the foregoing ideas, the more important problems which face us and point out approaches that might perhaps contribute to the reformulation of our political structure.

One of the most serious signs of the need for a revision of the Charter is to be found in the crisis that virtually prevented the nineteenth session of the General Assembly from being held. In my view, the crisis has yet to be conclusively settled. The United Nations did not touch upon the core of the problem. The strained consensus which was arrived at constituted merely an interim plan of action; you might call it a truce. The problem is a constitutional one. The problem of the payment of the assessments for peacekeeping operations arises out of diametrically opposed interpretations of the Charter, and in matters of principle any compromise is precarious for it does not alter the substance of the divergent positions. At the last session of the General Assembly the Brazilian delegation suggested, as an adequate solution for the crisis, a revision of the Charter which would take the form of a new chapter on peacekeeping operations. The efforts and discussions of the Committee on Thirty-three, as well as the provisional solution agreed upon, served but to strengthen our conviction of the urgent need for such a revision.

Brazil considers it essential to maintain the United Nations peacekeeping operations as one of the most useful and effective remedies

for the settlement of conflicts which threaten world tranquility. My country gave its enthusiastic support to the Suez Force, in which we have participated from the very outset with a battalion of soldiers and which is currently under the command of a Brazilian soldier. It has likewise contributed to the operations of the United Nations in the Congo and bent every effort to gain approval for the Security Council resolution 186 (1964) which gave origin to the Cyprus operation. It never hesitated to meet the ensuing financial obligations.

In the regional sphere, my country made an effective contribution to the establishment of another peacekeeping operation through the Inter-American Armed Force in Santo Domingo – a subject of much controversy. The facts have proven, however, that it was a sound measure which helped to enable the Dominican people, safeguarded from civil strife, to set up a provisional Government and guide the country toward democratic normalcy and social progress. I would like to point out, apropos, that regional systems, within the structure of the United Nations, should be understood as a deliberate effort, of their members to show their firm belief in the solidarity of their common interests and in the benefits of recourse to consultation whenever controversy threatens. By their access to collaboration and consultation during international emergencies, the regional organizations represent, within the framework of the United Nations, an imperative of our era.

Returning to peacekeeping operations, we are rather at a loss to understand why the United Nations should neglect to write into its Charter one of its most efficient political tools. What indeed could be more apt to stabilize situations that could degenerate into conflicts and to establish conditions leading to the halting of already declared conflicts? The delay in spelling out of the constitutional pattern to be given to peacekeeping operations causes us serious apprehensions.

We see another motive for concern in the stalemate in the negotiations conducted by the Eighteen Nation Committee on Disarmament in Geneva. The constant harping on problems completely unrelated to the recommendations addressed to the Eighteen Nation Committee on Disarmament by the Disarmament Commission – actually a sad survival of cold war issues – precluded in the course of the recent Geneva talks any further agreement leading to the reduction of international tensions. No headway was made toward extending the Moscow Treaty to underground nuclear weapon experiments, as the mediating countries – of which Brazil is one – proposed time and again in Geneva and in the Disarmament Commission. Nor has anything yet been done to solve the

problem of the proliferation of nuclear weapons. The nuclear club gained a new member – I might say: what a member! – and may dangerously increase in the near future with the acceleration in various countries in carrying out research programs and programs for nuclear production for military purposes. In spite of some suggestions and proposals that have been submitted – and your proposal, Mr. President, was very noteworthy – nothing was accomplished in Geneva to prevent this proliferation. This task requires the best efforts of all those who, without losing sight of the ultimate goal of general and complete disarmament under effective international control, fear the risks run by an international community whose survival will depend upon the fragile correlation of forces based exclusively on the nuclear balance. May the extensive exchanges of views in the debates of the Eighteen Nation Committee on Disarmament assist all Powers concerned in narrowing their differences when they again take up negotiations on disarmament.

In the regional sphere, however, note should be taken of the efforts of the Latin American countries to transform the area into a nuclear-free zone. General Assembly resolution 1911 (XVIII) served as a point of departure for the study of a program for denuclearization of Latin America. At the meetings of the Preparatory Commission for the Denuclearization of Latin America, the Latin American countries have worked hard to overcome certain difficulties which, by their nature, slow down the drafting of a treaty of such great scientific, military and political importance, a treaty without precedent.

The geographic demarcation of the area subject to the future statute, as well as the obtaining of formal guarantees on the part of the nuclear Powers that the statute will be respected, constitute, in the opinion of my Government, essential requisites for the preparation of an instrument which will prevent the spread of nuclear weapons and yet not imply any present or future risk to the security and to the scientific advancement of the countries signing the treaty.

It is worthwhile noting today that the inclusion in the United Nations Charter of what now constitutes its Chapter XI was not altogether a peaceful and simple matter at San Francisco. Some colonial Powers were opposed to Chapter XI at that time and proposed that its principles merely form an appendix to the Charter. Time has shown that the decision adopted was a wise one, for the problem of decolonization was soon to emerge and it would have been a blunder for the United Nations not to have foreseen it in the Charter. We would now have been confronted with one more constitutional crisis. Unfortunately, however, the fact that it was

foreseen in the Charter did not prevent the occurrence in these last two decades of many serious conflicts involving the process of decolonization. I might point out here that the only form of decolonization envisaged in the Charter is that accomplished by peaceful and democratic means. Recourse to violence, to armed fighting, and, above all, the interference of a State or group of States in the process of decolonization being carried out under the responsibility of another State, not only flouts the principles of the Charter, but could retard that process. If military in nature, this outside interference not only produces the retarding mentioned, but also engenders tensions and conflicts which can spread, to the detriment of international peace and security.

Brazil, true to the commitments assumed when it signed the San Francisco Charter – and, furthermore, true to its own history and destiny – firmly supports the principle of self-determination for all peoples, provided the desire for self-determination represents their will, freely expressed and free of outside interference. It is in keeping with this principle, moreover, that we wish to see the German people granted the right to express their will, through freely held elections, on the question of being reunited as one nation.

In order to understand the roots of the political crisis which rocks a large part of the underdeveloped world, it might perhaps be useful to seek a parallel in history. The principle of the equality of the individual before the law revealed its limitations during the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries. It was found that merely acknowledging a man's rights as a citizen was not enough. Only in the twentieth century, through the extension of the same principle to the economic and social plane, did the ideals of political equality begin to be satisfied in full. Without economic and social equality, the Western industrialized societies would inevitably have been the prey, for a long time, of totalitarian regimes which, in the final analysis, would render impossible that equality longed for by the masses.

At the present time, owing to the new communications systems, it would be impossible to convince the countries in process of development that their poverty and their backwardness cannot be speedily eradicated. Machinery must be created on the international plane to facilitate the transfer to the developing countries of the instruments and techniques created by the scientific revolution, as well as of the necessary capital for their full development.

The foregoing considerations stem from the observation of the economic picture of a large part of the underdeveloped world. Indeed,

if we examine the current world economic situation objectively, we note that concrete progress, although considerable in absolute terms, has been relatively slight. Despite the goals of the United Nations Development Decade, the truth is that the difference between the *per capita* income of the industrialized countries and that of the poor countries continues to rise. Relatively speaking, the poor countries are even poorer today.

We all realize that the process of development is first and foremost the internal responsibility of each country, the result of a national decision to affirm and fulfill itself, even through sacrifices. Whatever international contribution might be possible, there is no substitute for the desire to attain the objectives dictated by the special needs of each nation. The developing countries are fully aware that this truth is valid, not only on the political plane, wherein they achieved independence through the process of enforcing their legitimate claims, but also on the economic level, wherein prosperity is the result of persistent courage and hard work. As an example I can cite the efforts made by the Brazilians, which are being carried forward with unwavering tenacity by our Government: efforts to curb inflation, to foster development by promoting reforms in the agricultural, fiscal, banking and housing sectors, as well as in others; in sum, retrieving the country from the brink of chaos and resuming, in an orderly fashion, the road to progress. My country is firmly striving to prepare the basic conditions demanded for the continuation of our march towards economic development, in the persuasion that this is the only way to guarantee prosperity and fair distribution of wealth and social benefits.

Yet, problems remain whose solution continues to escape the internal sphere of the developing countries. Among those problems one could mention the large degree of instability affecting raw materials and basic commodities on the international market.

As for the international efforts being made to solve these problems, we cannot fail to refer with satisfaction to the establishment on a permanent basis of the United Nations Conference on Trade and Development, with its own governing Board and secretariat – indeed, a proof of the political foresight of the last session of the General Assembly.

Within the framework of the institutions of the United Nations, a specialized organ of great importance awaits international action for its establishment. I refer to the agency for industrial development. The approval, at the last session of the Economic and Social Council, of Resolution 1081 F (XXXIX) proposed during the fifth session of the Committee for Industrial Development, indicates that the idea has

developed sufficiently and has the firm support of those who have the greatest interest in it, that is, the less industrialized countries. The fact that the percentage of technical assistance expenditures for industrial development has decrease in the last three years – they represent today only 11 percent of total assistance expenditures – is an undeniable indication that, under the present set-up, it is not possible to provide for the growth of the industrial sector of the developing countries.

Still within the context of multilateral cooperation for economic development, particular mention is due to special assistance activities sponsored by the United Nations, notably in connection with the pre-investment programs of the Special Fund. According to the data submitted to the twentieth session of the General Assembly, after six years of technical assistance operations, 485 projects are in progress, benefitting about 130 developing countries and territories. These projects, some of which have already been completed, made possible the specialized training of more than 70.000 nationals of developing countries and, on the other hand, contributed to attracting investments in different sectors of the economy mounting to over $1.000 million.

The above data present modest but encouraging dimensions and results in the area of technical economic cooperation which serve to strengthen our conviction that we should redouble our efforts to meet the needs of the underdeveloped countries and help them to surmount the problem of the underutilization of their natural resources. However, for these initiatives of the United Nations to produce the desired effect on the economy and technology of the underdeveloped countries, multilateral cooperation must not be limited to pre-investment activities.

Within this context, two other complementary initiatives of the United Nations which are already in progress merit the attention of the General Assembly for speedy implementation, with resulting general benefits. The first of these has to do with the formation of the United Nations Development Program, stemming from the merging of the two principal organs of technical cooperation, including the Special Fund. Following this train of thought, the second initiative relates to the gradual participation of the new program in the area of direct investment in accordance with the proposal for the creation of a capital development fund, thereby rounding out the role of the United Nations in the area of economic cooperation through the mobilization of capital for development projects.

As regards the efforts of the regional organizations in this sphere, Brazil places well-founded hopes in the success of the task being pursued

by the Latin American Free-Trade Association. In its first years of activity, it already presents very encouraging results, not only towards strengthening interregional trade, but also in the preparation of other bases of the move towards the economic integration of Latin America. This ideal has been claiming for some time the attention of those governments and particularly that of the Chilean government, which has brought it up again, to general applause.

These are the observations of the Brazilian delegation at this opening of the general debate. They arise from our desire to seek to contribute to the solution of the problems which trouble the international scene. To accomplish the task before us, we cannot remain wavering between "fear and trembling hope". We need great courage and steadfast hope.

This courage and this hope are now to receive renewed vigor from the forthcoming visit of the Sovereign Roman Pontiff, who adopted the name of the Apostle of the Gentiles, and whose words of wisdom and peace will inspire us to bring our task to a successful conclusion. The Brazilian nation, the largest Catholic nation in the world, hails this unprecedented and most significant gesture of the common Father of Christendom – a pledge on behalf of the establishment of a climate of peaceful brotherhood, so vital to the building of a better world.

New York, September 23, 1965.

1966

1966

The international scenario in 1966 was marked by the start of the Cultural Revolution in China and by the growing involvement of the United States in Vietnam. At the same time, the left made progress in Italy. After the episodes of Algeria's independence, General de Gaulle's France would take measures aiming at its dissociation from the strategic leadership of the United States.

In Brazil, authoritarianism seemed to be reinforced with the launching of the candidature of Marshall Costa e Silva to the Presidency of the Republic and the proclamation of Institutional Act no. 3, which instituted indirect elections for state governors. After Costa e Silva's election by Congress, in October, the mandates of several Congressmen were voided and a temporary recess of Congress was imposed by decree. The traditional civilian leaders of the country gathered under the *Frente Ampla* to fight the militarization of the political system.

In his statement before the twenty–first Session of the General Assembly, Foreign Minister Juracy Magalhães took up the issues developed in the previous interventions by Minister Leitão da Cunha. The speech opened with high praise for the role played by Brazil in the Inter-American Peace Force at the Dominican Republic. The reestablishment of law and order in that Caribbean country is shown in contrast with the persistence of the conflict in Vietnam.

The speech emphasized economic issues. Brazil declared its satisfaction with the organization of the United Nations Conference

on Trade and Development (UNCTAD) and of the United Nations Organization for Industrial Development (UNIDO). Stressing that Brazil did not see the new forums as a stage for sterile confrontation between rich and poor countries, the Minister sought to encourage the operation of the new mechanisms of cooperation for development that were being established.

The question of decolonization was not expressly mentioned. The statement merely extolled the racial democracy that existed in Brazil and mentioned the fact that Brazil had been the first State to sign the International Convention for the Elimination of All Forms of Racial Discrimination. The Minister did not refrain, on the other hand, from praising the contribution of Portugal to world civilization. In a veiled mention to Portuguese colonialism in Africa, it was predicted that Portugal would still have much to contribute to the interests of other peoples with which it was linked by political and sentimental ties.

Finally, the sections of Minister Juracy Magalhães' speech which express doubts about the negotiations on the non-proliferation of nuclear weapons deserve mention. The drafting was cautious so as not to antagonize the United States, but the resistance of Brazil to process that would lead to the Non-proliferation Treaty (NPT) is clear.

XXI Regular Session of the General Assembly of the United Nations 1966

Minister Juracy Magalhães [*]

Mr. President,

In pursuance of a time-honored custom, which has become a proud and cherished tradition in the eyes of the people of Brazil, it is now my privilege to deliver the opening address in the general debate of the twenty-first session of the General Assembly.

Let my first words be of congratulations to you, Mr. President, on your election to the Chair, a choice which so aptly expresses the respect and affection of this great gathering of nations towards the noble Afghan people and towards their Permanent Representative to the United Nations. I am confident that I speak on behalf of all the delegations present here today when I say that we all place the fullest reliance on Your well-known ability to handle with an impartial mind, with calm and unruffled courtesy, and with firm and unswerving authority, the weighty matters that shall presently appear before us.

In the discharge of your duties, Mr. President, you may count on the assistance and sound advice of the illustrious Secretary-General of the Organization, Mr. Thant, to whom on behalf of my delegation and Government I make an ardent appeal to remain in his present position, which is the general wish. It is my hope that he will overcome his natural

[*] **Juracy Montenegro Magalhães**, born in Fortaleza, CE, on August 4, 1905. First President of Petrobras, in 1954. Minister of Justice and Internal Affairs, from 10/19/1965 to 1/14/1966. Minister of State for External Relations from 1/17/1966 to 3/15/1967. † Salvador, May 15, 2001.

hesitation and his intimate objections and will continue to give to mankind the valuable contribution of his efficient action and constant inspiration.

As we prepare to deal with the agenda of the twenty-first session, we are necessarily led to examine the results of the labors of the twentieth, which was so ably presided over by that great statesman Amintore Fanfani, Minister for Foreign Affairs of Italy; and as we do so we may look back with pride at some tangible and encouraging achievements.

First and foremost, great credit must be given to the twentieth session for having succeeded in weathering the gravest crisis in the history of the Organization, and for finding a way out of the deadlock which paralyzed the nineteenth session.

It is true, on the other hand, that no remedy has been found to end the bitter struggle in Vietnam, where countless thousands are daily suffering the hardships and misery of war and where so many young lives are daily being lost, both to Vietnam and to her allies in the cause of democracy. It is no less true, however, that in other parts of the world it has been found possible to avert conflict and bloodshed, and to dispel grave threats to world peace.

In the Dominican Republic, for instance, the timely and efficient intervention of the regional Organization brought about a prompt end to civil strife and cleared the way for the restoration of democratic rule through fair and peaceful elections. In Asia, two great nations, India and Pakistan, already on the brink of a full-scale war, gave heed to the voice of the United Nations and laid down their arms in response to a resolution of the Security Council. Even now those two countries, which must be counted among the most influential and oldest Members of this Organization, are engaged in endeavoring to settle their differences within the framework of the Charter and with due respect for the principles upheld by the United Nations.

In the Gaza Strip and in Cyprus, while no appreciable headway has been made toward a permanent settlement, even so, the presence of United Nations forces has continued to keep the peace, to ensure the safety of the population in both areas, and to prevent the outbreak of open violence. Brazil is proud to contribute one battalion to the United Nations; by the same token it is proud to have contributed substantially to the Inter-American Peace Force in the Dominican Republic, where Brazilian soldiers and marines have shared with their North American. Central American and Paraguayan comrades the task of enforcing law and order and of saving a sister nation, already sorely tried in the recent past, from succumbing to internal strife and to foreign political aggression.

As we review the events of the past year, we are compelled to note with regret that in one domain at least no perceptible success has been achieved. I allude to the problem of disarmament, which we find still bogged down in the discouraging morass of the Geneva talks. Some rays of hope had seemed to be discernible during the last session of the General Assembly, where, for the first time in many years, a number of constructive resolutions were passed. Nothing, however, has come out of them, in spite of a growing consciousness, on the part of all nations, of the dangers of nuclear proliferation. Brazil would like to urge that the highest priority be given to working out some formula that may lead to the concentration, and not the reverse, of the power of decision as to the use of nuclear weapons.

This last, of course, is stated as but an immediate goal, for there can be no disguising the fact that the ultimate aim is and must remain total disarmament. We seem to be as far as ever from reaching that goal; but it must also be recognized that certain intermediate steps must necessarily be taken. It is in this respect that General Assembly resolution 2028 (XX) must be regarded as a substantial step forward, inasmuch as it has defined non-proliferation as a means toward an end, and as it has just as clearly defined the respective balance of responsibilities and obligations of both nuclear and non-nuclear Powers.

It is quite clear nowadays that non-proliferation cannot be assured by a veto of the nuclear Powers. Non-proliferation is really dependent upon voluntary surrender by non-nuclear Powers of their possibilities of eventually joining the "Atomic Club" through their own efforts. In the absence of a really reliable system of collective security, such a surrender would obviously involve a singularly grave and fateful decision, since it would be tantamount to surrendering the most powerful means of ensuring national security against possible aggression, relying ever after on the benevolence and good faith of third parties for that all important purpose, the protection of the very life of a nation. This would be indeed too much to ask of or to expect from any country, unless we were to achieve a completely trustworthy framework of legal and material guarantees, bearing the stamp of infallibility to the fullest extent attainable by human endeavors.

Such a system would obviously place great burdens upon both nuclear and non-nuclear Powers and require them to accept considerable limitations on the exercise of their sovereign rights. I maintain, however, that the best interests, if not the very survival, of mankind demand such sacrifices from even the greatest Powers, and I trust that no Member

nation will shrink from its duty to this Organization and to the human race by balking at small or even great sacrifices of pride or of freedom of action where so much is at stake. It is the manifest duty of all of us, but most especially of such nations as already hold or have nearly within their grasp the awful power of destruction vested in atomic weaponry, to remove from mankind the fear of annihilation, to clear from the farthest horizons that threatening cloud of an all too familiar shape, to give good and sufficient guarantee of our determination to use for good alone, and never for evil, the fateful forces that lie hidden in the very heart of matter.

Another issue where, unfortunately, a deadlock seems to have been reached is that of defraying the costs of peacekeeping operations. The Special Committee on Peacekeeping Operations appointed to attempt to solve this problem has so far failed to do so, in spite of its earnest labors. The time has come, therefore, to acknowledge frankly the fact that there is little or no hope of arriving at a satisfactory conclusion in this respect, and that to pursue it further would be simply a waste of time and effort.

No country is more deeply convinced than Brazil of the usefulness, and indeed the necessity, of carrying out peacekeeping operations by means of emergency forces every time a situation arises entailing a threat to world peace. Furthermore, we think that no international organization can be really effective unless it has at its disposal the material means to deal with such situations; yet we are the first to advocate a realistic approach to the problem of apportioning the expenses arising from operations of this nature. It has become all too evident that some Member nations will not waver from their position of refusing to acknowledge their common share in expenses made for the common good, and to honor what seems to us their plain obligation. The only realistic approach, therefore, is to carry out a reform of the United Nations Charter, framing explicit rules on the conduct and financing of peacekeeping operations.

That future peacekeeping operations may be needed is only probable. Brazil has actively supported them in the past, supplying, as I have mentioned above, one battalion of infantry to the United Nations Emergency Force in the Gaza Strip – a force which was for some considerable time under the command of a Brazilian general – supplying air force personnel for the United Nations Force in the Congo, and having maintained observers, both military and civilian, in Greece, Cyprus, Cambodia, Vietnam and Kashmir, as required by the appropriate organs of the United Nations. Brazil feels justified, therefore, in claiming that the time has come to settle, by the only effective means, namely, through a

revision of the Charter, the vexing questions of apportioning the costs of such operations.

A new field has recently been opened to the fruitful action of the United Nations: that of devising rules to accelerate the development of underdeveloped Member states and to improve the economic relations between such countries and the more fully developed ones. I refer to the creation of the United Nations Conference on Trade and Development, an organ for the success of which Brazil voices sincere wishes.

Far be it from us to advocate any form of "class struggle" between nations, opposing "haves" and "have-nots". Such a confrontation would be not only sterile, but definitely harmful to the cause of unity and friendship among nations and to the best interest of mankind. Yet I must emphasize with equal firmness that it would be no less disastrous to reject the self-evident truth that close and intelligent cooperation is called for between the fully developed States and the less developed ones, in the best interests of all. I say "intelligent" cooperation, because it is too late in the day to propose inadequate formulae for or to apply evasive tactics to a problem that is not to be denied and which brooks no postponement. It would indeed be folly, and dangerous folly at that, to reject this postulate, that the achievement of an adequate rate of economic development, and of an adequate degree of social welfare and security, is the common concern of all mankind. Man has long ago conquered the ends of the earth; he is now conquering outer space and the celestial bodies far beyond the orbit of our planet. Even now, man-made objects already lie on the face of the moon, and other objects, also the handiwork of man, speed silently through interstellar space. At a time when almost unimaginable resources are devoted to these staggering achievements, when these same achievements seem to prove that there are no limits to the ingenuity and enterprising resourcefulness of man, it is a cruel mockery to our fellow-man, and a blasphemy against Divine Providence, to allow poverty, hunger, sickness and fear to stalk the earth.

I am well aware that prosperity is the result of effort, and that those who need help must be disposed to help themselves. Yet it is also very evident that the gifts of nature have not been equally apportioned among all countries; and it is equally evident that the underdeveloped countries, whatever the reason for their initial disadvantage, are severely handicapped in the struggle to bridge the gap between themselves and the more highly developed States. To channel resources where they are needed, resources in money, in men, in technical and scientific knowledge, is the great challenge of our times. To improve terms of trade, to make free

the access to old and new markets, to open up economic vistas, to break down the barriers of narrow self-interest – all this I believe to be consistent with the highest aspirations, and indeed with the ultimate interests, of the highly developed countries themselves.

In view of the immense possibilities to be explored for the future welfare of the world, in view of the immense tasks that challenge in our day and age the creative spirit of man and set us such high standards of mutual solidarity, it is deeply regrettable that the United Nations Cocoa Conference, convened to prepare an international agreement to safeguard the cocoa market against disruptive influences, should have been such a dismal failure.

Some countries still apparently fail to understand that some measure of protection is imperative for such basic commodities as are vital to the exchange-earning capacity of any individual country. Underdeveloped countries must rely on their ability to earn foreign exchange in order to obtain the capital goods essential to their development effort. In so far as basic commodities are concerned, often their main or only source of such income, protection against ruinous price fluctuations is a condition of the very survival, economically speaking, of such countries. The best interests of the highly developed countries are surely more consistent with the spread of prosperity and increased earning capacity to new areas and new potential markets, rather than with the impoverishment of struggling countries and the decline of their respective national economies to bare subsistence level.

The failure of the Cocoa Conference must be remedied; the United Nations must set itself resolutely to the task of ensuring to all Members fair access to world markets, and also fair access to those technological and scientific resources which today bid fair to change the very face of the earth. In the latter respect, I welcome with particular satisfaction the steps that have been taken to establish the United Nations Organization for Industrial Development. That will be a fitting complement to the United Nations Trade and Development Board as well as to the United Nations Special Fund. Financial assistance for development projects, technical guidance for the operation of industrial projects, adequate protection for prices of essential exports of the underdeveloped countries: those three parallel lines of attack can and should lead to victory in the struggle for full economic development – the decisive and vital struggle from the viewpoint of the immense majority of all men and women who inhabit this earth. It is greatly to be desired, therefore, that the United Nations Organization for Industrial Development may soon achieve full

operational status, that a United Nations conference may soon be convened to decide on this point, and that the United Nations Development Program, of which the Special Fund is now a part, may soon reach the $200 million level set for it at the twentieth session of the General Assembly. It is also greatly to be hoped that the new forms of economic association, now so prevalent in the world, shall not operate as walled-in enclosures behind high tariff barriers, nor resort to import restrictions to discriminate against the products of other areas. Latin America looks uneasily upon the thorny network of rules and regulations that hinder its trade with Western Europe, and its uneasiness and displeasure are by no means allayed by the unequal treatment granted, to the detriment of Latin America, by the European Common Market to other non-European countries.

In the field of social problems and of human relations, Brazil is proud to have been the first country to sign the International Convention on the Elimination of all Forms of Racial Discrimination, as approved at the last session of the General Assembly. Within the boundaries of Brazil, indeed, small need would be felt for such a document, since Brazil has long been an outstanding, and in fact I would be tempted to say the foremost, example of a true racial democracy, where many races live and labor together and freely mix, without fear or favor, without hate or discrimination. Our hospitable land has long been open to men of all races and creeds; no one questions, or cares, what may have been a man's birthplace, or that of his forebears; all enjoy equal rights, and all are equally proud of being part of one great nation. While the new Convention is, therefore, superfluous in so far as Brazil is concerned, we nonetheless welcome it as a useful pointer to other countries placed in less favorable circumstances. And I would take this opportunity to suggest that racial tolerance should be exercised by all races towards other races; to have been sinned against is no valid reason for sinning against others. May the Brazilian example and the moderation without effort, easy tolerance and mutual respect in our racial relations be followed by all multiracial nations.

In this connection, what I had the opportunity to note during the trip I made before arriving in this metropolis gives additional strength to my hopes. I have in fact, come from Portugal, Italy and the Vatican. In Portugal and in Italy I felt at close hand the Latin spirit which inspires Brazil and leads it on the path of tolerance and understanding. Those two countries, which have already given so much to world civilization, are still called upon to perform great deeds, both for the benefit of their populations and in the interest of other peoples linked to them by political or sentimental bonds. And the Holy See, thanks to the actions and to

the nobility of spirit of Pope Paul VI – whose visit to this Assembly was certainly the highest moment of its session last year – abounds in ability, interest and dedication to the tasks of international conciliation and of the spiritual and social perfection of mankind on the basis of the sacred teachings of the Gospel.

The satisfaction of opening this debate becomes deeper because it gives me the opportunity to extend a welcome to Guyana, a country I take special pleasure in greeting, not only as a neighbor, but also as a friend of Brazil, one which, for the first time, takes its seat amongst us. Membership in this gathering of the sovereign Powers of the world is a high privilege and, thanks to the labors of previous sessions, one that entails no small material advantages. However, not only rights, but also duties are the portion of Member States. First and foremost, of course, is the duty to abide by the United Nations Charter faithfully observing both its letter and spirit. This implies respecting the rule of law in international relations, accepting the decisions reached by the majority in the General Assembly or its Committees, abstaining from any form of aggression against other countries, and observing the rule of international courtesy in all dealings with other States. If all States enjoy equal rights in this august Organization so also are they all bound by equal obligations and by reciprocal rules of mutual respect. Too often in the past this Assembly has been the scene of shrill recriminations, with bitter accusations often couched in unseemly language. I sincerely trust that we shall be able to avoid this in the future. The General Assembly is indeed a proper court for the statement of legitimate grievances, for the hearing of occasional differences, a fit place for those seeking relief and justice; but we must never forget that concord is our goal, that a spirit of mutual tolerance should be our guiding rule, that reason, right and impartiality should reign supreme among us. Wrongs should not be merely pointed out, but patiently righted as a result of the sincere efforts of us all. This Organization will be in our eyes, in the eyes of the world and in the eyes of posterity, as high as our efforts will place it, not according to how much we ask of it, but according to how much we give to it. Many Members of this great fellowship of nations have freely and consistently given to the Organization of their wealth, their effort their loyalty, of the blood of their sons. All honor to such nations: may they be an example and an inspiration to us all. Loyalty, good faith, devotion to the common good, forbearance and mutual respect are the necessary conditions for success in our task. If we fail, we shall have forfeited the greatest, and possibly the last, hope of mankind for peaceful coexistence among the sons of Adam,

and we shall know that the curse of Cain is still upon us. If we succeed, and succeed we must, it will be through slow and painful progress, but we shall know that some day our children, and our children's children, will come to live out their days in peace and comfort under skies which no longer hold the daily menace of sudden annihilation, upon an earth made bountiful to their labor and from which, God willing, poverty, pain and violence will be gradually banished.

New York, September 22, 1966.

1967

1967

The appointment of President Costa e Silva made clear the decision of the armed forces to prolong indefinitely the process initiated in 1964. The military movement that had removed President João Goulart from office in the name of the preservation of representative democracy and of the alignment of Brazil with the values of the Western world evolved in an authoritarian context with a nationalistic character with State control. A regime of exception, mobilized around the ideological threat from the left, was being institutionalized and would raise internal security to the status of a fundamental element of the political action of the State, side by side with a development model based on the active participation of the State in the economy.

As these trends strengthened in Brazil, the international panorama seemed to change. The bipolar confrontation gave way to impulses of accommodation and understanding between the superpowers. Economically recovered, Western Europe sought to re-establish itself politically and strategically. France had withdrawn from NATO military arrangements in 1966. China would break with the guidance by the Soviet Union, opening the first great split in the Communist world. In the Third World, trends toward non-alignment as a means to contain the growing competition for spheres of influence between the U.S. and the USSR were increasing.

If on the one hand the understandings between the superpowers introduced noxious elements in the international system, on the other

the mollifying of the alliances and the multiplication of power centers opened new opportunities for diplomatic action. In this panorama, the central objective of Brazilian external policy in strategic terms would turn to the avoidance of the crystallization of an international superstructure based on the division of the world between the superpowers, that is, the freezing of world power as symbolized by the *co-chairmanship.* Brazilian diplomacy started to employ that expression, in an allusion to the dual presidency of the Conference on Disarmament in Geneva, to describe the new tendencies of the ordering of international politics.

The decision not to adhere to the Non-Proliferation Treaty (NPT), which was concluded in July 1968, became symbolic of the new course of the foreign policy of Brazil. This decision showed Brazilian disagreement with the international order reflected in the text of the NPT. Without abandoning the determination to utilize nuclear energy exclusively for peaceful purposes, Brazilian diplomacy explained the repudiation of the NPT in terms of the unequal nature of the treaty. The Brazilian position was repeatedly expounded at the United Nations and other fora. It was believed that at the time Brazil had already reached a stage of internal development that made it possible, without slipping into the ideological terrain, to disagree with the United States in an essential matter for its security interests.

Together with the decision not to relinquish the universality requirements prescribed by Article 26 for the entry into force of the Treaty of Tlatelolco, concluded in Mexico City in February 1967, the cautious attitude anticipated with regard to the NPT would become a turning point in the trajectory of Brazilian external policy.

Statements delivered at the United Nations since then reflect this change. The superpowers started to be treated in terms of equality. While linked to the United States by friendly affinities, Brazil would identify noxious connotations to its interests both in American and in Soviet policies. Since 1967, the ritual protests of "occidentalism" would no longer appear in Brazilian statements at the United Nations.

In 1967 Foreign Minister José de Magalhães Pinto delivered a statement of strong pragmatic content. He made a close analysis of the question of the NPT and advanced the Brazilian reservations to the text on account of the imbalance between the responsibilities and obligations of the Parties to the instrument. He dealt at length with economic development (his motto at the Foreign Ministry was *diplomacy of prosperity*) which he characterized as a responsibility to be shared by all nations. The questions of international trade were also treated with special care

in the 1967 speech: the concern in ensuring the adoption of norms that would allow the growing participation of developing countries in the international trade in manufactured goods is remarkable. Concerns with the theme of science and technology and the brain drain already emerge in the Brazilian discourse.

In the paragraph on the Arab-Israeli conflict, there is a marked concern of Brazilian diplomacy to assume a balanced and equidistant posture. The so-called "Six-day War" broke out in July and Brazil, in its capacity as a member of the Security Council, was engaged in the negotiation that would lead in November to Resolution 242, a document that despite its ambiguities would remain for many years the chief normative instrument for the conduct of the question of the Middle East.

XXII Regular Session of the General Assembly of the United Nations
1967

Minister José de Magalhães Pinto [*]

Mr. President,

Since it is customary for Brazil to open the general debate, the privilege and the honor fall upon me to be the first speaker to congratulate you, Mr. President, on your election. In so doing, may I express to you my most sincere wishes that your term of office will be a successful and fruitful one. This, I am certain, will be guaranteed by your outstanding qualifications and your great experience.

For more than twenty years we representatives of the States Members of the United Nations have been gathering here for the purpose of reviewing the international scene, combining our efforts to seek measures which will bring us peace, strengthen international security and promote the well-being of mankind.

During the last few months there have been increasing indications of better understanding between the United States of America and the Soviet Union, to the great satisfaction and renewed hope of all nations. It must be acknowledged however that, despite all efforts, the nuclear armaments race continues and no way has been found to solve the conflicts existing in areas that are highly sensitive from the standpoint of international security. Indeed, we see with alarm that they not only remain unsolved but tend to gain in intensity.

[*] **José de Magalhães Pinto**, born in Santo Antonio do Monte, MG, on June 28, 1909. Governor of the State of Minas Gerais from 1/1961 to 1/1966. Minister for External Relations from 3/15/1967 to 10/30/1969. † Rio de Janeiro, March 6, 1996.

Moreover, we view with deep concern the fact that instead of diminishing, the gap between the highly industrialized countries and the developing nations is growing wider. This represents a serious threat to peace and a frustration of our common endeavors on behalf of universal well-being.

We must, therefore, do our utmost to encourage the now foreseeable slackening of international tension; must commit ourselves to finding effective lasting solutions to the present conflicts; we must devise formulas to eliminate the poverty in which two-thirds of mankind lives.

The maintenance of peace is not a task limited to the political and military fields. This task must inevitably be the outcome of a complex process set in motion by economic and social factors. Peace cannot be dissociated from development. Even an agreement among the most powerful nations would be meaningless if it operated only in areas in which their own specific interests happened to coincide. No civilization today is self-sufficient or isolated. The prosperity of each nation – I would even say its very survival – is dependent upon that of all the others.

It follows therefore that prosperity and peace are the responsibility of all nations, and that each nation must devote all the means at its disposal to the pursuit of those goals. The industrialized countries have special duties in the face of this gigantic undertaking.

It must be recognized, however, that the means at the disposal of the international community have not as yet been mobilized in the urgent, effective manner dictated by the grave needs of the time. When we proclaimed the United Nations Development Decade we all seemed to be convinced that if we wanted peace we had to reduce the economic and social imbalances besetting the world. Now that the decade is drawing to a close, it is apparent that our actions have not lived up to our expectations. Indeed, the results have been exactly the opposite of what we had hoped: the gulf between the developed and developing countries has never been as wide as at present. The developed countries have accelerated their growth, and the developing countries can barely free themselves from stagnation. The developing countries may not have done all they should, but cooperation from the wealthy countries has fallen far short in every respect of what had been expected. For example, the flow of financial assistance lags far behind the one percent of the gross national product recommended by the General Assembly. Negotiations such as the Kennedy Round give added impetus to trade among highly industrialized countries and only remotely benefit the others. Even in the meetings of the

United Nations Conference on Trade and Development (UNCTAD) a sense of frustration is evident.

Primary commodities, exports of manufactured goods, general and non-discriminatory preferences and a larger participation in international services – all these aspirations of the less-developed countries are being dealt with on a makeshift basis, and the behavior of the industrialized countries has not been inspired by a desire to create general prosperity which, after all, is the real and long-term interest of all nations.

The group of thirty-one developing countries members of the Trade and Development Board has dealt lucidly in a memorandum with the various specific problems requiring immediate solution. Brazil hopes that that fundamental document will serve as the basis for effective decisions and that the UNCTAD meeting to be held at New Delhi in 1968, will mark the beginning of its implementation.

It is urgent for us to find adequate solutions to the problems of international commodity trade on which the developing countries depend to such a large extent. It is urgent for us to adopt measures of international cooperation, so that the developing countries can expand their exports of manufactured goods, an indispensable requirement for their economic growth. And it is no less urgent for international financing to be made available in sufficient volume and under appropriate conditions in order to promote development, and not just to cover the servicing of previous loans.

In 1964, 120 countries met in Geneva and agreed that the problems faced by the developing countries were well known and that only the determination to act was lacking for their solution. Yet here we stand, almost three years later, and the determination has still not materialized on the international level. If we wish to keep our faith in the solidarity of nations we cannot afford to subject it to further trials. It is indispensable that the political will to act be translated into effective measures instead of taking the form of renewed pious declarations of good intentions.

In the concerted action undertaken by UNCTAD there is no place for ideological motivation, which would vitiate its meaning. The seventy-seven nations, united by common interests, make up a group for the attainment of clearly defined and specific goals, exclusively linked to the promotion of economic development. It is strictly in this sense and in full awareness of our responsibilities that Brazil participates in the group.

The increase of wealth on the part of the industrialized nations is being partly diverted to the accumulation and improvement of military equipment. Many of the best brains in the world have been recruited

to devise and perfect the techniques of those armaments and the art of their application. Ever more distant seems the arrival of the day on which those vast human and material resources can be released to serve the progress and well-being of the developing countries and the less favored communities of those very Powers engaged in the arms race.

The United States of America and the Soviet Union have recently submitted two identical drafts of a treaty on the non-proliferation of nuclear weapons to the Conference of the Eighteen Nation Committee on Disarmament at Geneva. We read this as a sign of international détente. Brazil welcomes this important step in the hope that a better understanding between the two Powers may result in concrete measures leading to general and complete disarmament under effective international control. Only in that context will the treaty achieve meaning and validity.

We note with satisfaction that the two Powers, in contrast with the procedure adopted in the case of the Moscow Test-ban Treaty, have chosen to submit their drafts to the Disarmament Committee, thus acknowledging that the proposed measure does fit into the framework of the efforts undertaken by the United Nations to achieve disarmament as one of its objectives.

Imbued as we are with the spirit of cooperation and objectivity we cannot but observe that those drafts do not imply any reduction of existing nuclear weapon stockpiles, nor do they even discourage the increase and development of nuclear weapons by those countries which already possess them. No resources are to be released to serve economic and peaceful ends. For all practical purposes, the drafts propose limitations only for those countries that do not possess nuclear weapons and they include restrictions which are not essential to the objectives of non-proliferation.

The adherence to the purposes of non-proliferation must not entail a renunciation by any country of the right to develop its own technology. On the contrary, Brazil, while supporting, as it always has, the non-proliferation of nuclear weapons, is convinced that the measures to this end should facilitate nuclearization for peaceful purposes. Such nuclearization for peaceful purposes should include the technology of nuclear explosives which might become indispensable for major engineering projects of significance for economic development.

As a matter of fact, Brazil has already undertaken the sovereign commitment to renounce nuclear weapons by signing the Treaty for the Prohibition of Nuclear Weapons in Latin America, concluded at Mexico City on February 14, 1967. The manner whereby this Treaty draws a distinction between nuclear weapons, which it prohibits, and unlimited

peaceful nuclearization, which it authorizes, seems to us quite appropriate for an agreement on a worldwide basis. The drafts presented in Geneva can and should benefit from the introduction of amendments improving them and ensuring a fair balance between the obligations and responsibilities of the contracting parties, thus making the drafts universally acceptable.

The scientific and technological gap between the Member States of this Organization is growing at an increasing pace to the detriment of the aims of the United Nations. As the President of my country has recently pointed out:

> We must realize that the planning of our development must take place within the context of the scientific and technological revolution which has ushered the world into the nuclear and space age. In this new era which we are entering, science and technology will increasingly condition not progress and the well-being of nations alone, but their very independence.

The fact that human resources of the highest caliber in science and technology are drawn from all parts of the world and are being concentrated in the already developed countries constitutes another serious problem. Some aspects of this situation were taken up by Secretary-General U Thant in his report to the Economic and Social Council on the development and utilization of human resources in developing countries.

It is my opinion that we should consider the possibility of collecting, coordinating and completing the studies undertaken under the aegis of the United Nations and the specialized agencies on the various aspects of this problem of the growing scientific and technological imbalance. A high-level committee might be established for this purpose by the Secretary-General, expressly enjoined to give special attention to the study of the causes, effects and possible solutions of the problem of the constant brain drain of technicians and scientists by the more developed countries.

This brief outline of my country's position on current international problems would not be complete without a reference to some issues which concern the United Nations and which deserve my Government most careful attention.

The recent outbreak of hostilities between Arabs and Israelis with the resulting human and material losses imposes upon us the duty to find the way for realistic and objective negotiations towards a conciliatory settlement between the States concerned. During the fifth special emergency session I had the opportunity of stating the position of my country on this matter. On the one hand, we recognize

the existence of the State of Israel with all the rights and prerogatives of a sovereign nation; on the other hand, as I pointed out on that occasion, we recognize the validity of many important claims of the Arab countries. What must be avoided is the continuance of a state of belligerency between Members of the Organization, punctuated by military clashes and bringing substantial damage to the economies both of Israel and of the Arab countries, as well as being a constant threat to world peace. We shall continue to cooperate in the spirit of friendship which binds us to both sides in the search for a just and lasting solution which will enable the peoples of the Middle East to concentrate their efforts on the rewarding pursuit of their development and prosperity.

Brazil reiterates its adherence to the principle of self-determination and its staunch support for the task of decolonization which the United Nations has been carrying out since its inception. There have been major accomplishments in this area, but we still have a long way to go. The consolidation of the objectives of decolonization will only be made effective in the global context of the economic and social development of the less-developed countries. This premise is essential if the process of decolonization is to be conducted in a peaceful and orderly way.

We are convinced that extreme inequalities both on the international and national levels are sources of insecurity, dissatisfaction and apprehension, thereby constituting, as much as the nuclear weapons race, a serious threat to peace. My country is determined to fulfill its destiny by creating wealth and distributing it fairly among our people, while preserving our multiracial society bound together by deep-rooted Christian and non-discriminatory traditions.

We have overcome economic difficulties and faced serious financial problems. We are meeting the needs of our economic and social development with our own resources and with the limited assistance we receive from abroad. We do not for a moment doubt that our efforts will meet with success. Our goals, however, will be more readily attained as we succeed in translating into practical measures the common belief that peace and development, indissolubly linked, require universal conditions and a collective effort on an international scale.

This is the reason why we shall strive in all bodies of the United Nations to ensure that the principles of international cooperation in the economic field shall be used not merely for verbal formulations but as a guide for action on the part of all States. This is also the reason why we insist that this Organization must face, purposefully and with decision, the problem of the increasing scientific and

technological gap which divides the highly industrialized Powers from the developing countries. And finally, this is the reason why we shall make every effort in order that disarmament be translated into measures which shall effectively ensure the security and the development of all nations.

New York, September 21, 1967.

1968

1968

The Brazilian internal scene would become considerably more complicated in 1968. Many student marches and demonstrations were held throughout the year. In December, the National Congress was suspended as a result of the request for authorization to prosecute a Congressman for a speech deemed offensive to the armed forces.

On the international level, the invasion of Czechoslovakia by Russian forces in June 1968 made clear the determination of the Soviet Union not to allow any deviation from Communist orthodoxy. It was the most evident demonstration of the principle of spheres of influence and of the use of the so-called Brezhnev doctrine of limited sovereignty.

The Brazilian world view would be negatively influenced by this set of factors, which confirmed previously expressed fears that the world was being managed by a condominium of power between the two superpowers, in a context where the security and development interests of emerging countries were being postponed. In the view of sectors linked to the State sponsored development effort then prevailing in Brazil it became imperative to break the rigidity of the international system. However, given the features of the regime in force, Brazilian diplomacy would face increasing difficulties to put together coalitions of interest that could make its postures viable in the multilateral field.

Foreign Minister Magalhães Pinto opened his statement at the Twenty-Third Session of the General Assembly with an eloquent condemnation of the invasion of Czechoslovakia (Brazil, in its capacity as

non-permanent member of the Security Council, had participated actively of the debate on this issue) and of the lack of results in negotiations on vertical proliferation of nuclear weapons and the failure of UNCTAD. All these elements, said the Minister, showed that the international system was again dominated by the most primitive of logics: the logic of might.

Once again the speech emphasized the Brazilian position regarding the NPT. Developments in Czechoslovakia, the Minister went on, supported the criticism made by Brazil about the inadequacy of guarantees given by nuclear weapon States.

Other prominent issues in the speech were the Arab-israeli conflict (with the reaffirmation of support to the recently approved Security Council Resolution 242); the seabed (mention to the hope that negotiations then initiated would lead to a satisfactory regime both for developed and for developing countries); South Africa (condemnation of the Pretoria regime), and Rhodesia (support for the sanctions against the Ian Smith regime).

XXIII Regular Session of the General Assembly of the United Nations 1968

Minister José de Magalhães Pinto [*]

Mr. President,

I should like to begin my address today by expressing the gratification of the Brazilian Government at seeing you preside over the work of the Twenty-Third Session of the General Assembly. For my Government, your presence in the Chair represents not only the election of a representative of a sister nation of the Hemisphere but the choice of an experienced statesman, former permanent representative of Guatemala to the United Nations and its present Minister for External Relations, whose legal knowledge and political experience are a pledge of the successful outcome of the Twenty-Third Session of the General Assembly. Allow me also at this time to express our gratitude to Mr. Manescu, Foreign Minister of Rumania, for presiding over the proceedings of the Twenty-Second Session with such tact, impartiality and objectivity.

On behalf of the Government of Brazil, I wish to express our deep satisfaction at seeing today in our midst the representatives of Swaziland, which has just been admitted to our Organization. During the relevant proceedings of the Security Council, Brazil had the occasion to strongly support and recommend its admission, which bears a special significance for Brazil in view of its historical and cultural bonds with the nations of the African continent.

[*] **José de Magalhães Pinto**, born in Santo Antonio do Monte, MG, on June 28, 1909. Governor of the State of Minas Gerais from 1/1961 to 1/1966. Minister for External Relations from 3/15/1967 to 10/30/1969. † Rio de Janeiro, March 6, 1996.

We convene here for the Twenty-Third Session of the General Assembly at a time of insecurity for international peace and for the cause of law and justice among peoples. The year 1968 is one of tensions that test to the utmost the purposes and principles which gave life, shape and content to the San Francisco Charter. The events in Czechoslovakia, the absence of any progress in the control of vertical nuclear proliferation, the dismal failure of the last session of the United Nations Conference on Trade and Development (UNCTAD) are all aspects of a deplorable reversion to the most primitive of logics: the logic of force. The patient labor of the United Nations on behalf of international peace and security, economic and social development, human rights and the emancipation of peoples is in danger of suffering a serious setback.

Not only the small and middle Powers suffer the impact of events which threaten the return of the atmosphere of the cold war which we thought had become a thing of the past. Also threatened are the expectations of a permanent understanding among the great Powers. What a precarious security is that in which the tranquility of peoples is contingent upon the existence of arsenals that daily increase in their sophistication. The world is lacking in the mutual confidence essential for the development of political cooperation among nations.

Which way are we bound? Towards a new cycle of the cold war? Will we consign to oblivion the political and cultural experiment which seemed to place humanity at the threshold of a new destiny?

The United Nations was built upon the idea of the maintenance of peace through the preservation of the victorious alliance of 1945. In the name of political realism, we were led to accept situations and operational formulae which, to a large extent, were irreconcilable with our juridical conscience and with the principles which preside over our legal systems. Concessions, however, were made to be used according to the principles of the Charter, and to ensure the achievement of its high purposes. These principles and objectives are what make the United Nations so much more than a simple conference-holding mechanism.

As unacceptable as the invasion of Czechoslovakia itself are the arguments that have been advanced to justify and condone it. It has been stated in the Security Council that the events in Czechoslovakia are of an internal nature, of sole and exclusive interest to the members of the Warsaw Pact. There was even an invocation of Article 2, paragraph 7, of the United Nations Charter, a curious invocation indeed which purports to construe the action of the Security Council and the United Nations as a violation of this precept, while reconciling it perfectly with the

movement of troops and cannons across national frontiers. Never have the rights of force been enunciated in such peremptory and undisguised fashion. As Brazil has already had the occasion to state, we cannot build international peace and security on the precarious foundation of spheres of influence or on the delimitation of power along certain arbitrary geographical lines.

No one denies to any State, whatsoever, the right to provide for its own security and to join whatever military pacts it deems convenient, adequate or necessary to its interests of self-defense. Each State is the sole judge of its own needs and interests. As long as the principles of general and complete disarmament and international collective security do not prevail, the existence of military alliances will continue to characterize world reality. This cannot be said to be perfect or ideal as a state of affairs or, even less, a reassuring one, but it is accepted by the political realism so often invoked in the meetings of our Organization. At any rate, the thesis that joining a military pact implies surrendering one's sovereignty, territorial integrity and equality before the law, is totally inadmissible. We are face to face with new concepts and ideas which, if not challenged and repudiated, will render impossible the coexistence of free and sovereign States, conscious of their mutual rights and obligations.

We seem to have had confirmed some of the views set forth by Brazil when we were fighting for the fair and equitable Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons, in which we would renounce weapons we never wanted in the first place, but not the benefits of science and technology. Both in the Conference of the Eighteen Nation Committee on Disarmament and in the resumed Twenty-Second Session of the General Assembly, we insisted upon the necessity of a balance of obligations between the nuclear weapon countries and the other nations. And, more recently, at the Conference of Non-Nuclear Weapon States in Geneva, we had the opportunity to reiterate our arguments and suggestions. Recent developments have confirmed the precariousness and insufficiency of the guarantees extended to the non-nuclear countries under resolution 255 (1968) of the Security Council.

Brazil fully accepts a general policy of non-proliferation of nuclear weapons. The success of such a policy, however, depends upon the effective security conditions and increased stimulus of the peaceful use of the atom. We hope that the military nuclear Powers will ponder carefully the latest recommendations made in Geneva, seeing in them not just the specific aspirations of the non-nuclear States, but the basic elements of the preservation of the peace and security of all. We have reached a point

in the evolution of history where no real progress can be made towards peace unless guarantees against aggression or the threat of aggression by nuclear weapons are made politically more effective and juridically more perfect. For that purpose, we favor the idea of a worldwide convention, which will represent a step beyond the Charter of San Francisco, and we likewise emphasize the urgency of drawing up conventions for nuclear disarmament, under effective international control.

To be valid, a policy of non-proliferation of nuclear weapons must necessarily guarantee unrestricted and non-discriminatory access to science and technology and to nuclear materials for peaceful purposes. In like measure, it ought to provide for concrete measures of technical assistance and financing. World peace cannot be the resultant of a mere parallelogram of opposing forces. True peace exacts assured cooperation for constructive purposes, to accelerate the economic and social progress of peoples within the framework of respect for the freedom and safety of all.

During 1968, no progress can be recorded in the furthering of solutions to the serious problems of trade and development. At the second session of UNCTAD in New Delhi, the developed countries employed evasive and dilatory methods and tactics. On March 26, Brazil made following statement:

> The balance-sheet of the Second UNCTAD Conference is dismal indeed. It could have become a turning point in the history of international economic cooperation. Instead, it may well become a source of frustration and disenchantment. At New Delhi, developed countries could have paved the way for a new era in the field of international economic relations. Instead, by systematically blocking all important initiatives of developing countries, they have chosen to deepen the cleavage between North and South, fraught with such dangerous, social and political implications.

After the experience of New Delhi and the results on the debates on the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons in New York, we now venture to express the hope that, in formulating a legal regime for the seabed beyond the limits of national jurisdiction, the interests of all, developed or developing, may be fully satisfied in the exploration and exploitation of that immense region which is the common heritage of mankind. The result of the work of the *ad hoc* Committee to Study the Peaceful Uses of the Seabed and the Ocean Floor beyond the Limits of National Jurisdiction, to which the Brazilian Government had the honor

to extend its hospitality recently in Rio de Janeiro, can serve as a basis for effective measures to be taken during this regular session of the Assembly.

It is precisely in order to fight for a better world that we meet here today in this Organization, which represents our best hope for the establishment of an international order that will prove just and long lasting. We are once again called upon to express our ideas and to vote upon the great themes of peace and war, of collective security, of human rights, of economic development and the emancipation of peoples. We shall have to consider complex problems, both those which appear on the agenda and those which do not. We will have to contribute, directly or indirectly, to the effect that the Paris negotiations may, within the shortest possible time, bring an end to the conflict in Vietnam.

As far as the Middle East is concerned, Brazil has expressed its apprehensions as regards the arms race in which the countries of that area are engaged. We would like to reiterate our appeal for the flow of arms and war materiel to the parties in conflict to be suspended, limited or regulated. If allowed to go on unchecked, this arms race can lead to a new conflagration of unpredictable consequences. We still think that resolution 242 (1967) of the Security Council is a fair and reliable basis for the establishment of peace in the Middle East. We ought to spare no efforts to create conditions propitious to the mission that Ambassador Gunnar Jarring has undertaken as Special Representative of the Secretary-General, a mission that he is discharging with so much patience and tenacity.

Finally, the Government of my country observes with great concern that there is a continuing violation of the human rights consecrated by the United Nations and the international community. During this very year, which has been proclaimed in resolution 1961 (XVIII) as the International Year for Human Rights it was with sorrow and dismay that we watched the Pretoria Government take a series of measures in relation to Namibia, in flagrant disrespect for the resolutions of the Security Council and the General Assembly. We again call upon that Government to abide by the decisions of the United Nations. For our part, through the adoption of concrete, specific and mandatory measures, the Brazilian Government acted promptly upon the Security Council's decision on Rhodesia aiming at the establishment in that country of a govern fully representative of its inhabitants, and at the elimination of its present heinous policy of racial discrimination.

Great are the dangers and grave the risks that surround us, and yet never has mankind had at its disposal so many efficient tools to employ in the solution of its problems and difficulties. Science and technology

for the first time in history allow an adequate response to the needs of social well-being and progress for all peoples. But, at the same time, there has never been a historical period with such an accelerated chain-reaction of basic problems. The need for frequent readjustments to a great extent explains, if it does not justify, the setbacks which periodically occur in our arduous quest for true peace.

Brazil adheres to the belief that the ideals of this Organization will at last prevail over narrow political concepts, over near-sighted and short-term economic positions, over methods of action inadequate to the complexity and unity of today's world. Amid a sequence of crises we witness the affirmation of a sentiment of solidarity that transcends boundaries and the occasional divisions of mankind. Such circumstances and the simple fact that we gather here today the representatives of 125 nations strengthen and justify our earnest hopes.

New York, October 2, 1968.

1969

1969

In July 1969, disabled by illness, Marshal Costa e Silva was replaced by a military junta. In September, the kidnapping of the American Ambassador Burke Elbrick would put in motion a series of actions and reactions characterized as of revolutionary war, with episodes of guerrilla and airplane hijackings. In October, Congress was reopened to formalize the election of General Emílio Garrastazu Médici as President of the Republic. President Médici took power on October 30.

As these developments disturbed the internal Brazilian scene, changes in the international macrostructure became evident. The acceptance of strategic parity by the United States opened the way to a series of concrete negotiations between the superpowers. Upon taking office, President Richard Nixon announced that after a period of prevailing confrontation the United States and the Soviet Union had entered a phase of negotiations.

The SALT talks on strategic arms limitation began in 1969. In Europe, the accession to power of German social-democracy dramatized the new era of understandings. With his *Östpolitik,* Willy Brandt opened the way for dialogue with the USSR and the Eastern European countries. The ideas of Dr. Henry Kissinger, then national security advisor to President Nixon, gained influence. A partisan of realistic conceptions in international relations, Kissinger suggested the division of the world in spheres of influence and the fading away of the autarchic trends in the Soviet Union through the recognition of its

security interests and its progressive involvement in the mainstream of international trade and investment.

Thus, developments continued to support the Brazilian criticism to the condominium of power. Addressing the Twenty-Fourth Session of the General Assembly, Foreign Minister Magalhães Pinto again criticized the tendency to reduce international questions to the minimum common denominator of the interests of the great powers. The international reality was described in a negative tone: a cycle of power politics expressed through military might and a series of political, economic, financial, commercial and technological pressures. The Minister found fault with the fact that disarmament negotiations had given way to arms control. The superpowers were blamed for the inclination to ignore the multilateral negotiation mechanisms in favor of understandings limited to closed decision circles.

It was a long text of special conceptual wealth in which were expounded the bases of many postulations that for many years would continue to appear in Brazilian external concerns: non-proliferation, seabed and ocean floor, international trade and many others. The passage dealing with the question of the Middle East supported the good faith application of Resolution 242. The paragraphs devoted to the issue of racial discrimination and decolonization contained more positive formulations regarding the African group.

The statement ended with a reference to the reform of the Charter.

XXIV Regular Session of the General Assembly of the United Nations 1969

Minister José de Magalhães Pinto [*]

Madam President,

First of all I should like to extend to you my heartiest congratulations for the unanimity of choice which singled you out to preside over the proceedings of the Twenty-Fourth Session of the General Assembly of the United Nations.

That inspired choice was made in recognition of your great personal and professional qualifications, as well as in testimony of appreciation and admiration for your country, placed since its founding under the aegis of liberty. Your election as President is, moreover, a tribute to the African nations which so often in this forum have joined the Latin American delegations in defense of the principles of the United Nations Charter, in affirmation of the freedom of man, and in furtherance of the great causes of economic development and social progress. Let us express our earnest hope that this General Assembly, under your guidance, will present a step ahead towards freedom, justice and the sovereign equality of all nations.

After extending our good wishes to you, my delegation cannot fail to render tribute to the memory of Emilio Arenales, who presided over the work of the General Assembly at its Twenty-Third Session with unquestioned political and diplomatic leadership, under circumstances that exacted from him the greatest personal sacrifice. To the delegation

[*] **José de Magalhães Pinto**, born in Santo Antonio do Monte, MG, on June 28, 1909. Governor of the State of Minas Gerais from 1/1961 to 1/1966. Minister of State for External Relations from 3/15/1967 to 10/30/1969. † Rio de Janeiro, March 6, 1996.

of the sister Republic of Guatemala we are moved to express our deep sorrow at his early demise, which has deprived Latin America of a most effective spokesman and of one of our greatest statesmen.

At the same time, allow me to recall a colleague who for twenty-three years placed his wisdom at the service of our Organization, in the cause of law. The delegation of Brazil mourns his loss; and here today, among friends to whom he was so deeply attached, the outstanding personality of Gilberto Amado is very vivid in my mind.

I should also like to acknowledge with deep appreciation the honor shown my country in the election of a member of my delegation to the chairmanship of one of the Main Committees of the General Assembly.

When each year, on the third Tuesday of September, we gather here in order to resume our great dialogue, it is the custom, and a most opportune one, to look around us in order to ascertain whether we are moving towards peace or towards war. In doing so, on this occasion, we are forced to conclude that we are not living in a time of peace, for we still see the use of force in the settlement of controversies. Instead of building a world of solid peace and lasting security, we have to content ourselves with cease-fire agreements, truces and armistices.

We are going through what is a clear and avowed cycle of power politics, which expresses itself not only in military force, but also through a whole range of pressures – political, economic, financial, commercial and technological. This regrettable trend towards the unilateral resort to force has severely put to test the principles contained in Article 2 of the United Nations Charter, which has been covertly or overtly disrespected.

Notwithstanding, progress in certain areas and a combined effort to reach understanding, which, for lack of a better name, we might call "agreements for survival", the confrontation between the two Superpowers had not yet given way to the desired phase of negotiation. The arms race continues unimpeded, unchecked and more foreboding than ever. The vertical proliferation of nuclear armaments tends to become more complex because of the development of more and more sophisticated weapons. The destructive power of these weapons now encompasses the whole environment which sustains human life, and may even lead to the elimination of all animal and vegetable life on our planet.

Meanwhile the term "disarmament" is gradually being superseded in the lexicon of the great Powers by the concept of "arms control". It is worthy of note that in Geneva the Conference of the Committee on Disarmament seems to have virtually abandoned its attempts to negotiate a treaty for general and complete disarmament, the final objective assigned

to it eight years ago by the General Assembly and by the very terms of the Zorin-Stevenson Agreement. It might be said that the matter has been shelved as a utopian and unattainable objective. The shift in emphasis from the concept of "disarmament" to that of "limitation of armaments" means a step backwards politically far beyond the range and scope of a mere variation in semantics.

Also in regard to disarmament, there is another element we cannot ignore. I refer to the question of chemical and bacteriological weapons. One needs only to peruse the conclusions of the report of the Secretary-General. It constitutes an impressive and sobering document, depicting a strange and irrational world, which goes so far as to admit that the mobilization of germs, bacteria and viruses can be instrumental in handling frictions and dissensions among human beings.

It might not be inappropriate to recall in this connection that, while a terrifying arsenal of weapons is continually being increased and refined, some scientists, encouraged by Governments and international agencies, insist upon trying to dramatize the dangers of the population explosion, drawing alarming generalizations, without regard for the specific situation of each country or region. It is my opinion that there is much more cause for alarm in a graver, more ominous problem – that of the possibility of the disappearance of man from the face of the earth. Brazil is determined to resist any pressure directed against its demographic growth, as far as we are concerned, life is entitled to take precedence over death.

Sometimes one cannot avoid the feeling that the United Nations, which will shortly celebrate its twenty-fifth anniversary, is being put aside, as though its purposes and principles were cumbersome and its machinery and procedures inadequate.

There is a loss of confidence in the organized action of the international community and an abusive and unwarranted return to unilateral action, to intervention, open or disguised. Even more serious, there have been attempts to justify some interventions by the invocation of concepts which are diametrically opposed to those which inspired the United Nations. There is no way to dismiss what happened in Czechoslovakia last year. In truth, if there were many who deplored and denounced the invasion and occupation of that country, there were few – and these not necessarily the most powerful – who impugned the barbarous and uncouth doctrine of limited sovereignty on which the act of aggression was based. It is as if an attempt were being made to return to the situation which existed prior to the founding of this Organization, in conditions still less favorable to peace and security, since there is a

rejection of the traditional principles of international law, arising from the sovereignty and equality of States.

Our agenda is comprehensive and covers a large number of questions, but in vain would we seek to discover in it any reference to some of the more serious problems which weigh heavily upon us. There even seems to prevail a curious tacit understanding to the effect that a debate in the United Nations on a given matter could poison the atmosphere to such a point that the question would thus become insoluble. It is difficult for us to accept this concept, lest we condemn the United Nations to silence, inaction and impotence.

The same distrust concerning an open and frank debate seems to motivate the tendency, which my delegation deplores, to deal with certain questions in narrow and ever dwindling circles. Quite often, without any plausible reason being adduced, a transfer of forum has been favored from a General Assembly of one hundred and twenty-six Members to a Security Council of only fifteen on the argument that it would be unrealistic to try to reach or even undertake a solution of a matter in a body so broad in scope and so numerous in membership. Once on the Council level, the idea is advanced that it might perhaps be more practical and more convenient to avoid discussion by a body consisting of fifteen members, which at this juncture likewise appears to be cumbersome. So we fall back on the five permanent members; and, in a very short lapse of time, the five are reduced to four. Then the idea prevails that, in the final analysis, after duly weighing and measuring the realities of power, it might be more advisable, more realistic, to set the matter aside in order to leave it to the discretion of the superpowers, as if a new world directorate had already been established. This is exactly what has happened in the case of the Middle East, and of other world problems as well, such as disarmament and the non-proliferation of nuclear weapons. Such a final stage of negotiation actually has little or nothing to do with the United Nations. It seems to be inspired, in fact, by notions of spheres of influence and of balance of power which, in themselves, are the very rejection of the principles and purposes of the Charter.

Formerly, the argument went that the United Nations, while in a position to play a part in solving conflicts between small nations, could not interfere effectively in conflicts involving any of the major Powers. Now the theory seems to have been polished up so as to extend it to conflicts between small countries as well since, it would seem, such conflicts always involve the interests of the major Powers. Actually, it is an extremely dangerous delusion to attempt to draw a sharp dividing line between

"big conflicts" and "small conflicts". In a world continually drawn between the opposing forces of polycentrism and bipolarization, the so-called small conflicts tend to insert themselves into the context of larger and more complex ones affecting the whole international community. The Brazilian delegation called the attention of the Security Council to this point when we emphasized some time ago in; that forum that the problem of the Middle East, difficult enough to settle on its own terms, could become downright impossible to solve if allowed to move in the direction it is: even now taking, of becoming one more chapter in the long history of confrontations between the great powers.

If we cease to apply the Charter and if we no longer avail ourselves of the Organization to deal with the larger world problems, with the questions of peace and war, disarmament and collective security, we shall end up with either a useless Charter or a pointless Organization, or both, incapable of settling any conflicts whatsoever. Furthermore, if we abandon the principles of the United Nations: and procedures through which it acts, both of which are the very *raison d'etre* of this Organization, then we shall end by drawing the logical conclusion that dialogue even between two parties is futile and that international negotiation has become purposeless.

Here we feel bound to stress a point: no one can have reasonable or valid objection to the superpowers continuing their attempts to bring about a harmonization of their interests and responsibilities. The hopes for peace in the world rest on the assumption of a *détente* in the antagonism and rivalry between the two superpowers.

Many times, in different forums, Brazil had insisted upon the need for a permanent understanding between the United States and the USSR in order to lay the groundwork for nuclear disarmament, or at least for a diplomatic process that would lessen the risks involved in the vertical proliferation of nuclear weapons. And more than once in the debates held in the Security Council on the question of the Middle East, Brazil had the opportunity of stressing and emphasizing the special responsibilities of the major powers, to which we have addressed an appeal – which has so far been ignored and unheeded – for a reduction or balance in the supply of armaments and war material to the parties in the dispute. In all these matters, agreement between the superpowers is of the essence.

But such an agreement can contribute to a true and lasting peace and to the progress of mankind only if fully consistent with the principles and purposes of the Charter of the United Nations, which means that due attention should be paid to the legitimate rights and aspirations of

non-nuclear, non-developed countries. Unfortunately, we could allude to some questions in respect of which this has not occurred.

We could mention, for instance, the bilateral talks which led to the conclusion of the Treaty on the Non-proliferation of Nuclear Weapons. We could mention the fact that at the Twenty-Third Session of the General Assembly the nuclear Powers opposed the establishment of an *ad hoc* committee to coordinate the implementation of the results and conclusions of the Conference of Non-Nuclear Weapon States, held in Geneva from August 29 to September 28, 1968. We could also mention the fact that the superpowers did not set a deadline for the resumption of the talks in the United Nations Disarmament Commission in order to consider, *inter alia,* the question of cooperation of States in the non-proliferation of nuclear weapons and the peaceful uses of nuclear energy, two inseparable aspects of the same fundamental problem. In this case, however, since the arguments then put forth have lost much of their validity and cogency, we are hopeful that the question may receive adequate and constructive consideration.

Before leaving the question of disarmament, I wish to point out that this might be the appropriate opportunity to refer to the decision taken by the two co-Chairmen of the Conference of the Committee on Disarmament to enlarge its membership. We do not wish to question the legality of the decision, nor have we any objection to the choice of the new members. On the contrary, we are gratified by the admission of the eight new members, including another Latin-American country, Argentina, which, I am sure, will be a valuable addition to the Committee. We do hold, however, that the procedure followed by the co-Chairmen was politically ill-advised, since the normal method would have been to bring the matter to the attention of the General Assembly as it was the Assembly which endorsed the Zorin-Stevenson Agreement and which, since 1961, has annually assigned specific terms of reference to the Eighteen Nation Committee on Disarmament.

On another important matter, the attitude of the major Powers would not appear to take into account the most legitimate aspirations of the international community. I am referring to the problem of the peaceful uses of the seabed and the ocean floor. As far as the developing countries are concerned, this area constitutes the common heritage of mankind and, as such, cannot be the object of claims of sovereignty or of appropriation. It must be regulated and administered by the members of the international community, which should be entitled to share in the benefits obtained from the exploration and exploitation of the resources of the seabed.

It is equally indispensable that the seabed and the ocean floor be reserved exclusively for peaceful purposes, preventing an arms race from developing in the area to the prejudice not only of the exploitation of the seabed resources but also of the traditional activities on the high seas, such as navigation and fishing. It is difficult to accept the position taken by the great Powers, or by the technologically advanced countries, in favor of a *laissez-faire* regime of unqualified and indiscriminate freedom. Such a regime would be potentially anarchic and dangerous and would result, above all, in widening the gap which already prevails between those who possess an advanced technology and those who are striving to develop one. We should then see a small number of nations with full access to the riches of the marine environment, enjoying all its advantages, while the majority of nations would helplessly witness the utilization, by that privileged minority, of resources which belong to all.

All these positions add up to an open rejection of the commitments undertaken in other organs of the United Nations, and the overall philosophy of our Organization, aimed at narrowing down the economic disparities among nations. Let us hope that an objective examination of the problem will bring about fair and reasonable solutions.

I have just referred to economic disparities: no examination of the present world scene could fail to include those questions which refer to economic development and one of the means of achieving it – international trade.

The balance of the last decade – the United Nations Development Decade – is conclusive: the relative underdevelopment of the developing countries has clearly increased. And it is against this sobering background that the program for the next Development Decade will have to be examined, making full use of the lessons we have learned from our experience in the last ten years. If we really wish to do so, this is the way to avoid incurring the same mistakes. The errors of the past are linked to some facts which it might be pertinent to recall.

As a matter of fact, we have roughly three quarters of mankind simultaneously attempting to accelerate their development. To a large extent this effort is an internal one, and finds expression in an increase in production and in a reduction in consumption so as to liberate resources for investment. However, a substantial portion of the resources created and not consumed are channeled to the developed countries – a quarter of mankind – to serve as payment for goods essential to the development process: When primary goods are involved in the transaction, there is a constant deterioration in the terms of trade of the underdeveloped

countries; when the export of industrial goods is involved, quantitative restrictions have been established, in a more or less disguised fashion, so that the end result prevents the essential rise in value of the exports of the underdeveloped countries.

Efforts by the developing countries to improve the commercial rules of the game have been frustrated by the lack of understanding on the part of the developed countries. Under present conditions, a good part of the exports of the underdeveloped countries are dashed against the barrier raised by import quotas, or have a part of their value transferred to the developed countries, in the form of unfair prices.

If this state of affairs is allowed to prevail, development can expect little from external incentives and will have to turn inwards. Some countries will have to resort to a policy of full employment and protectionism; others will have to do the same by way of regional arrangements, likely to secure them adequate economic dimensions. But then we shall have to conclude that international cooperation in this field makes no practical sense, and its usefulness is a fallacy.

It is indispensable that plans for the Second United Nations Development Decade should be conditioned to the need for accelerating development by having the underdeveloped countries use their own resources; they should foresee the maximum of assistance compatible with the balance of payment of the recipients and above all, the restrictions imposed on exports from developing countries must be reduced to a minimum. It is pointless to attempt development with resources that simply do not exist. The goals must be realistic and attainable by procedures linked to the social, political and economic realities of the developing nations.

Economic domination and technological monopoly are not conducive to peace and the same should be said of the balance of arms. What we seek is the participation of all the members of the international community in peace, progress and development.

A joint participation in which all voices can make themselves heard is just as necessary in connection with problems such as that of the Middle East. Security Council resolution 242 (1967) in our view still provides us with the best basis for a constructive and enduring political settlement. It is regrettable that more effective action on the part of the Security Council has been thwarted by the fact that its individual members, including the permanent ones, each give a different interpretation to a text which was unanimously adopted. We urge a renewed effort to achieve in interpretation the same unanimity accorded the enunciation of principles.

It is urgent that a permanent political solution should be arrived at, lest we move inexorably into a new cycle of "open warfare", to quote the expression used by Secretary-General U Thant. Brazil continues to place great hopes in the mission entrusted to Ambassador Gunnar Jarring and appeals once again to the parties directly involved not to permit isolated incidents, condemnable as they may be, to aggravate a situation which is already pregnant with danger.

As one of the largest Catholic communities in the world, Brazil attaches particular importance to the question of the Holy Places. We continue to maintain the necessity of implementing Security Council resolution 267 (1969), unanimously adopted on July 3, 1969, and we cannot remain indifferent to the measures, unilaterally adopted, which aim at altering the status of the City of Jerusalem.

The basic concept of the United Nations is a primary concern with the condition of man and with social progress. The premise of our activities, the central idea of our efforts in all fields, the reasoning behind the decisions we take, is the desire for justice, freedom, social welfare and the betterment of all peoples. On several occasions we have explicitly reaffirmed this concept, and we have adopted many declarations, conventions and resolutions to implement it. However, we must recognize that the progress made in certain areas, such as the affirmation of the rights of women, the protection of the rights of children and the eradication of slavery, have not found their counterpart in efforts to meet the insolent challenge of the odious practice of racial discrimination.

Brazil – a country in which inequality and hatred between races are unknown – would not be true to itself if it were not always in the forefront of the fight against discrimination. As the spokesman of a people who have equal respect for all others, the Brazilian Government cannot fail to fight, wherever the opportunity arises, the policies and practices of discrimination which lead to *apartheid,* the object of our formal condemnation and abhorrence.

As we gather here today we have before us the prospect of the tenth anniversary of the Declaration of the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples. As we look around this chamber, we can see how great has been the contribution of the United Nations to building a new world. Offsetting the undeniable difficulties faced by this Organization, and lightening the pessimism induced in us by the prevalence of power politics, we have the reassuring reality of the presence at our debates of some fifty States awakened to sovereign life since the creation of the United Nations, in many cases with the encouragement and support of our Organization. The contribution we have made to the

process of decolonization will be inscribed with special distinction, among our more positive achievements. I am particularly pleased to point out the consistent participation of Brazil in all the diplomatic and parliamentary phases of the moral and political action of the United Nations on behalf of the self-determination of peoples. The valuable contribution the new States – African, Asian and American – have made to our work is proof of their political maturity and of their noble purpose in the cause of peace and international cooperation.

A year from now we will celebrate the twenty-fifth anniversary of the United Nations, which will give us a good opportunity of taking stock of our achievements and planning our future. The world of today, in which the boldness of science and of the human spirit has carried man beyond the limits of our own planet, is very different from the world of a quarter of a century ago. The Charter of the United Nations is a document of the year 1945. But the purposes and principles enshrined in it have not lost their validity and continue to represent a clear expression of the ideals which should guide international life.

The sovereign equality of States, good faith in international relations, the use of peaceful means for the settlement of disputes, the abandonment of the use of force, strict adherence to obligations arising from treaties and other international agreements, cooperation to maintain peace as well as to achieve economic, social and cultural progress, non-discrimination, respect for the self-determination of peoples, and non intervention – these make an impressive program to which we can still today give our most conscientious and firm support, as we did twenty-five years ago.

This continued adherence to basic principles does not prevent us from recognizing that it is possible to improve the structure and machinery of cooperation at our disposal. As soon as possible, it would be well to revise our Charter so as to consolidate and reinforce the ideas crystallized over the last quarter of a century, particularly in regard to defense against the new insidious forms of pressure and intervention, and cooperation on behalf of peace and the enunciation of a universal obligation for solidarity in development.

The Charter is a document that signaled the close of a war. By revising it and adapting it to the needs of our times and, whatever happens, faithfully applying it, it is incumbent upon us to make of it a document signaling the beginning of an enduring peace.

New York, September 18, 1969.

1970

1970

As the consolidation of the nationalistic development model inspired by the military progressed, the dynamics of Brazilian international insertion underwent changes. With the Médici administration a period of fast economic development was opened. The industrial basis of the country was extended concurrently with the expansion of the currents of international trade and the modernization of the energy and communications infrastructure. On the external level, the expectations of economic development would lead Brazil to qualify as an "emerging power" and to look constantly for opportunities of international projection.

The internal contradictions and the unredeemed mortgages in external policy would, however, bring difficulties for the multilateral transit of Brazil. Already inhibited from exerting influence in the political forum of non-aligned countries due to the persistent support of Portugal's colonial policy and the preference for Israel in the Middle Eastern conflict, Brazilian diplomacy would also start to face hindrances in the economic circles because its postulations and demands did not match those of countries relatively less developed.

Brazilian diplomatic rhetoric reflected the ambiguities of that moment. The statements at the General Assembly became more vehement with each passing year. The politics of power and its instruments were criticized. The United Nations was constantly praised as the sole viable alternative to the closed doors of the deciding circles of the big powers.

As the diplomatic space for the country kept shortening in practice, the utopian component of the formulations increased in an inverse proportion. To replace the realism of the politics of power, unreal theoretical formulations devoid of sustainability were put forth.

In his statement before the Twenty-Fifty Session of the General Assembly, in 1970, Foreign Minister Mário Gibson Barboza avoided express mention to the USSR and to the U.S.A., focusing instead in the United Nations as the alternative to power politics and at the same time criticizing the reduction of the prospects for peace to the accommodation of *détente*, in which universal peace became a mere slackening of tensions, general and complete disarmament would be replaced by arms control and the concept of collective security would give way to nothing but security guarantees. The reductionist trend of the international process was viewed by Brazil as a threat to its emergence. Minister Gibson Barboza did not fail to call attention to the risk that "dangerous conceptions of political realism, spheres of influence, balance of power and above all, an odd doctrine of limited sovereignty" would gain the upper hand. Accordingly, he embarked in a detailed examination of the action of the Security Council, together with proposals for it to regain its effectiveness, in particular the recourse to the so-called *ad hoc* committees in order to consider specific disputes.

The statement appropriately reflects the circumstances of Brazil and Latin America (1970 was the year when Salvador Allende was elected in Chile). Right at the start, the Minister spoke emphatically about the need for measures within the scope of the United Nations and the Organization of American States to combat the methods of armed struggle employed to destabilize the military regimes in power in several countries of the region: airplane hijackings, hold-ups, assassination attempts and hostage taking.

He also mentioned in the speech the priority attached to economic and commercial issues. Minister Gibson examined the negotiating strategy of the so-called "development decades" and warned against the possibility that the failure of the first decade would be followed by equal result of the second one, which was then beginning. He proposed a dynamic strategy made up of three main elements: global and sectorial objectives that would favor the increase in the GDP of developing countries; effective measures of cooperation in the fields of trade, finance and technology; and the establishment of target dates for the implementation of those measures, particularly the goal of one per cent of financial transfers.

Minister Gibson once again insisted on the concept of collective economic security brought forth at the eighth Session of the General Assembly by Ambassador Pimentel Brandão.

The statement concluded with an exhortation for diplomatic reactivation of the United Nations.

XXV Regular Session of the General Assembly of the United Nations 1970

Minister Mário Gibson Barboza [*]

Mr. President,

I should like, first of all, to congratulate you on your unanimous election as President of the twenty-fifth regular session of the General Assembly of the United Nations. Your unexcelled experience in international affairs, your proven competence in all matters pertaining to the theory and practice of the Organization, your outstanding contributions as professor, statesman and diplomat, and the fact that you are a national of a country which loves peace and is dedicated to the great causes of mankind, are a pledge of the kind of action and leadership which will guide us in the debates that we are now starting. Allow me also to express our gratitude to Mrs. Angie Brooks-Randolph for the tact, impartiality and keen political sense with which she presided over our work during the Twenty-Fourth Session.

At the same time, it behooves me, on behalf of the Government I represent, to express to all representatives here assembled our gratification upon the election of Brazil to one of the Vice-Presidencies of the General Assembly at its twenty-fifth anniversary session. Brazil accepts this honor and this trust as a mandate for the active defense of the ideals, the rights and the aspirations which the Latin American nations share with other developing countries.

[*] **Mário Gibson Alves Barboza**, born in Olinda, PE, March 13, 1918. Bachelor in Law from the Faculty of Law of Recife. Third Class Consul, public selection process, 1940. First Class Minister, by merit, 1961. Minister of State for External Affairs 10/30/1969 to 3/15/1974. † Rio de Janeiro, November 26, 2007.

If you will allow me now a remark of a personal nature, I should like to say that I am now reliving in spirit the experience of twenty-five years ago, when, in the early years of my diplomatic career, I was assigned as a Junior Adviser to the delegation of Brazil to the San Francisco Conference. Like many others in this hall, I had a small share in the creation of this Organization, and it would be less than human of me to fail to contrast the dreams and illusions of 1945 with the disturbing realities of the year 1970.

I do not wish to begin my statement without a special, albeit brief, mention of three highly significant recent events in the domain of international relations.

In the first place, I would cite the re-establishment of the cease-fire in the Middle East and the concurrent creation of better prospects for a peaceful solution to the crisis. The developments of the last few days are showing, however, how fragile and precarious is the present cease-fire regime, which will be meaningful and effective only if accepted as a first step towards the political settlement of the problem on the basis of resolution 242 (1967) of the Security Council and the purposes and principles of the Charter. Time and again Brazil has stressed in the organs of the United Nations the need for an open and frank debate on the fundamental causes of the conflict. For historical reasons, very special responsibilities devolve upon the United Nations in connection with the question of the Middle East. It is imperative, therefore, that the Organization, with the support of all its members, fulfill the obligations it has assumed.

Secondly, we have the conclusion of the German-Soviet treaty of August 12, 1970, an important milestone in the history of international relations and a concrete step towards at long last breaking the bonds which hold us to 1945, thus superseding the post-war concept. It cannot be denied that the significance of this agreement transcends the scope of bilateral relations involving the two signatories. It affects European politics as a whole, and even the overall pattern of international relations. Its impact upon the United Nations is equally significant; it would not be far-fetched to point out that it is tantamount to a supersession of Articles 53 and 107 of the Charter. Here is additional evidence that the world has not stood still during the last twenty-five years, and that the structure of international life does not cease to evolve.

Finally, I could not fail to mention the convening of the first Special Session of the General Assembly of the Organization of American States, putting into effect the changes in the structure of the OAS provided for in the Buenos Aires Protocol of 1967. In bringing the machinery for cooperation up to date, the nations of the western hemisphere reaffirm their decision

to broaden the scope of their common endeavors for development and justice. They take this positive stand at a time when very small minority groups, in obedience to an outside guidance which they blindly follow, try in vain to use the weapons of terrorism to undermine the progress of their own peoples. Insane acts such as the hijacking of aircraft, armed assaults and robberies, the seizure and holding of innocent hostages, particularly diplomatic representatives, dastardly, brutal assassinations – these are crimes at which world public opinion recoils, vehemently condemning the perpetrators. The Organization of American States has classified these as common crimes, and even as crimes against humanity. Echoing this line of thought, at the first Special Session of its General Assembly, the Organization of American States reaffirmed its emphatic repugnance for such methods of violence and terror.

Brazil is particularly sensitive to this situation. For over a month and a half, we have been suffering the agonizing drama of having a member of our diplomatic corps held by despicable kidnappers, the defenseless victim of heinous brutality.

Moreover, the serious incidents of the last few days are demonstrating that the problem of aircraft hijacking and hostage taking demands clear and effective measures on the part of this Organization, as an instrument of the collective will of the community of nations.

By instinct man attempts to evade eternity, and in doing so resorts to artificial divisions and demarcations of time, to the expedients of clepsydras, clocks and calendars. Man himself continues to be the measure of all things, and he feels the need to impose upon the measuring rod of his existence certain marks and points of reference, way stations, stopovers, from which he can look back at the road he has already travelled and prepare himself for the rest of the journey. In this moment for pause and reflection it is important not to allow ourselves to be lulled into the unrealistic attitude of imagining the past and remembering the future.

The Assembly of the twenty-fifth anniversary is indeed one of these way stations at which we can stop for a brief moment before proceeding along the road which will hopefully lead us to peace, justice and progress.

This year we are also commemorating the tenth anniversary of the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples. The adoption of General Assembly resolution 1514 (XV) was one of the most important decisions ever taken by this Organization. It embodies the formal reaffirmation of the inalienable right of all peoples to self-determination. My country here and now reiterates its full support for this principle, just as it cannot fail to reiterate its concern over the

persistence of policies of *apartheid* and racial discrimination, objects of the most formal repudiation and strongest condemnation by the Government and people of Brazil.

Peace is no longer a simple ideal, a dream or a Utopian scheme. It has become the most pressing, the most elementary, of all needs. It has ceased to be an objective and has become a premise. Either we have a peaceful future before us or we run the risk of having no future at all. It is no longer a matter of evoking ideals of self-denial and altruism. It is no longer a matter of emphasizing the necessity for moral and political advances to match the prodigious scientific and technological progress of our day. It is a matter of appealing to the fundamental interest of man, to his instinct for self-preservation, for what is really at stake is the survival of man.

No institution is more important than the men who set it up or the purpose it was designed to serve, and no political institutions are to be more revered than the people whose interest they are intended to protect. For that very reason, as far as the United Nations is concerned, we should first of all ask ourselves if our world Organization measures up to the ideals and desires vested in its creation at San Francisco and, then, what we can do today to improve it in the light of the experience we have acquired during the last twenty-five years.

As for our first question, there is no doubt that the United Nations has not played the full role it was intended for in a world of crises, open conflicts, war communiqués, shocks and counter-shocks. Without solving and at times without even discussing in depth the problems of peace, collective security and economic development, the United Nations has managed to give the impression that we have found it possible to content ourselves with the so-called new tasks – matters of science and technology, the preservation of the environment, population growth and others. Of course, no one underestimates the importance of all these problems and, in some cases, the need for their adequate treatment through effective international cooperation with all due deference to the principles of the Charter which guarantee the national sovereignty and juridical equality of Member States. It is obvious that we have no objection to dealing with these matters in this forum, although it might seem more logical and practical to turn them over to the specialized agencies, *ratione materiae*. However, we must be careful to avoid turning the scale of priorities upside down. We cannot afford to reduce this Organization to the meager proportions of an international institute of technology. We must not forget that the United Nations represents the only specialized agency we have

for peace, development and collective security. Should the Organization fail to carry out the fundamental tasks entrusted to it by the Charter it would be so debilitated that it would not even be able to cope with the ancillary assignments.

One has the impression that there has been a retreat from the ideals and principles of San Francisco. If this were allowed to happen, world peace would shrink to a mere process of détente or relaxation of tensions; the concept of general and complete disarmament, which strictly speaking should be inscribed among the purposes and principles of the Charter, would be superseded by the concept of "limitation of armaments" or "arms control"; the concept of collective security would dissolve into mere "security assurances" more limited in scope than those already provided for in the Charter. In the process dubious concepts would gain ground: "political realism", "spheres of influence", "balances of power" and above all the uncouth doctrine of "limited sovereignty", which stands for the very negation of international law and the freedom of nations.

An attempt is being made to present the objective of general and complete disarmament as chimerical or utopian while, in reality, it is no more utopian or chimerical than the purposes and principles of the Charter which preclude the use of force in international relations. To relegate disarmament to the roll of unattainable objectives would be tantamount to denying as a premise the validity of the principles of the Charter in the world of today. In this context abandoning disarmament as the end objective of our efforts would be equivalent to rejecting the norm of peaceful settlement for international litigation. If force cannot be used, why do States persist in accumulating arms?

It is up to us to forgo any tendency to consider some of the purposes and principles of the Charter as outmoded or bypassed by events. Supra-nationalism and interdependence may well constitute desirable goals, but they presuppose a stage, still to be reached, of political and economic independence and of effective juridical equality of all nations. Before declaring that the purposes and principles listed in Article 2 of the Charter are obsolete or outmoded, we should make a common effort to implement and observe them. Legitimate and lasting interdependence can only be attained through full sovereignty and equality.

It is often said that although the United Nations has had little success in the specific field of peace and international security, it should not be forgotten that significant results have been achieved in the area of economic and social development. Unhappily, we are not in a position to share this optimistic view. The First United Nations Development Decade

presented an unmistakable balance-sheet of failures and the Second Development Decade may well follow in its footsteps if we do not succeed in defining the strategy for it in stronger, more definite terms. In the final analysis, it must be determined whether or not the nations that make up the Organization are ready to accept, both in theory and in practice, a concept of collective security in the economic field, paralleling those for peace and security among nations.

The failure of the First Development Decade lies as much in the field of planning and coordination as in the field of implementation and, above all, in the political field. The measures adopted were inadequate when compared to the needs of the developing countries. But beyond that, in the crucial moments of taking decisions, as for example during the second session of the United Nations Conference on Trade and Development, the conceptual framework of the United Nations system suffered from the lack of a global theory of development and, primarily, from the absence of the indispensable political will.

Now, as we approach the end of the task of elaborating the strategy for the Second Development Decade, the United Nations has before it a clear new option that will determine the future to the system of international economic cooperation for development. It must choose between a "strategy of stability", designed only to maintain the indices of poverty at their present levels, or a "dynamic strategy" for development.

The "strategy of stability", though for obvious reasons never couched in explicit terms, seems to contain three main elements: a demographic policy that fails to take into account the dynamic implications of the process of population growth; an agricultural policy directed towards a quantitative increase in the production of foodstuffs, as an end in itself and not as part of a global policy of industrialization for development; and, finally, an employment policy which, if necessary, is ready to sacrifice the greater objective of development to the attainment of sectoral employment goals.

The "dynamic strategy", on the other hand, is designed to go beyond a mere freezing of the present international economic imbalance. This has always been the guiding principle followed by Brazil in all the bodies in which there was any discussion of the prospects for the Second Development Decade: the strategy for the seventies should be, in our view, a program for action with converging and additional measures. Essentially, it should consist of three elements: firstly, global and sectoral objectives that, by the end of the Decade, will make it possible for the developing countries to increase their gross national products so

significantly as to narrow the income gap between the north and the south; in the second place, a combination of measures mutually agreed upon in the fields of trade, financing and technology; and, finally, target dates for the implementation of these measures, of which the most important is the goal of 1 per cent of financial transfers.

It should be emphasized that the amount of information and research already available within the United Nations system makes it perfectly feasible to adopt such a "dynamic strategy", if – and this is the main point – the Governments of the developed countries, both those with a market economy and the centrally planned ones, gird themselves with the indispensable political will to accept their commitments and to see that they are carried out. The alternative would be a sad realization that the scheme of international cooperation for development can only result in failure, a failure that it is impossible to cover up with half-way measures and declarations of good intentions.

Such a failure would not imply that economic and social development would become unattainable, though, for many, the road would certainly be rendered more painful and more difficult. We all know that some Member States achieved notable growth indices by internally mobilizing their own resources. May I be allowed to say that my own country, Brazil, for instance, in 1969 had a 9 per cent increase in its gross national product. I do, however, have some doubt as to the possibility of developing countries as a whole finding viable formulae for economic and social progress if we have a continuation of present tendencies towards stagnation in the flow of trade and of economic cooperation. We are not pleading for a solution to our national model. We are fully aware that the development of Brazil is our own responsibility, and we do not shrink from it. What we are attempting to do is to pose the problem on a worldwide basis.

Brazil has repeatedly declared itself in favor of a revision of the Charter of the United Nations so as to adapt it to present day conditions and relate it to the problems of the contemporary world. We do, however, recognize the political realities and difficulties standing in the way of an immediate revision. We see the revision as an essential step forward. But there is a danger that the prevailing conditions in the world, where power is used every day – political power, economic power, military power, scientific and technological power – may force us a step backwards, and a new Charter under these conditions may take the form of just one more element for freezing world power, as one of the factors for the maintenance of the *status quo.* Anyhow, it would be impossible to undertake a sober

stock-taking of the achievements and short-comings of the Organization in these last twenty-five years without a full and thorough analysis of the international instrument which gives life to and governs the working of our Organization.

That is why the problem of the revision of the Charter should be posed, and that is why we consider it highly significant that the General Committee should have decided yesterday to recommend the inclusion on our agenda of item 88 relating to the "Need to consider suggestions regarding the review of the Charter of the United Nations".

As of now it is imperative to bring back to the forum of the United Nations certain problems which clearly fall within its competence and are now being discussed behind closed doors in dwindling circles. As a concession to the realities of power, the United Nations Charter conferred special prerogatives upon the permanent members of the Security Council. The permanence of their powers in the field of peace and international security is already in itself one of these prerogatives. But the Security Council as an institution cannot abdicate from its primary responsibility for the maintenance of international peace and security by acknowledging a new world order based upon a co-chairmanship in the hands of a very reduced number of Powers, in direct opposition to the spirit of the Charter. Powerless before the conflicts and dissensions that threaten and disrupt world peace, the Security Council seems little by little to be taking on the shape of a public registry office for the filing of complaints and counter-complaints, claims and counter-claims. It is well known that the methods of work of the Council have changed substantially during recent years with the result that now decisions are reached after a series of informal consultations rather than in open debates at formal meetings of the collective organ. Despite this development, which has been accompanied by a trend towards unanimity, the Council has been unable to ensure the enforcement of its decisions. This is largely due to the fact that the consultations carried on by the members of the Council are, as a rule, directed at collateral aspects of the problems and not towards the search for a political solution capable of eliminating the causes of the conflicts. Moreover, it so happens that consensus and unanimity are almost always reached at the expense of the relevancy of the texts adopted, language so vague and ambiguous being employed that the decisions are open to varied interpretations by the Council members. We are thus threatened with the emergence of a "veto by interpretation".

In a memorandum dated April 3, 1970 in reply to a consultation by the Secretary-General of the United Nations under the terms of

resolution 2606 (XXIV), the Brazilian Government took the opportunity to declare that any effort to reactivate the security system of the United Nations should lead the Security Council to a substantive examination of the differences underlying every specific situation that presents a threat to peace and security. The substantive consideration and study of the questions would be greatly facilitated by the active participation of the litigants in the informal process of consultations which is now prevalent. For that very reason and with the objective of institutionalizing these consultations, the Brazilian Government advanced the suggestion - which I now reiterate – that the Council, utilizing the faculties with which it is endowed by Chapter VI of the Charter, should in each case consider the advisability of the establishment of *ad hoc* committees for the pacific settlement of disputes, such committees to be made up of the parties to a conflict together: with other delegations chosen by the Council at the suggestion of the litigants. These committees would have the broadest and most flexible mandates and would function, unhampered by records or a predetermined agenda, under the authority of the Security Council with the objective of harmonizing and reconciling the positions of the parties to the dispute.

All of us are aware of the difficulties that arise once the means provided for in Chapter VI have been exhausted whenever an attempt is made to choose among the range of coercive measures set forth in Chapter VII. This is only natural considering that we can almost always count on a lack of unanimity among the permanent members and that if coercive measures were to be applied certain consequences would arise. What we should ask ourselves in a good number of cases is if the potentialities of Chapter VI have really been explored to the fullest. It is our earnest conviction that the United Nations and, more specifically, the Security Council should make greater use of the large variety of means and resources authorized by Chapter VI of the Charter.

In short, what Brazil proposes now is a diplomatic reactivation of the United Nations. The adoption of procedures similar to the one suggested would afford the Organization much greater efficiency and authority as well as a more active role in the major problems of the world.

Why should this suggestion strike anyone as unrealistic or impractical, and why should the eternal argument of "political realism" be leveled against it? Let us not forget that this so-called political realism pushed us to the brink of war and destruction and is the chief cause for the US$ 200,000 million spent every year in the arms race. Apart from possible

catastrophic consequences, the arms race has already done irreparable damage to mankind by draining off enormous means and resources which could have been used to further peace, justice and progress.

Our problems and difficulties are not outside the reach of human intelligence and its creative power. With all its shortcomings and frustrations the United Nations is the only forum in which we can still opt for life, peace and development.

At this stage, my country does no more than the most modest and the least original of proposals: let us use our Organization and let us apply the Charter; no more, no less. The acceptance of this proposal, which is a commonplace in the statements delivered in the general debate of every Assembly, could nonetheless have a dramatic impact upon the shape of our future.

Brazil will never forsake this great hope: the hope for peace, justice and progress.

New York, September 17, 1970.

1971

1971

The most significant development at the level of the United Nations in 1971 was the decision taken by the General Assembly to recognize the government of the People's Republic of China as the legitimate occupant of the seat meant for China, followed by the consequent withdrawal of Taiwan. The process was conducted in a manner contrary to the interests of the United States, which argued in favor of the presence of both Chinas in the world organization. This episode provoked the generalization in North American circles of an attitude of reserve toward the United Nations and the role of the "automatic majorities" made up by Third World countries. At the end of the year, the war between India and Pakistan around the independence of Bangladesh would test the ability of the Security Council to manage an armed conflict of significant proportions.

Besieged by frequent episodes of kidnappings and armed struggle, the Brazilian government tried unsuccessfully to obtain at the OAS agreement on measures to fight terrorism in the continent.

In his speech at the Twenty-Sixth Session of the General Assembly, in 1971, Foreign Minister Mário Gibson Barboza expounded with clarity the view of Brazilian diplomacy about the international reality. In the version distributed in the plenary, the suggestive heading on text read "The Reorganization of the International Community for Peace and Development".

Brazilian ambitions of emergence did not fit an exclusivist or selective international reality. If the cycle of polarization had ended, its

alternative could not be, according to Minister Gibson, a new system of power sustained by an equally small number of nations that claim *de facto* hegemony over the rest of the world, but rather the organization of the international community around the wide and equitable terms of the Purposes and Principles of the Charter". Power politics were harshly criticized. The word "power" was used twenty-five times in the text. There is a convincing appraisal of the international reality; however, the prescriptions hardly break away from utopia.

The way in which the speech mentions the imminent admission of the Popular Republic of China betrays the ambiguities that characterized Brazilian external policy. The Minister avoided a concrete statement about the question of the representation of China, without even naming the country, but criticized vehemently the decision process that had led to that outcome. It does not become clear whether Brazil was for or against the admission of China.

While stressing that he was not postulating a symmetrical view of the big powers, their global interests or their political behavior, Minister Gibson blamed both the U.S. and the USSR for trying to impose a division of the world in which some States would be relegated to the role of bystanders or *protegés* of the powerful. Such a trend contradicted the fundamental interests of a country like Brazil, expressly described by Minister Gibson as possessing "an acceleration of economic and social progress that foreshadows the rupture of the barriers of underdevelopment".

Moreover, the text contains a significant passage on the question of collective economic security to which are implicitly linked the expressed concern with the consequences for the international monetary and commercial panorama of the measures adopted by the United States to mitigate its balance of payments deficit (increase of interest rates and suspension of the convertibility dollar/gold). It also includes sharp formulations about questions of the Law of the Sea (the Brazilian government had decided to extend the limit of its territorial waters to two hundred miles from the coast), disarmament and the reform of the Charter.

XXVI Session of the General Assembly of the United Nations
1971

Minister Mário Gibson Barboza [*]

Mr. President,

Let my first words be of congratulation to you on behalf of the Brazilian Government and in my own name, on your unanimous election as President of the Twenty-Sixth Session of the General Assembly. Your personal and professional qualifications, fully recognized by all of us who are acquainted with you, assure us that the guidance of our debates will be in the hands of a skilful and internationally respected diplomat. May I also express the appreciation of the Brazilian Government for the efficiency, tact and assurance with which your distinguished predecessor, Mr. Edward Hambro, carried out these functions.

We are saddened by U Thant's irrevocable decision to leave his post as Secretary-General at the end of his second term. The Brazilian Government had previously expressed its hope that U Thant would still be in a position to reconsider his decision and would agree to place his valuable services at the disposal of the international community for another period. Now that he has reaffirmed that his wish is irreversible, I should like to reiterate the gratitude of my Government to the Secretary-General for the dedication with which he has worked to serve the United Nations. The need to replace him leads us more than ever to ponder

[*] **Mário Gibson Alves Barboza**, born in Olinda, PE, on March 13, 1918. Bachelor in Law from the Faculty of Law of Recife. Third Class Consul, public selection processs, 1940. First Class Minister, by merit, 1961. Minister of State for External Relations 10/30/1969 to 3/15/1974. † Rio de Janeiro, November 26, 2007.

the delicate nature and the importance of that position as well as the political responsibility the Secretary-General holds within the system of our Organization. U Thant has given us ample evidence of this kind of understanding in the course of the 10 years during which we have become accustomed to seeing him work for the cause of international peace and harmony.

In the course of the celebration of the twenty-fifth anniversary of our Organization, we unanimously asserted the belief that the United Nations continued to provide the most valid alternative for the theories of power and balance of power which nourish hegemonic ambitions. Despite the unanimity with which this belief was expressed, we concurrently pointed out the limitations which were reducing our Organization's capacity for action because of the resurgence of political concepts and diplomatic practices that run counter to the purposes and principles of the Charter.

The purposes and principles which the 51 founding Members of the United Nations incorporated into the institutional Charter of the Organization have made it possible for 79 nations, in the course of the quarter century of the existence of the United Nations, to accede to membership with the same sovereign status. When in July of 1945 we faced the misery, suffering and destruction brought about by the Second World War, we also assumed collective responsibility for eliminating the unjustifiable poverty plaguing two thirds of mankind. We were not aware then that a few weeks later the destructive force of the atom would appear on the scene as the major threat to peace and international security. It is indisputable that that event has conditioned the evolution of international relations since San Francisco, and its negative impact will persist as long as the knowledge that breeds power is not placed definitely and unconditionally at the service of the international community.

The contemporary crisis and the danger that the United Nations will be left to play but a marginal role in it will grow more and more acute so long as wealth and power continue to be concentrated in a few States, so long as scientific and technological knowledge remain "oligopolized", so long as, in the last analysis, the practice of power politics downgrades the United Nations and progressively lessens the importance of its position as an organizing, valid and active forum for international relations. Therefore, the alternative to the United Nations, both for the poor States and for the rich ones, for the powerless and the powerful, is chaos, which is the inevitable consequence of theories that set up force, the naked force of economic, scientific and military power as a pattern for international behavior.

The Brazilian Government thus maintains, and will continue to stress, that peace and collective security, as well as the social and economic progress of developing countries, are the crucial problems of our time and that on their solution depend harmonious relationships among States.

For the same reasons, during the General Assembly's twenty-fifth anniversary session Brazil strove for the adoption of the Declaration on the Strengthening of International Security, through which we reiterated the purposes and principles of our Organization and its competence to examine, debate and settle major world issues. That reiteration doubtless implies a rebuttal of the so-called political realism used as a means of imposing and justifying new modes of the freezing of power, as well as the implicit or explicit establishment of spheres of influence.

At the present session of the General Assembly we are invited to consider, in the light of this pseudo-realism, the accession of another great Power to our Organization. This realistic spirit seems to be a modern version of *Realpolitik,* a term which brings to mind less than happy memories. As a matter of fact, I would prefer to have that so-called realistic spirit applied to the recognition by the United Nations of a process that can no longer be delayed: the translation into concrete deeds of the moral duty and political obligation of wealthy nations to make an effective contribution to the progress of the less-developed countries, or, at the very least, not to raise obstacles to their development. There is no lack of studies on the subject. Quite reasonable proposals have been put forth and even adopted. Yet, when we take stock of the outcome of their implementation we are made aware that all we have succeeded in achieving is the splitting up of our deliberations into comfortable time-packages. That is how we came to the Second Development Decade.

Now, unfortunately this is not *Realpolitik* we are dealing with – not the *Realpolitik* that would lead us to lasting and fruitful peace. Quite the contrary, the *Realpolitik* we are invited to apply on this occasion is the admission of the fact that a nation counting its population in the hundreds of millions and possessing its own nuclear weapons – even though, incidentally, the proliferation of those weapons is supposed to be proscribed – could not fail to be given a position among us compatible with its strength. What we are facing here is another instance of power politics, which can hardly set proper criteria for organizing an international society based on peace, justice and the equality of States.

In relation to this issue, which is being given top priority attention in all the chancelleries of the world, I should also like to remark that the new fact before us is not the discovery of a new star in the constellation of

the great Powers. This star has long been shining. It has been there ever since it mastered the technology and means to jeopardize the survival of mankind – in other words, ever since it proved it possessed atomic weapons. The very novelty of the situation now in the offing that fundamentally changes the prospects of the membership of the United Nations is that a superpower has decided the time has come to acknowledge the existence of another great Power. This fact seems to be irrefutable. Consequently the candidate for membership comes into existence from the moment the directorate of the club of power so decides.

The participation of this new partner is taken for granted, whether it be today or tomorrow. Timing appears to be irrelevant. The important point, the relevant innovation, would be for this display of *Realpolitik* to result in the United Nations henceforth discussing and deciding upon major issues of international peace and security which, strangely enough, have not been discussed in the General Assembly.

Certainly, while I am attempting to picture the freezing of power as a trend that has become a major obstacle to the achievement of the objectives of peace, security and development, I do not postulate, either directly or indirectly, a symmetrical evaluation of the superpowers, their world interests or political behavior.

Even if, hypothetically, the international community were willing to accept a "nuclear peace" and therefore the resulting principle that absolute power engenders absolute rights, historical experience disavows any permanent differentiation of States into a small group endowed with, on the one hand, unparalleled power and, on the other, a second category of countries condemned to the role of spectators or *protegés* of power.

On the contrary, the political philosophy of our Organization rests on quite a different basis: the equality of rights, duties and opportunities of all Member States, respect for the sovereignty and independence of States, the non-use of force in the settlement of international disputes, and the fulfillment in good faith of the obligations contracted under the Charter. It therefore becomes obvious that the doctrines of power threaten the existence of the United Nations as the normative organ of international society, downgrading it politically as the international forum competent to impose discipline on the fact of power itself-discipline that should benefit the international community as a whole rather than the oligopoly of force that acts to the community's detriment.

The most evident, and in the long run most dangerous, attempt to sanction immobility is the systematic even to entertain the possibility of reviewing the Charter. The Brazilian Government does not think the

political philosophy of the United Nations, as expressed in its purposes and principles, is in need of revision. That was the sense of the appeal I made during the twenty-fifth anniversary session: "let us use our Organization and let us apply the Charter".

But since times change, the machinery established for the implementation of these purposes and principles must now be submitted to review and revision. The scenarios that have evolved and disappeared in the changeable international reality, the experiences we have accumulated during our 25 years of work to put a stop to or contain crises and causes of conflict, and, even more basically, the entrance into these scenarios of so many new, sovereign States, have rendered many of the mechanisms created a quarter of a century ago archaic, inadequate and insufficient. Revision is a prerequisite for making available to the United Nations instruments which will make them more active, more normative and more agile.

As an illustration of the need for revision, I could point to the limited representativeness of such organs as the Economic and Social Council, the current membership of which renders it incapable of reflecting and interpreting the whole and complex gamut of the economic and social interests of Member States of the United Nations.

Along this line of thought I wish to reiterate that the Brazilian Government cannot agree that the principle of sovereign equality of Member States should be questioned in any way or restricted in its consequences. This principle is not subject to any qualification other than those prerogatives explicitly set forth in Article 27 of the Charter. An exceptional rule is involved here. Its effects cannot be extended to any other forum or activity of the Organization, thus endowing the permanent members of the Security Council with special prerogatives. Nor should this privilege, which is restricted to the forum of that same Council, serve to assure its permanent members any advantage or priority of membership in the subsidiary organs of the Assembly, to the detriment of the principle of equitable geographic representation.

It seems necessary here to stress the obvious since the obvious frequently becomes distorted under the impact of powerful conflicting interests. The establishment of peace is the fundamental task of the United Nations: a peace which is not to be confused with the balance of power or its nuclear counterpart, the balance of terror; a peace which should not be the mere perpetuation of an unjust international situation, or the mere absence of conflict with a whole range of sinister nuclear overtones; a peace, in short, which should not be reduced to sheer hope for the

survival of mankind on the morrow and a hope, consistently renewed on a short-term basis, that the nuclear arsenals will not be used. On the contrary it should be a peace resting on the stable structure of collective security and providing conditions for progress, a peace which is identified with the eradication of underdevelopment and which guarantees to all Member States territorial integrity, national identity, the right to develop their human potentialities, their political and social capabilities and the unimpeded possession and disposition of their factors of progress.

The basic requirement for the permanent establishment of peace and political and economic security lies essentially in general and complete disarmament, which cannot be reduced to the inadequate dimension of partial measures of arms control or non-armament. Although necessary and praiseworthy, these measures have not gone beyond the maintenance of the present distribution of nuclear power under the deceptive cloak of the co-chairmanship. The existence of nuclear arsenals and the sums expended annually to strengthen them quantitatively and improve them qualitatively are the result of antagonisms which the practice of the balance of power does not allow to be resolved. No one disputes any longer the irrationality of "overkill", or that unrestrained spending on nuclear arms constitutes the greatest impediment to any integrated plan for global economic development.

We meet here once again entrusted with the responsibility of seeking a solution which, viewed rationally, seems about to materialize. Yet this solution stubbornly eludes us, prodded beyond our grasp by a diabolical illusion that power, which only apparently renders a few immune, will through its own dynamics guarantee the survival of all.

Hence our eyes and ears are fixed on the doors behind which, in Helsinki and in Vienna, the secret talks on the limitation of strategic arms are proceeding with the slowness to which we have, unhappily, become accustomed. Around those tables, where we have no seats, the negotiators of the superpowers play with the destiny of us all.

In a few months the third session of the United Nations Conference on Trade and Development will be convened, the third opportunity afforded the developed world in less than 10 years to cooperate concretely with the developing countries to improve their living standards, and to close within the shortest possible time the economic, scientific and technological gap separating the nations of the world.

Disappointed at the poor results of the first and second sessions of UNCTAD, and aware of the reluctance of developed countries, of the intransigence of some and the even less excusable indifference of others,

Brazil believes that the fate of the third session of UNCTAD will depend on the growing acceptance by the international community of the concept of collective economic security through the adoption of decisions of broad range and significance at the institutional level, and through the creation of new and more ambitious mechanisms.

The concept of collective economic security will complement the system of collective political security. In practice, this concept, which Brazil has consistently defended since 1953, upholds in the first place the right of all nations to economic and social development. It also postulates the duty of the more developed countries to contribute to the elimination of the external barriers which they have created and which hinder the acceleration of the growth of developing countries. This should be achieved in accordance with the negotiated time-tables and, in any event, before the end of the Second United Nations Development Decade.

To the extent of its capabilities, Brazil is prepared to take up its responsibilities towards the least developed among developing countries, bilaterally as well as multilaterally. And we are naturally moved to do so by reason of the solidarity that links us to these countries, and also because we consider it to be an ethical imperative. We want to see this issue frontally tackled in Lima, at the Ministerial Meeting of the Group of 77, so that the third session of UNCTAD may bring about concrete and global solutions to this problem. We are convinced that other countries in stages of development similar to Brazil's will join us in seeking such solutions; concurrently, it is essential, in accordance with the International Development Strategy for the Second United Nations Development Decade, that developed countries be prepared to contribute additional resources to eliminate more rapidly the disparities in growth among those in process of development. In the Latin American context, we are already acting increasingly in accordance with this political decision.

Collective economic security further presupposes the protection of all Member States against economic aggression, threats or pressures, especially in relation to international trade and financing; it also presupposes respect for the sovereignty of all States over their natural resources and the political and economic consequences thereof, namely, the right freely to protect those resources and exploit them for the benefit of their own peoples and in accordance with their own priorities.

Brazil reiterates the right and duty of riparian States to avail themselves of the resources of the seas, the seabed and the subsoil thereof adjacent to their coastlines in order to ensure the economic and social well-being of their peoples. To this effect we maintain that such States are

entitled to exercise the right to determine the extent of their sovereignty or jurisdiction over those areas, in accordance with their geographical, geological and biological peculiarities, and their requirements in the fields of security, scientific investigation and with respect to the preservation of the marine environment. The Brazilian Government wishes to express its gratification at the widespread understanding and support these principles are increasingly receiving from States of all continents and levels of economic development in the context of the preparatory work on a comprehensive conference on the law of the sea.

I have no intention of bringing into this debate matters that are already being discussed in other international forums in a more adequate technical manner. But I cannot refrain from pointing out that Brazil is following with deep concern the new trends and developments that now characterize the international monetary and trade scene as a consequence of the decisions taken by the Government of the United States of America to offset the deficit in its balance of payments. It is undeniable that the fundamental interests of developing countries have in this case once again been neglected. It should be stressed that developing countries have in no way contributed to bringing about this abnormal situation on the international financial and trade scene. Therefore, it is imperative that their interests be duly safeguarded in the search for corrective solutions in order to avoid any further setbacks to their economic and social development process. However, I very much fear that if Governments and specialized organs adopt measures to reshape the international monetary system without previously consulting the developing countries in the appropriate international organs – I very much fear, I repeat – that the action program for development embodied in the International Development Strategy adopted last year by this Assembly will be gravely impaired in the very first year of its existence.

The Latin American countries have already taken a common political stand on those problems. We firmly trust that the United States of America, as well as the developed countries currently engaged in mutual consultations for the purpose of maintaining their stability, will not abandon their prior commitments towards the developing world.

Brazil, with an already accelerated rate of economic growth and social progress which heralds the breaking of the barriers of underdevelopment, will continue to the best of its ability to strive for the strengthening of an international order based on the concepts I have just outlined.

Since historical events are rendering obsolete the bipolarization which dominated international relations, its alternative cannot be a new

power system also to be based on a small number of nations claiming a *de facto* hegemony over the rest of the world; rather it must be an international community organized in conformity with the broader and more equitable provisions of the purposes and principles of the Charter.

The consistent tenor of our foreign policy is summed up in the following words of President Emílio Garrastazu Médici:

> Brazil is opposed to the division of the world into spheres of influence; it believes that peace is essential to the achievement of progress, and it adheres faithfully to the principle of the peaceful settlement of international disputes as its guideline in the conduct of its diplomacy.

That is the understanding of the contemporary reality that Brazil wishes to share with other Member States at the opening of this general debate. Nothing can undermine our determination to go on working toward our common ideals and aspirations, which will draw us ever closer in progress and in peace. Nothing shall alter our certainty that, despite so many setbacks, we still retain in our hands, in the hands of the peoples of the United Nations, the power to repudiate, once and for all, the tragic legacy of violence and folly which drenched in blood and tears the road we had to travel in order finally to create this Organization. Nothing shall weaken our efforts to improve the United Nations by expanding its responsibilities and increasing its effectiveness in disciplining international relations among States for the benefit of world peace and security.

New York, September 27, 1971.

1972

1972

Around 1972 the change in the international strategic panorama became evident. The Popular Republic of China had joined the United Nations with an anti-Soviet attitude as the main element of its external action as it occupied the place until then given to Taiwan. In Europe, the *détente* was consolidated with the German-Soviet and German-Polish treaties, the agreement guaranteeing Western access to Berlin, the mutual recognition of both Germanies and the talks on mutual balanced reduction of military forces.

The way was open for the European Security Conference, which would anoint the territorial *status quo* arising from World War II. The theories of balance of power gained strength. The world, according to the vision of Dr. Kissinger, whose influence was fundamental throughout this period, was kept balanced by a system of forces displayed in the form of a pentagram with the superpowers at a privileged position at the top of two of the five angles, and then China, Western Europe and Japan at the remaining intersections of the figure. At the periphery, the balance would result from the acceptance of the basic preeminence of one or two of the top angles of the pentagram and from the action of regional powers to which authority to manage the subsystems would be delegated.

It was an attractive model, both for its power logic and for its aesthetics. It was based on the balance of forces between the superpowers, solely responsible for global stability. Since the recognition of strategic parity with the USSR by the United States, the path was clear to accept the

globalization of the former's interests. The concept of *linkage*, by its turn, would allow for the global scope of the condominium of power through the interrelationshipship of events occurring in any part of the world.

The reciprocal interest of the Soviet Union and the United States in taking forward the process of accommodation was so strong that not even the episode of the bombing and blockade of the port of Haiphong in Vietnam, in which a Soviet ship was damaged by American bombs, prevented the realization of the journey of President Nixon to Moscow in May 1972. At the occasion the main instruments of the *détente* were signed: SALT-I, which imposed limits on offensive and defensive missile systems of both countries and the "Basic Principles of Relations between the United States and the Soviet Union". SALT-I permitted one and the other country to organize better the resources spent on armaments. Through the "Basic Principles" the conceptual bases of the *détente* were formalized. From then on, according to the "Principles", the U.S. and the USSR would relate on the basis of equality, agreeing not to look for unilateral advantages to the detriment of the other party and recognizing that in the nuclear age there was no option for both except peaceful coexistence. Eventual differences should be negotiated by pacific means in a spirit of reciprocity, mutual accommodation and mutual benefit.

A new era in internationals relations had been opened. At the time, Brazil was under a process with a double meaning, placed between the threat of armed conflict ant the success of economic growth. Perhaps because it was not able to evaluate clearly the real benefits that eventually could accrue from the *détente*, Brazilian diplomacy would momentarily mitigate its criticism of the superpowers in the speech of Minister Gibson Barboza at the Twenty-Seventh Session of the General Assembly, in 1972. Presenting himself as the representative of an emerging country, the Minister declared the willingness of Brazil to assume wider international obligations as well as the increased responsibilities, commitments and duties deriving from its development. Recognizing the worth of the *détente*, Minister Gibson argued in favor of complementary measures that would institutionalize an equitable system of international peace and security. In the light of his country's emergence, he strove for the opening of the forums and mechanisms of decision as a way to reinstate the United Nations in the negotiating process. To achieve this goal, he proposed the reformulation not only of the practices of *Realpolitik* but of the international organization itself. In 1972, the Brazilian aspirations for the reform of the Charter resurfaced with vigor. The "normative gap", that is, the breech between international reality and the precepts contained in the U.N.

Charter, the Minister said, had come to join the "development gap" as a phenomenon that demanded measures on the part of the international community.

The year 1972, on the other hand, marked the first appearance in the United Nations agenda of an issue that for several years would turn into a serious difficulty for Brazilian-Argentine relations: the use of shared natural resources. Since Brazil and Paraguay had arrived, in 1971, to an agreement of the hydroelectric utilization of Itaipu, on the Paraná River, the prevention of the construction of the power plant unless prior consultations were held in Buenos Aires became a priority for the Argentine diplomacy. Interpreting the Argentine postulations for previous consultations as an attempt to create hindrances to the project, the Brazilian government refused to accept a principle that put in doubt a State's sovereign right to utilize natural resources situated in its territory. For the Brazilian diplomacy, in the case of a successive river such as Paraná, the principles applicable to the downstream riverains were those of information and responsibility for eventual significant damage. The issue was the subject of a resolution by the Twenty-Seventh Session of the General Assembly, the so-called "New York agreement", negotiated by Foreign Ministers Gibson Barboza and McLoughlin, with sufficient ambiguity to permit each of the two Parties to maintain their positions of principle while at the same time allowing room for negotiations. Such was the context that inspired the precise formulations with which Minister Gibson approached the issue in his statement, particularly by referring to "rational criteria capable of guiding the sovereign action of States in the exploitation of their natural resources, according to national priorities and projects, without undue interferences".

XXVII Regular Session of the General Assembly of the United Nations 1972

Minister Mário Gibson Barboza [*]

Mr. President,

Brazil is attending the Twenty-Seventh Session of the General Assembly in the conviction that the intense diplomatic activity which has in recent months attracted the attention of our foreign ministries should be the subject of thorough study, not only because this diplomatic activity will have an impact on the general interests of the international community, but also because we shall thus be able to gauge its compatibility with our Organization's specific competence and objectives.

Before I undertake such an analysis, allow me, Mr. President, to congratulate you on your unanimous election and to express my gratification at seeing you preside over our work; for I also bear in mind that you represent a country whose sons migrated to Brazil in substantial numbers and, by their productive efforts and perfect integration into the open and multiracial Brazilian society, contributed in large measure to the progress of their adopted homeland.

In addition, I would avail myself of this opportunity to convey to Mr. Adam Malik my appreciation for the serene and correct manner in which he presided over the Twenty-Sixth Session of the General Assembly.

[*] **Mário Gibson Alves Barboza**, born in Olinda, PE, on March 13, 1918. Bachelor in Law from the Faculty of Law of Recife. Third Class Consul, public selection process, 1940. First Class Minister, by merit, 1961. Minister of State for External Relations 10/30/1969 to 3/15/1974. † Rio de Janeiro, November 26, 2007.

It is also my wish to reiterate to Ambassador Kurt Waldheim, whom I have so often met in other diplomatic forums, the satisfaction that my Government and I myself experienced upon his assumption of the responsibilities of Secretary-General of the United Nations. His sense of mission, already evidenced during the brief period in, which he has been exercising the functions so worthily discharged by his predecessors, and his diplomatic experience which we all acknowledge and which contributed so decisively to his unanimous election to a post so exacting, yet so full of possibilities – all these qualifications are the best assurance of a reactivation of the role that the United Nations, through its Secretary-General, should play in the international political field. I am certain that in my words of greeting Mr. Waldheim will detect not only the affectionate message of a colleague and friend of many years standing but also and chiefly the conviction held by the Foreign Minister of a country whose international involvement keeps up with its growth that our Secretary-General possesses the indispensable qualities of moderation and dynamism required by the office he occupies. Proof of his capacity for taking the initiative to bring to the attention of the United Nations major problems we are now facing was the solemn appeal he addressed to the General Assembly to find the most appropriate means to combat terrorism and other forms of violence which endanger and take innocent human lives.

It is, in my view, most deplorable that the Assembly has failed to endorse the wording of item 92 as recommended by the General Committee. After the voting on the amendments presented at the plenary meeting last Saturday night, the Brazilian delegation stressed two points that we deemed essential to clarify our position: first, we cannot accept terrorism, or any form of violence, as a legitimate political instrument; secondly, the wording of the item as finally adopted contains expressions which have been frequently used in attempts to justify or even tolerate terrorism. We are seriously concerned lest this wording encourage attempts at undue interference in matters falling within the exclusive domestic jurisdiction of States and consequently lead to acrimonious and sterile debates.

It is not only in recent days that we have been concerned with the problem of terrorism which has affected so many countries, including my own, as is generally known. In January and February 1971 the General Assembly of the Organization of American States met at Washington in extraordinary session to attempt to establish on the regional level a juridical order capable of facing up to and overcoming this intolerable threat to the peace and well-being of our peoples. However, the limited results then obtained did not constitute, in our opinion, an adequate

instrument with which to meet this pressing need, as subsequent tragic events have unfortunately proved. I do not feel it necessary to recall the clear and forceful position that Brazil has always adopted with regard to this grave problem. Nor is it my purpose to recall here recent history which must certainly still be in the minds of all. What I wish is to launch now, in this world forum, a vehement appeal for us to harken to the outcry which requires our statesmen and government leaders to take practical and immediate measures to defend the most elementary principles which should preside over social relationships.

We are not prompted by any political preference or any ideological bias when we declare that it is urgent, that it is indispensable, for us to unite and organize ourselves with firmness and determination against the hideous and indiscriminate violence of terrorism to which each and every country has become exposed; indeed, this brooks no delay. We continue to maintain that this indiscriminate violence gives the outright lie to the thesis that terrorist subversion is the fruit of social injustice or of the poverty of a given society.

At this juncture let us be truly the "United Nations", regardless of our respective and different ideological convictions or patterns of political organization, and let us heed this clamor and be firm and united in the struggle for the final extirpation of violence in any of its forms.

The Brazilian nation celebrates this year the one hundred and Fiftieth anniversary of its independence. The civic enthusiasm with which we commemorate our entry, a century and a half ago, into the community of sovereign States strengthens our determination to build our national destiny in the certainty that, to progress, Brazil must rely on itself and on the work of its people, and to build it in the conviction that this development can be accelerated by the establishment and maintenance of that peace and security which will ensure to each and every one of the members of the international community the right to progress and to stability as well as a sovereign voice and an active presence in the formulation of the world political order. Brazil's diplomacy; which it is today incumbent upon me to conduct, abides fully by the traditions of understanding and negotiation bestowed upon us by our elders.

For the past 26 years Brazil has been given the privilege and responsibility of opening our general debate, a custom which brings me to this rostrum as the first speaker for the third consecutive session of the Assembly. This tradition also presents the challenge of initiating a critical analysis of the international political scene in the light of the diplomatic events of the past 12 months and from the angle

of the repercussions that same activity will have on this broad and irreplaceable forum for the harmonization of the external behaviour of States which is the United Nations.

Contemporary international political relationships are characterized by the complexity, extensiveness and swiftness of their evolution. No less characteristic of the times in which we live is the unrelenting persistence of situations and ways of action which Brazil considers ethically unjust, politically anachronistic and legally condemnable. The conflicting interaction between a new concept of peace and security – new because it is as young as the aspirations we inscribed in our Charter – and the old patterns of international behavior, which we have not yet succeeded in superseding, is basically responsible for the crises and tensions which still exist on the large stage of inter-State relations.

It is not that I am unaware of, or appreciate any the less, the encouraging progress that we are achieving, little by little, along the intricate path of reconciling differences, and in the search for the easing of tensions. But I cannot fail to deplore the fact that this slow progress towards the realization of our ideals of peace and security is being attained amidst contradictions and paradoxes, for there continue to weigh on the horizons of the world, albeit apparently less heavily, the dense clouds of nuclear confrontation; a kind of suspended sentence of doom hovers over mankind as a whole. Neither the doctrine or the practice of strategic balance nor arbitrary compositions among the poles of international power have succeeded in extinguishing the fires of regional conflicts. The attempt to coexist within a strategic arrangement – or, in other words the contemporary "balance of prudence" referred to by the Secretary-General – determines the outstanding bilateral diplomatic activity in which the great Powers are currently engaged and reflects the complex problems of today's international reality.

But it so happens that the easing of tensions and coexistence are not synonymous with the peace and security we pursued when founding the United Nations. Rather they are palliatives, perhaps opportune in the circumstances, but inadequate and insufficient, serving only to render the political atmosphere less oppressive, yet still not succeeding in brightening it. In fact, to be lasting and fruitful, the easing of tensions should be more than a mere expedient resorted to by the predominant powers as a function of their national interests.

Our sense of reality obliges us to recognize the pragmatic merit of the various initiatives which have enabled us to leap over the walls of dissension and irreducible ideological conflict and pass from the sterile and

somber Cold War years to this period of dialogue. But it is indispensable and urgent that the spreading awareness of the impossibility and irrationality of a final nuclear confrontation should result in the institutionalization of an equitable system of international peace and security. I submit that this system, to be enduring and universally accepted, has to be built within the framework of the United Nations and legitimized by it; for this is the true, the genuine, normative forum of inter-State relations.

A few months ago, after a long period of waiting that became more and more anxious in view of the unbridled increase in the means of mass destruction at the disposal of the superpowers, the international community was informed of the first and meager results of the Strategic Arms Limitation Talks – results which in the final analysis reflect the interests of the microcosm of strategic parity.

It is worthwhile asking whether the subsystem of lateral pacts is to supersede the United Nations and even override it, or whether our Organization prevails over these pacts and retains its right to appraise and sanction them. So long as strategic parity *per se* remains the goal, or so long as this parity is construed as the only possible condition and guarantee for peace, this peace will, by definition, be unstable and fleeting.

Recent and explicit references to an alleged primacy of the security interests of the great Powers – to which lesser interests and, viewed from that perspective, supposedly parochial interests should be subordinated – betray the original assumption that some countries can act in consonance with special responsibilities which would politically validate their conduct. The logical consequence of such a doctrine and its ensuing application relegate to a category of secondary objectives the implementation of an effective system of international security in conformity with the conceptual terms of the purposes and principles of the Charter.

The considerations of *Realpolitik,* which at San Francisco influenced the composition and functioning of the Security Council, are not enough to justify bypassing the mechanisms for action envisaged in the Charter, as is increasingly occurring, through negotiations in lateral forums of restricted membership, without the active presence of the medium-sized and small Powers. It is beyond question, in our view, that the participation of the medium-sized and small Powers would be highly constructive and creative; it would be tantamount to an infusion of new blood, which might serve to heal the sclerosis of structures that have aged apparently without being aware of it. How can one deny the validity of the claim to a broader role for the international community in the solution of problems that, after all, are of collective world interest?

We are asked to be realistic. Well, then, let us be truly realistic and take advantage of the atmosphere of *détente*, the momentum provided by the initiatives that in Europe have resulted in the accommodation of interests through the German-Soviet and German-Polish treaties and the Berlin Agreements, which have opened favorable prospects for a future conference on European security. And let us apply this momentum to the international scene as a whole by making full use of the diplomatic mechanisms available in our Organization. Let us give a voice and role in building true peace and lasting security to all of us gathered here, persuaded as we are that the destiny of each of us is closely intertwined with that of all the others, that the development of the poor segment of mankind is a condition for the stability of the wealthy segment of humanity, and that peace and security – both political and economic – are inseparable.

These same purposes of reconciling points of view and of accommodating legitimate sovereign interests enabled us at Santiago to further negotiations on so many important matters falling within the competence of, the United Nations Conference on Trade and Development (UNCTAD) and in Stockholm to achieve fairly appreciable results towards the solution of the major problem of safeguarding the human environment.

The Brazilian Government considers that the United Nations Conference on the Human Environment attained its stated objectives, namely, to arrive at a common outlook on the problems of the environment and to define principles bound "to inspire and guide the peoples of the world in the preservation and enhancement of the human environment". The normative and operational framework adopted in Stockholm provides the bases for broad international cooperation in the preservation of the environment and indicates rational criteria to serve as guidelines for the sovereign action of States in the exploitation of their natural resources, in accordance with their national plans and priorities and without undue interference.

The unwavering defense that Brazil has undertaken, and will continue to maintain, of the sovereign right of each State to make full economic use of the resources of its territory for the benefit of its own people does not preclude recognition of its responsibility to carry out its development plans without risk of significant damage to the environment of bordering areas. Our attitude in this regard can be illustrated by the positions we have been taking, in all good faith and in the best spirit of good neighborliness, at the regional forum which specifically deals with

this subject and where, we believe, practical solutions that meet all the interests at stake can always be found.

Despite the persistence of serious situations of conflict I recognize that, in many aspects, the evolution of international relations appears to be following a more constructive course. But the conspicuous absence of the United Nations from the whole process of the easing of tensions, as though the flow of the major currents of negotiation had been diverted in order to bypass our Organization, has engendered a crisis of confidence and a feeling of frustration which limit the normative capacity of the United Nations. We are obliged to acknowledge that we have not as yet been able to assert the juridical and ethical pre-eminence of our constitutional document, nor have we been able in the political and security field to render the Organization fully operative.

I am stressing the political and security field inasmuch as in the economic and social spheres the performance of the United Nations is less discouraging. Economic cooperation and assistance, as we understand them today and as we intend to develop them further, are products of the consciousness which was born and raised in this very hall and which has in fact enlarged the scope of Chapter IX of the Charter and converted into reality many ideas originally expressed as timid aspirations. I emphasize this fact because the General Assembly christened and sponsored many initiatives which were later shaped in other organisms of our system because the Economic and Social Council did not bestir itself in time to deal with the multifarious problems of economic development and did not exercise its responsibilities in the area of policy-making and coordination.

In any critical analysis of the United Nations there must be a chapter acknowledging the merits of our Organization – or, if one prefers, the merits of its General Assembly – in activating, in giving form and substance to the aspirations to assistance and cooperation nurtured by the large majority of its membership.

There remains, of course, much – very much – more to do in this field. Many myths must be destroyed and much conservatism must be eliminated if we are to make more effective and more active the rendering of international assistance by the rich countries to the poor ones; in order, in a word, to reshape at last the international division of labor, so that the mechanisms of cooperation can function in a manner less hindered by such preconceptions, myths and conservatism. It has been a long and patient effort which is beginning to thrive and which can flourish if we are willing to fertilize other ideas sown in the Charter, ideas that interrelate collective economic security and collective political security.

That is the path recently shown us by the Secretary–General, with the authority vested in him, when he said:

> … development issues which in the past might have been local or regional in character today affect the entire world and should therefore be dealt with at the international economic level … economic problems, just as political and military disputes, affected world security. Collective economic security was therefore a necessary correlate to the concept of collective political security. The concept of collective economic security would give added life and meaning to the International Development Strategy and its review and appraisal mechanism.
>
> It was most timely and appropriate that, at a time when the Economic and Social Council was in the process of self-renewal, it should give serious and careful consideration to this idea and to the practical ways it could be realized.

Here I wish to convey the satisfaction of my Government with the endorsement by the Secretary-General of the Brazilian concept of collective economic security. He has granted this concept the passport with which we hope it will travel through the international economic thinking of the 1970s. It is not Brazil's intention to advocate that we should hasten to arrive at a final formulation of this concept, or that we should hurry to put it into operation, thus risking its faulty, incomplete or insufficient implementation. Quite to the contrary, what we propose is wide-open, frank dialogue; what we expect is that we shall work together to reaffirm this concept and to formulate its operational principles. The Brazilian delegation will return to this subject on the proper occasion, in the proper forum, with the sole intent of contributing to the strengthening and improvement of the foundations on which world peace and security should rest.

Let me now sum up the main line of reasoning of this presentation.

If the process of international organization is irreversible, inasmuch as it embodies a universally shared aspiration and inasmuch as it is a constant in the historical evolution of inter-State relations, why does our Organization so frequently find itself bypassed? Does this situation derive from an option by some countries not to utilize the Organization as an organ of collective decision? Or is the weakening of the United Nations to be attributed to structural deficiencies stemming from its institutional stagnation, from its inadequacy vis-à-vis contemporary international

reality, already so distinct from that prevailing at the end of the Second World War, which the Charter had to mirror?

Whatever the reasons for the progressive political, diplomatic and even financial impoverishment of the United Nations, it is urgent to reinvigorate our Organization, to fortify it as a converging centre for international politics, to make it regain control over the revamping of the system of inter-State relations, for only the United Nations can provide the juridical-political parameters of conciliation between legitimate national interests and what suits the collective interest.

The diplomatic marginalization of the United Nations has been and still is derived to a large extent from its institutional aging process, which reduces its procedural capacity to transform words into action, will into deeds, determination into reality. The Charter of the United Nations is to international relations what national constitutions are to the domestic political-juridical order of Member States. No written constitution has historically succeeded in remaining unaltered. As the societies to which they apply change and evolve, national constitutions evolve and change to avoid becoming a dead letter as the result of refusing to acknowledge and to institutionalize new situations and new social facts. We are currently witnessing at the international level a growing gap between constitutional norms and reality. This is the normative gap, I would say, now being added to the other gaps which so afflict two thirds of mankind.

Obviously, the degree of effectiveness of the United Nations is less dependent upon the text of the Charter than upon the political will of States to respect and implement its purposes and principles; it is no less true that any anachronistic norms become in themselves a hindrance to evolution and that the over-validity of supplanted institutions discourages the exercise of that same political will.

The Brazilian Government holds that the only alternative is adaptation and reform.

My Government fully acknowledges all that is permanent and valuable in our Charter. From this very rostrum, on the occasion of the twenty-fifth anniversary of the United Nations, l launched an appeal for us to apply the Charter in its high normative sense, and for us to make full use of the diplomatic capabilities of our Organization. Thus, as I reiterate Brazil's total adherence to the purposes and principles, I also maintain that it is high time to improve the Charter. I find it a fallacious argument that if we were to redraft the Charter, the political conditions of today would prevent us from producing a document as valuable as the one drawn up in 1945. In this argument there is implicit the pessimistic assumption

that, in the course of these past 27 years, the world has become worse and statesmen have become less rational.

It is not the intention of the Brazilian Government to suggest that we rewrite the Charter; what is in fact incumbent upon us is to revitalize our constitutional document, to correct its inadequacies, to update it, and, if I may say so, to adapt it to a world that is already distant from the international reality of the post-war period.

Interpreting the will of our Governments, the drafters of the Charter themselves acknowledged, with the humility of true statesmen, that they had not produced a perfect and everlasting document. In Article 109 they themselves foresaw and affirmed the need for reform in setting a time-limit for review, a process considered indispensable for the United Nations to endure and advance. I should like to recall that, as early as in San Francisco, the Brazilian delegation, aware of the changeability of the times, suggested that the Charter should be reviewed automatically every five years irrespective of the veto. When are we to follow the course of action so wisely set forth in Article 109?

The Brazilian Government believes that a review and eventual reform of the Charter would decisively contribute to stimulating the political will of States to utilize the avenues of the international Organization in the most effective and comprehensive manner, to render the Organization itself operative and dynamic, at the service of a world in such an obvious phase of transition.

In replying to the questionnaire of the Secretary-General, my Government has already indicated those matters which in its opinion should be assigned first priority in connection with a review of the Charter. Specific reference was made to the concept of collective economic security and to peacekeeping operations. We also presented suggestions regarding the enhancement of the effectiveness of the Security Council. And while stressing the interconnection between these different subjects, we noted that the debate on the item concerning the review of the Charter would offer an opportunity for an in-depth examination of all related issues and positions of principle having a bearing on the work of the Security Council as well as on its organizational structure. This issue calls for a thorough and unbiased re-evaluation, free from considerations based on the outdated power structure of the immediate post-war period.

The acceleration of the pace of international relations and the growing development of the communications media afford the emerging countries the opportunity to break out of the historic isolation in which they have been living and to project their national interests on

the international plane. Domestic development concurrently broadens international obligations; growth increases international responsibilities and, consequently, commitments and duties. Brazil has long since made its irreversible choice in favor of all that presupposes clarity and harmony, in favor of just and correct relations with other nations, of good faith in discharging obligations, and systematically rejects the theses of separate paths of progress and of the false rights stemming from power.

New life should urgently be given to the ideals of collective security which inspired the Charter, in the form of a system of more operative norms that better encompass contemporary reality, these norms being firmly linked to germane principles of sovereign equality and equality of opportunity among States.

True political realism consists in trying to construct a permanent international order founded on collective consensus. This Assembly is the forum *par excellence* to expand the understandings arrived at among a few on matters of interest to so many, and to render these understandings beneficial to all. It is incumbent upon the United Nations, where the organized international community is represented, to assume the final and non-transferable responsibility for forging the bases of an equitable system of international cooperation, to build peace and to defend it.

New York, September 25, 1972.

1973

1973

1973 was a year of significant developments in Latin America. The return of General Perón would unleash tensions leading to the seizing of power by the armed forces in 1976 and the consequent radicalization of the Argentine political and institutional life. The coup that culminated with the death of President Salvador Allende would open the long military cycle that ruled Chile until the 1980's. In the Middle East, the so-called Yom Kippur war provoked new antagonisms. The Israeli counteroffensive eliminated any doubt about the real capability of Arab countries to resolve the conflict by force. Defeated in Vietnam, the United States withdrew from Southeast Asia, definitively closing the age of application of the doctrine of *containment*. The strong increase in oil prices agreed by the cartel of producing countries generated uncertainty about the economic and financial stability of the international system, creating a hitherto unknown sentiment of vulnerability in Western countries. That sentiment, by its turn, would become an additional factor of hesitation regarding the relationship with Third World countries, rendering the dialogue and cooperation at the multilateral level more difficult.

The increase in oil prices brought serious consequences for Brazil. At the time, however, as the Médici government drew to a close, the prevailing sentiment in the country was of confidence in the future. Brazilian diplomacy, spurred by the success of the "economic miracle", would not refrain from claiming, in the words of Minister Gibson, at the Twenty-Eighth Session of the General Assembly, "global responsibilities and duties".

The world marched swiftly toward *détente*. China had been admitted into the United Nations in 1971. Two years afterwards, the simultaneous admission of the Federal Republic of Germany and of the German Democratic Republic would consolidate divisions that at the time seemed to be permanent. For Brazil, however, *détente* still presented undesirable characteristics. "*Détente* for what? For whom?" Minister Gibson asked rhetorically, concluding his statement with an exhortation for the revalorization of the United Nations as a counterweight to the power politics so decried by Brazilian diplomacy. "Political security and "economic security" was the double motto proposed by Brazil at the U.N. It was an external counterpoint to the motto "security and development" proclaimed by the War College (Escola Superior de Guerra), which was then at its zenith, as the driving principle for governmental action. Gibson went on to propose that the concept of collective economic security should include the possibility that the United Nations, in the case of situations of crisis, were given the ability to engage in operations of economic peace: *economic peacemaking* and *economic peacekeeping*. Of course, at that time those were unrealizable concepts. Today, however, when mechanisms for the prevention of crises such as the one in Mexico in 1994, which shook the international financial system, are discussed, the concepts put forth by the Brazilian diplomacy appear pertinent and prescient.

In the 1973 statement one remarks a strong criticism of the politics of power and of the lack of concrete results in disarmament negotiations, side by side with the care to claim identity as a developing and especially as a Latin American country. The prescriptions offered by Brazil, however, are somewhat vague and to a certain extent based on principles, while mentions to concrete questions of the international agenda are practically non-existent. The situation in the Middle East, the policies of South Africa and the remaining instances of colonialism in Africa were avoided.

The ambiguous attitude of Brazilian policies regarding these issues and the absence of relations with the Popular Republic of China made up a picture of Brazil as a country that had not yet freed itself from the ideological hypotheses stemming from the East-West confrontation. This was due not so much to external strategic constraints as mainly because of the radicalization of the political and institutional internal conjuncture and of concern by the political leadership with the gains of the revolutionary left in Latin America.

XXVIII Regular Session of the General Assembly of the United Nations 1973

Minister Mário Gibson Barboza [*]

Mr. President,

I wish to begin by expressing the gratification of the Government of Brazil and my own at your election to preside over the Twenty-Eighth Session of the United Nations General Assembly. Your vast diplomatic experience and the brilliant services you have always rendered to your country, to the inter-American system and to the international community, assure us that our work during this session will be guided by your proven lucidity and political acumen. As a Brazilian, I recognize among your attributes the outstanding values of the noble people of Ecuador, a country which has always been linked to Brazil through friendship, mutual respect and a cooperation which we are today expanding more than ever; as a Latin American, I am aware that your personal attributes are highly representative of the long lineage of statesmen and internationalists who have built up the cultural and political heritage of our Continent. The historic deeds of those statesmen and leaders mirrored the common cultural origins of Iberia – that discoverer of seas and continents, sower of civilizations, and heiress to and propagator of the Mediterranean cultures. Luso-Spanish Iberia intermingled with the aboriginal races of America and acquired a new dimension through the contribution of the blood

[*] **Mário Gibson Alves Barboza**, born in Olinda, PE, on March 13, 1918. Bachelor in Law from the Faculty of Law of Recife. Third Class Consul, public selection process, 1940. First Class Minister, by merit, 1961. Minister of State for External Relations, 10/30/1969 to 3/15/1974. † Rio de Janeiro, November 26, 2007.

and cultural values of Africa. This is exemplified by my own country, Brazil, where all these influences were amalgamated, rendering it for that very reason so profoundly Latin American and so much part and parcel of the Latin American world which nominated you, Sir, as an authentic representative of our continent, to the presidency of this Assembly.

The presence in this hall of the delegations of the Federal Republic of Germany and the German Democratic Republic, resulting from a long and patient process of political evolution, is a positive sign of the *détente* now sought by contemporary diplomacy. My country, which did not hesitate to sacrifice the lives of its sons to defend the ideals of freedom and democracy on European battlefields, can well appreciate the true significance of the admission to the United Nations of both those States. To the United Nations, founded as an alternative to the use of force in inter-State relations, this event overcomes one of the most acute problems of the political balance-sheet of the post-war era. Brazil maintains with the Government of the Federal Republic of Germany relations that I dare to describe as exemplary. Wide-ranging common interests have for many years been drawing our two countries together again, under reciprocally and increasingly advantageous conditions.

It is my hope that negotiations in progress with the German Democratic Republic, with which we have been sustaining fruitful commercial relations for over a decade, will result very soon in a reciprocally beneficial relationship based on mutual respect.

It is with the greatest pleasure that I welcome in a very special way the delegation of the Commonwealth of the Bahamas, a sister country from our continent, which we shall receive with an open heart into our Latin American group and with which we wish to develop increasingly broad and cordial cooperation.

No one in good faith can fail to applaud a policy of *détente* which seeks and propounds understanding and cooperation as alternatives to mistrustful isolation and to latent conflict. We look upon this relaxation of tensions with renewed hopes that inspired diplomatic action may gather momentum and reach all the existing hotbeds of crisis and eliminate them. Nonetheless, while squarely facing the political, economic and social realities of our times, we are bound to ask objectively: *détente* for whom, *détente* for what?

We view as the source of the policies of *détente* a willingness on the part of the superpowers and the great Powers to launch a process of peace-seeking and understanding which has brought about a rational and pragmatic placation of the conflicts of interests in the vast field of the

political-strategic balance as well as in the area of dominant influences – dominant because they are built on objective conditions of unmatched power. That willingness to desist from further confrontation has motivated and rendered possible new European developments – as evidenced in recently concluded treaties and in other agreements still under way – aimed at establishing peace in Europe and creating a European security system, envisaging the reduction of arsenals and troops and also serving the purpose of stimulating closer economic cooperation. Although laudable, meritorious and of extreme importance, this *détente* nonetheless cannot by inference be a regional goal, nor can it be thought of as a temporary arrangement to accommodate certain conveniences and interests.

We hope that this determination to desist from confrontation, this rationalization of what is politically viable and diplomatically feasible, will provide elements of action to extend those processes of peace-bringing and understanding to all areas of conflict, thereby safeguarding and rendering compatible the mutual interests of the parties directly concerned.

Détente, as we envisage it, should be the extension to the whole of the international scene of this political will to pacify and cooperate. It should inject this political will into the body and system of our Organization. It should offer opportunity for finally implementing the purposes and principles of the Charter, and for the United Nations to pay its ethical debt to itself – namely, the eradication of underdevelopment. To reduce *détente* to a rationale for the use, and for the balance, of power, to regionalize its scope and objectives – and hence to forgo using it as an instrument for normative reconstruction and as an inspiration and guide line for a policy of global relaxation – would be tantamount to reviving the fallacy of arrangements based on considerations of power which are transient and fleeting because they fail to comprehend the dynamics of international problems and because they are uninspired by any sense of the future.

From the renewed diplomatic interaction which these first steps in the process of *détente* may set in motion, a more equitable international order must emerge, one which should foster an effective system of collective political and economic security based neither on oppression nor on the alleged acquired rights of the strongest but on the recognition of the just claims and interests of all States, their sovereign right to full economic development and social well-being, and their participation on an equal footing in the institutionalization of the rules of collective behavior. It is hard, if not impossible, to believe that the policy of relaxation of tensions will succeed outside those parameters. The past is teeming with examples

of the fragility of arrangements contrived merely to serve the momentary interests of the exercise of power or to allocate such interests within the fallacious framework of spheres of influence. These arrangements have never survived the wear and tear inflicted by crises and contradictions of policies inspired by the myth of power and its alleged rights and hence policies which are inequitable and unjust. What we need today – now that we would appear to be more experienced and more convinced of the frailty of the exclusivist concepts of international security – what we need today, I repeat, more than a temporary harmonization of means, is a common and global concept of the ends we seek.

As a means or an instrument, the policy of relaxation of tensions will either achieve greatness or demean itself, depending on the ultimate aims it pursues. As it is not endowed with mechanisms for automatic control and adjustments, the success of *détente* will be contingent on our capacity to expand it so that its long-term aims are not lost sight of and so that it does not become an instrument for the imposition of hegemonic arrangements. I am ready to agree that such is not the purpose. Since it is not, let us stand guard to prevent it from being reduced to such a purpose by temptations along its course and by unforeseen crises, it is our belief, furthermore, that the new orientation that is being sought for international relations will be meaningless in the long–term if those attempts aim at no more than drafting a charter to discipline inter-State interests in the affluent areas of mankind and fail, therefore, to meet the very legitimate claims of countries outside that area.

This is an overriding concern of Brazil's foreign policy, which, conscious of its global responsibilities and commitments, assigns priority to close cooperation with all developing countries, and especially those of Latin America.

During the last few years, it has been my duty to translate into diplomatic action the instructions and directives laid down by President Médici to foster and expand the political, economic and cultural ties between Brazil and the sister nations of our continent. Bilaterally and multilaterally Brazil's inter-American policy will firmly continue to seek the goals of solidarity, reciprocal assistance, understanding and the minimization of sporadic dissidences, since Brazil is averse to rivalries, resentments and hegemonies which have no place among us.

It is our conviction, however, that while regional scenarios must be dealt with in accordance with their specific needs, they should be seen in perspective within the system of the United Nations. The lines of negotiation now prevailing cannot run parallel to the normative system of

the Charter but on the contrary must be geared to it; otherwise they will lack consistency and will not profit from the constructive evaluation and invigorating support of the community of States joined together in this Organization, in the search of peace for all, security for all and collective progress.

It is for this forum to decide on the compatibility between instruments laterally negotiated and the purposes and principles of the Charter, so that the convenience of some will not be construed as the measure of the interests of all the others. Thus, once submitted to the scrutiny of the General Assembly, the agreements on the non-use of force in international relations and on the prevention of nuclear war, which are timely and valid in principle, will gain a new normative dimension, thereby allaying the suspicion that they may become an instrument for the imposition of a tutelage system by the great Powers. The expectations aroused by the policy of *détente* will materialize only if the relaxation of tensions puts an end to the nuclear arms race and if effective measures of general and complete disarmament are not confined to the secret negotiation of agreements that do not go beyond disciplining the expansion and sophistication of nuclear devices.

Like so many other Member States, Brazil hopes that the relaxation of tensions in critical areas will prevent the interrelated questions of disarmament and collective security from remaining intractable and unsettled in this forum, as they have been to date. The task of achieving disarmament and arms control was assigned to this General Assembly by the founders of our Organization as one of its primary responsibilities. I would be less than candid were I not to express my Government's disappointment at the lack of concrete results of disarmament negotiations, particularly during the last two years, both in this Assembly and in the Conference of the Committee on Disarmament. Vitiated by its original flaws, the Special Committee on the World Disarmament Conference has not really come into being.

In the specific case of the Conference of the Committee on Disarmament, we are led to the conclusion that it has increasingly eluded its tasks, or to say the least, that it has been incapable of carrying them out. Notwithstanding the much-touted spirit of conciliation, the meetings of the Conference and the negotiating process itself have been handicapped by political restrictions that have blocked the possibility of reaching meaningful decisions. What is the explanation for the frustrating results of so many efforts? It seems clear that the work of the Conference has not been as attuned to international trends as one would hope or wish.

The ambiguous relationship between the General Assembly and the Conference, which has existed since the very inception of the Disarmament Committee – that is, since the Zorin-Stevenson Declaration of 1961 – may perhaps have been the greatest obstacle to our goal of making its work more responsive to the aspirations and desires of the community of nations. In reality, the important bilateral understandings between the major nuclear Powers have been arrived at, and continue to be arrived at, outside the Conference. As a result, obviously, the Conference is gradually transforming itself into a mere advisory body.

But the widening gap between the General Assembly and the Conference of the Committee on Disarmament does not stem solely or exclusively from a question of deficient machinery or structure. As it happens, negotiations on the most vital disarmament issue, namely, nuclear disarmament, have proceeded without the involvement of all the nuclear Powers, as though the main responsibility for the arms race did not devolve upon all those Powers, individually and collectively. Unless effective steps are taken to ensure the presence and cooperation of all of them around the negotiating table, the quest for disarmament, irrespective of the negotiating machinery available, faces the threat of becoming politically irrelevant or being reduced to a subject of merely academic interest.

Brazil believes, therefore, that the time has come for the General Assembly to rededicate itself with renewed vigor and zeal to the disarmament purposes enshrined in the Charter. This would thus appear to be the opportune time for a debate in the Political and Security Committee focusing on the existing machinery for negotiation on disarmament and on the methods of improving it. I am well aware that various proposals to that end have already been put forward and that they all deserve careful study. If a broad exchange of ideas is to prove of value, the General Assembly should consider the advisability of reconvening its own Disarmament Commission, where the full membership of this Organization is represented, to seek new and effective instruments for collective negotiation. The Disarmament Commission could act as a kind of preparatory body for the world disarmament conference.

In today's world, political security is intertwined with collective economic security. I have already dwelt on *détente*, which is undoubtedly one of the major political facts of the 1970s. If it is not allowed to degenerate by having its scope reduced to that of mere political accommodation, if it maintains momentum and creative spirit, the current relaxation of tensions may well open up new and extraordinary prospects for international

economic cooperation. To that end, it should go hand in hand with the global objectives of expansion and economic development and should ensure economic security, with which political security will thrive.

The world's economy indeed is passing through a critical transitional period; in order to expand, international trade needs new rules to correct present day distortions in this field; concurrently, the monetary crisis persists unchecked. It would be absurd and dangerous to suppose that minor plastic surgery or superficial measures, unrelated to each other and to the root cause of such evils, might eradicate them. I believe, nonetheless, that in these times, so deeply marked by a collective malaise in economic and financial relationships, the elements of disruption and distortion will finally, however paradoxically, arouse our consciences to the need for more effective worldwide solidarity and collective participation in the global enterprise of development and expansion.

The complexity of the world's economic and financial system and the growing importance of the external sectors of national economies have made of the adjustments and harmonization of existing diverse interests basic factors conditioning the global security process. The prevailing political situation and the series of bold initiatives which are being taken at the major conceptual and operative levels encourage us to believe that the embryonic awareness of joint responsibility for the settlement of important international economic and financial questions will begin to supersede the view that the affluence and well-being of a few can coexist indefinitely with the underdevelopment of the destitute two thirds of mankind.

The trade negotiations which have begun in Tokyo under the auspices of the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade [GATT] should provide the world with an opportunity to ascertain whether the principles of solidarity and cooperation which ought to inspire a concerted effort towards development and expansion remain mere dreams, mere abstract expressions of contemporary political semantics, or whether, on the contrary, they will act as a driving force in the reformulation of the world trade system, so as to afford a fair and equitable division of labor, which is an essential condition for the growth of world productivity. The aggregate growth of the world product and its improved distribution call for a recognition of the need to accord special treatment to the developing world so that it may increase its participation in international trade and cease to be a minor, statistical and decreasing part of it. It would be a tragic mistake to believe that only or chiefly the interests of mature economies will be in play in those negotiations, or that the fate of the world's economy is linked

merely to the harmonization of the currently conflicting conveniences of those who, as of now, weigh more decisively in international trade. If the multilateral trade negotiations confine themselves to these purposes, they will have rendered a disservice to the international community and will have the effect of curtailing the objectives of global development and expansion. This was the conviction that emerged from the last meeting of the Special Committee on Latin American Coordination held in Brasília, in connection with the coordinated position of the Latin American countries in regard to these negotiations.

I believe that, on another level, the same can be said for the crisis that assails the international monetary system and the need to reform it. It would be impossible and futile to conceive of this reform, which is so urgent, without taking into full account the claims of the developing countries without seeing to it that their needs are met and without affording them solutions for their problems that neither the Bretton Woods Conference nor, more recently, the unproductive and short-lived Smithsonian Agreement could find.

The Brazilian Government is gratified at seeing that the reinvigoration of the Economic and Social Council is taking place concurrently with events of such great importance in the trade and monetary fields. Now that it has gained renewed vigor and is disposed to exercise the normative role in the field of international economic relations envisaged for it by the Charter, the Council has demonstrated, both in New York and in Geneva, that it has resumed its functions within the panorama of the United Nations. These functions relate essentially to its right to oversee all matters pertinent to social, economic and financial cooperation, a right which will make it a central negotiating forum within our Organization.

Parallel to these institutional developments, which augur a more active participation of the United Nations in rendering international economic cooperation more dynamic, we have been given the opportunity in this year of 1973 to embark on a comprehensive review of the nature and range of this cooperation, through the first exercise of review and appraisal of the implementation of the International Development Strategy for the Second United Nations Development Decade as concluded a month ago by the Economic and Social Council. The balance sheet for the first two years of the Decade is not encouraging, to say the least. The gap between developed and developing countries has widened, and even among the developing countries the performance of individual economies has been extremely uneven.

While some very positive results have been registered in certain regions or countries, the overall picture continues to be gloomy. What is worse, the flow of development assistance and financial transfers has lost the momentum reached in the late 1960s. The industrialized world seems more and more concerned with its own internal conflicts.

Brazil has taken the initiative of reviving the concept of collective economic security. We see in this economic counterpart of political security the synthesis of our aspirations for a better world, one in which global development, expansion and social progress may become additional components of our concept of peace and security. The Economic and Social Council has already had the opportunity to begin a very timely debate on the subject and should now study the concept and its institutional and functional implications in greater depth.

The definition of this concept in terms of doctrine and practical potentialities requires prolonged examination, analysis and critical evaluation. On the basis of the existing interrelationshipship between political and economic security, one of the possibilities worthy of consideration is a study of ways and means to endow the United Nations with the faculty to launch economic peacemaking and peacekeeping operations to prevent or remedy critical situations. Once ideas have matured and the elements of the concept, together with its operational capabilities, are broadly identified and accepted, an effort at negotiation to that end would render the Organization even more active in one of the areas in which it has, it is only fair to say, distinguished itself in these 28 years of its existence.

Among the issues attracting the growing attention of the international community, there stand out the peaceful uses and practical applications of outer space in promoting development.

The Brazilian Government is convinced that in this area, as in so many others, it is indispensable that the interests of all countries be duly taken into account, regardless of their respective stages of development in the area of space research. Moreover, at this point, it is necessary to discipline activities in the fields of remote sensing by satellite of the natural resources of earth and space communications, so as to ensure strict respect of the sovereign rights of States. On the basis of these principles, which uphold, after all, our international system it should be possible to ensure that the progressive results of the exploration and peaceful uses of outer space are equitably shared among the members of the World community.

While addressing the Assembly last year, I referred broadly to the question of review of the United Nations Charter and I stated that, in the

opinion of Brazil, the review or reform of the Charter remains an essential element in the process of the political and diplomatic reactivation of the United Nations. I consider it essential that the General Assembly at its next session finally assert its willingness to study this subject with imagination and political foresight in order to enable us to adjust our constitutional instrument to the realities and the needs of today's world. Brazil will continue to press this point precisely because it believes in the destiny of this Organization.

The unrestricted adherence to the ideals, purposes and principles of the United Nations is, and will remain, a fundamental premise of Brazil's foreign policy.

New York, September 24, 1973.

1974

1974

During the Ernesto Geisel Administration the vectors of Brazilian external action and consequently its discourse at the United Nations were substantially altered. Two main elements contributed to the change of course. First, the oil crisis which led to policies of *rapprochement* with Arab countries by making clear the dependence of the Brazilian development model on external energy source. Second, the perception that by adopting attitudes fundamentally contrary to the wide majority of developing nations, as well as Latin American ones, the country ran the risk of diplomatic isolation in multilateral fora. Later, a divergence with the United States stemming from the opposition of the Carter Administration to the Brazil-FRG Nuclear Agreement and from the American human rights policies was added to these two elements.

Already in 1974, in the first of the five speeches he would deliver before the General Assembly, Minister Antonio Francisco Azeredo da Silveira expounded the changes in policy. The perception that the growth of the country in the past few years had brought about an increase in its external responsibilities was maintained. But in the exercise of these responsibilities, the Minister said, in direct and plain words, Brazil would be guided by efficacy and the search of the affirmation of its interests in an ethical and responsible manner. Through "responsible pragmatism" Brazilian diplomacy tried to free itself from ideological duties or alignments that hindered its search for the alliances and relations suited to the demands of its unilateral political or economic interests. 1974 was,

in fact, the year when the Brazilian Government established relations with the Popular Republic of China.

In accordance with this new course which would gradually bring Brazil into the same wavelength with the majorities at the Assembly, Minister Silveira again mentioned at the United Nations issues whose consideration had been diminished or suppressed in the previous period. This was the case with regard to questions related to decolonization, an area where it was necessary to redeem the mortgage of years of support to Portuguese colonialism. *Apartheid* was vigorously condemned in order to set the basis for a policy of closer links with African countries. Brazilian vehemence was also extended to the question of the Middle East, where it had become imperative to eliminate previous ambiguities perceived as favorable to Israel from then on, in a formulation that in following years would be gradually expanded and made more explicit, Brazilian diplomacy became straightforward: "withdrawal from the occupied territories is uncontrovertibly an integral part of the solution of the conflict".

From the first speech by Minister Silveira one gathers the impression that the Brazilian view of the global strategic pictures and especially of the relationship between the superpowers had changed. There is an effort to attenuate the vehemence of the condemnation of the superpowers and at the same time to formulate a more realistic evaluation of the problems and opportunities faced by Brazil in the international scene.

The strong defense by Minister Silveira of the Brazilian position regarding the question of the use of shared natural resources is particularly notable in the 1974 speech. The controversy around the project of building the Itaipu hydroelectric plant continued to expand in international forums since the denunciation by Argentina of the so-called "New York Agreement" negotiated in the previous year. Taking advantage of its participation in the Non-Aligned Movement Argentina tried to bring together majorities in favor of its arguments which aimed at making the use of rivers for energy purposes dependent on prior consultation to the downriver neighbor. Minister Silveira affirmed categorically before the General Assembly that Brazil did not accept that the principle of consultation between Governments could be misrepresented from its cooperative function and put into doubt the sovereignty of States.

XXIX Regular Session of the General Assembly of the United Nations 1974

Minister Antonio Francisco Azeredo da Silveira [*]

Mr. President,

I would like at the outset to express my delegation's satisfaction and, in particular, my own, at seeing you directing the work of the Twenty-Ninth Session of the General Assembly. I remember with special satisfaction the brotherly relationship we shared at Algiers, in 1967, when I had the pleasure of sitting beside you when you presided over the first ministerial meeting of the developing countries. On that occasion there were countless times when we found that our views converged regarding solutions for the most urgent and acute problems the developing countries were facing. No less numerous were the occasions on which I witnessed the demonstration of your exceptional qualities of leadership. For this reason, I am convinced that you will prove able to impress upon the deliberations of this General Assembly the objectivity, the firmness and the political acumen required by the complexity of the subjects under debate.

I also offer Mr. Leopoldo Benites the thanks of the Brazilian delegation for the able and sound way in which he presided over the Twenty-Eighth Session of the General Assembly. Mr. Benites is not only an asset of this Organization, which he has served for so many years with unchanging dedication, but is also an asset of Latin America and of his

[*] **Antonio Francisco Azeredo da Silveira**, Born in Rio de Janeiro, RJ, September 22, 1917. Third Secretary, public selection process, 1943. First Class Minister, by merit, 1964. Minister of State for External Relations from 3/15/1974 to 3/15/1979. † Rio de Janeiro, April 27, 1990.

valiant country – Ecuador – which has in him a respected spokesman in the service of its most authentic aspirations.

May I be allowed to address a very special word of greeting in our common language to the representatives of the Republic of Guinea-Bissau, present here today in their full right, to the great rejoicing of us all.

As Minister for External Affairs of Brazil and as a Brazilian, nothing could give me greater satisfaction than to salute the admission to this Organization of a new country of Africa and of Portuguese speech, to which we feel linked therefore by bonds of blood and culture. These links constitute the strongest guarantee for the close and fertile friendship which will certainly unite our two peoples.

Our greetings are also directed to the delegation of Bangladesh. We are sure that there will be many opportunities for us to extend within the scope of the United Nations the friendly relations we already entertain bilaterally.

I also address an equally warm expression of brotherly feelings to the delegation of Grenada, which has added its presence to our regional group.

An honored tradition, which goes back to the first session of the General Assembly, gives Brazil the privilege of opening this great dialogue of sovereign nations each year. This tradition I take up today, speaking for the first time as my country's Minister for External Affairs in this forum. I do so with redoubled emotion, for I am conscious that I am addressing the community of nations at a particularly important moment in the history of the Organization and of our participation in it. It is unnecessary to make more explicit the importance of this hour in universal terms. It seems obvious to all that we are at the threshold of a new era which will be one of peace and prosperity or of insecurity and poverty, according to whether we know how to harmonize, in a constructive fashion, the most essential objectives and the most enlightened national interests of each country here represented. Brazil has the benefit of facing the challenge of this new hour with a Government whose term has just begun and which carries, in its objectives and mode of action, the indisputable stamp of realism and diligence. This allows us to contemplate our action within the Organization against a background that is simultaneously broader in time and more encompassing in terms of solutions to the problems under consideration.

We have repeatedly and publicly enunciated the principles on which the international conduct of President Ernesto Geisel's administration is based, and we have already given sufficient demonstration that we know

how to unite action with words when it comes to turning those principles into reality.

During recent years Brazil has taken broad steps, first in correcting the main distortions that disrupted its economic and social development and, subsequently, in the consolidation of a model of growth that truly attempts to respond to the authentic aspirations of our national community. Thus the country has grown internally and thus also it has grown in terms of its presence, its potentialities and its responsibilities in the international field. While this is happening, we try to avoid the traps of history by not repeating the errors of nations which became great, many times at the expense of others. We want our presence in a wider-ranging international scene to be accompanied by the preservation of the primordial ethical values that have been and that continue to be the bases of our foreign policy.

We want our words in the international field to be direct and simple, without ambiguity or subterfuge. We want the Brazilian Government to be able to accomplish the ecumenical vocation of its people, who are open to uninhibited and frank communication. We want to explore the paths of understanding, for we believe, fundamentally, that cooperation is more effective than antagonism and that mutual respect is more creative than ambitions of preponderance.

Our conduct for attaining those objectives is pragmatic and responsible: pragmatic to the extent to which we desire effectiveness and to which we are disposed to seek, wherever Brazilian national interests may move us, areas of convergence and zones of coincidence with the national interests of other peoples; and responsible because we will always act within the framework of ethics and exclusively as a function of objectives clearly identified and accepted by the Brazilian people.

I do not intend to comment on the various items on the agenda of the present session. There will, I am sure, be many occasions on which the Brazilian delegation will speak on those items during the coming weeks. From this rostrum I wish only to underline which are the problems, in our understanding, to the solution of which we must jointly dedicate our most urgent attention.

Immediately the problem of decolonization springs into view. We have on this question a position of absolute clarity: Brazil believes unreservedly that there is no justification for delay or subterfuge in the process of decolonization, both in the American continent itself and over the entire world. Brazil will give its support so that those peoples still subject to forms of colonial domination may achieve, within the

shortest possible time, the national independence to which they aspire. We believe that to the extent that the will of the community of sovereign nations in support of acceleration of the decolonization process becomes general, so much greater will be the possibility that decolonization may be achieved peacefully and under conditions that will allow constructive cooperation between the peoples of those countries that were previously held as colonies and the peoples whose Governments had theretofore followed a colonial policy. In this sense, support given to emancipation is as important as action directed towards the colonizing Governments so that they may detach themselves quickly and with conviction from their policies of colonial domination. In both forms of action the forum of the United Nations has demonstrated its effectiveness, and it is our intention to support it in this role.

Brazil is following this path, which is not always the easiest one or one which pleases those who cannot distinguish appearance from reality. For the Brazilian Government, the challenge faced by those who want to rid the world of the colonial stigma is the challenge of efficacy. To blame the colonizing past is not what matters; what matters is rather to help build the future of free nations. This position corresponds to what is deepest in the Brazilian soul. We are prepared to make explicit those sentiments and the aspirations that correspond to them by offering our concrete cooperation in the building of these new nations.

Amilcar Cabral, the great leader of the independence of Guinea-Bissau, was aware of the anti-colonial will of the Brazilian people. His words are so similar to those we have so often uttered in relation to African peoples under colonial domination that they seem almost to have come from the same mouth. I quote them:

> Our interest – in developing relations of friendship, solidarity and cooperation with Brazil – is all the greater as we feel ourselves linked to the Brazilian people by bonds of blood, culture and history, and we ardently desire to establish with Brazil, after the conquest of our independence, broad fraternal relations in all fields, just as we desire them with the people of Portugal, which we never confused with Portuguese colonialism.

The same feeling of brotherhood binds us to Mozambique and Angola, whose independence we want to see completed. We hail the agreement that on September 7, the Portuguese Government concluded with the Frente de Libertação de Moçambique. Little more than a century and a half ago the same date marked the first independence of a former

Portuguese colony, and it is Brazil, that former colony, which is here represented and which offers its hand to its African brothers. To Brazil this gesture signifies not just an unbending adherence to the inalienable principle of self-determination. To us, the emergence of African nations to independent life has an additional dimension which allows us to take up again, on an equal footing, the close sharing of life with peoples that have been among the most generous sources of our mode of being.

To the opening-up of prospects for the populations in the Territories under Portuguese administration in Africa, there has not been, unfortunately, any corresponding visible progress in respect to areas under colonial domination in other continents. In the same fashion, there still remain forms of subjugation resulting from racial or religious prejudices.

In the United Nations and outside, *apartheid* has been universally condemned in the name of the most diverse principles. Ethically, it runs directly contrary to the universal values of the human conscience. From the viewpoint of doctrine, it incorporates the most discredited theories of alleged racial superiorities.

When we repudiate *apartheid* we also repudiate any pretension of the international community wishing to colonize culturally the nations of Africa. Thus, when we rejoice at the emergence to independence of the new Portuguese-speaking nations we are not uttering praise for any cultural supremacy but are simply welcoming the opportunities now open for a broader brotherly understanding by the communities of the same language. For the African Portuguese-speaking nations and for other nations what we want is that they may be authentic in the expression of their own rich and varied cultures. We in Brazil, who owe so much to the different African cultures, can only hope that they may reinvigorate themselves in the climate of freedom offered to them by national independence.

It has been said, and rightly so, that in the history of mankind ours is the first generation upon which has fallen the task not only of making the world but also that of preventing the world from being unmade. It is an enormous responsibility for those who, like the great majority of mankind, have so much minute means available to them for influencing global decisions which have such a great effect on them.

We stand almost as helpless spectators of the accelerated arms race, which is incessantly pursued under the mantle of protestations of *détente* and promises of disarmament. The disproportion between the scope of the problem and the measures agreed on for its solution is smaller only than that which exists between the alleged defense justifications and the overwhelming destructive power that has been accumulated already.

More than anything else, it is shocking to see the magnitude of financial and technological resources devoted to arms production, so many times higher than that which would be necessary to reform the present structure of economic inequities and thus to allow men to live in a world free from fear, more unfettered by shame and, above all, more favorable to the expression of its creative potentialities.

There would be reasons, perhaps, to welcome the evolution during recent years from a world in a climate of "cold war" to a world in a climate of *détente.* We would have more reasons to rejoice if we could see confirmed in the future what seems to be the present evolution of that climate into a virtual *entente.* It depends, in part, on us to help the countries that seek development, whether such an *entente* will be made to our benefit or to our prejudice. It is to a certain extent natural that the great Powers should seek such an *entente* and, above all, for the preservation of the *status quo* – which, however, would benefit them only in the short run. However, under its shadow, and this is the only benefit which we receive, we who are less strong must seek only to realize a policy of closer and less tense cooperation in the international field. We must utilize this opening in order to obtain a better coordination of the less developed countries in the defense of their interests in economic and social progress.

This evolution has saved us from the specter of apocalyptic war, which would be the logical consequence of a boundless arms policy. This does not mean that the world has reached the certainty of being able to live in peace and security, a certainty which is the most profound aspiration of the majority of peoples. Many are those who still continue to suffer from the bitterness of armed conflict or who live under the recurrent threat of its intensification. We have to recognize that the contribution made by the countries not directly involved in those conflicts to their solution is precarious. And we have to admit that it is the very terror of total nuclear conflict which feeds or allows the growth of those localized wars.

The question of the Middle East deserves constant and real attention from all of us.

It is surprising – I would even say shocking – to see that the world seems to turn its preoccupations towards the Middle East only when a war crisis occurs in that disturbed region. The set of problems which for so many years have afflicted the peoples of the Middle East should require of the international community a concern to bring about continuous and creative cooperation. Within that context, if the implementation of Security Council resolution 242 (1967) may indeed constitute one of the

possibly indispensable conditions for the development of the solution to the problem, it is also true that that implementation does not exhaust the range of measures essential to the attainment of the greater objectives of peace, security, tranquility, and social and economic development of the countries of the region.

Objection to wars of conquest is a constant factor in the history of Brazil and a norm inscribed in our Constitution. We hold the right to territorial integrity and the obligation of respect for sovereignty to be absolute. Consequently, we believe that withdrawal from the occupied territories is uncontrovertibly an integral part of the solution to the conflict.

Only those frontiers which have been negotiated and recognized by all for the good of all will be calm. This is the solution which, by bringing them peace and security, will truly serve the countries of the region.

We, the countries of the American continent, are fortunate to have an institutional solution to such problems and we are proud that the security agreement binding us together has determined for many years now that all regional conflicts be solved starting from the initial and indispensable assumption that occupying forces are withdrawn from areas under military invasion.

The drama of the Middle East is enlarged and made universal to the extent that it involves human aspects which cannot be ignored. The community of nations must not spare any effort, including efforts made in conjunction with the peoples of the Middle East, to ensure that the sufferings of the Palestinian people are alleviated by appropriate measures. It is inhuman to consider that any solution that does not attend to their rights is equitable, and it is an illusion to think that such a solution would be lasting.

We are sure, on the other hand, that a greater effort of international cooperation with the countries of the Middle East in the economic and social fields may provide a decisive contribution to peace. It is gratifying to note that wide prospects seem to be opening up in this direction, and there will arise – if all parties, conscious of their growing responsibilities, work with creative imagination and firmness of intention – unprecedented modalities for cooperation which will be of great significance to the international community, and especially to the developing countries. Such cooperation, which is in the interest of all countries and all regions, if correctly implemented, may bring about results of extreme importance in the reorientation of the flows of trade of investments and of financing, correcting the existing distortions which contribute to insecurity and instability in the international field.

Latin America, in its mutual solidarity, has a clear conception of the challenge that the present crisis represents for each one of our countries. This challenge does not frighten us; rather, it stimulates us to redouble internally, within each country, the efforts needed to accelerate national progress, and to expand, in the external field, forms of cooperation to achieve common objectives resulting from the convergence of our national interests.

One of the characteristics of the time in which we are living is the growing command that developing countries are assuming over their natural resources. This evolution is allowing those countries to reduce their excessive dependence on the economies of the developed countries and better to orientate their own economic growth. It also opens up unprecedented opportunities for cooperation among developing countries.

In Latin America, an awareness of the importance of this process is visibly increasing. The full use of natural resources in Latin American countries is fundamental to the acceleration of the growth of the region and may become a relevant Latin American contribution to the alleviation of the world crises of energy, raw materials and food. At the same time, the strong cultural and political solidarity that binds together the countries of Latin America also makes joint endeavors in the economic field ever more viable. Thus we see ever-growing possibilities of cooperation in the use of natural resources common to or shared by more than one country. The novelty of this form of cooperation, at least on the scale on which it is being developed in Latin America, has not yet permitted a general understanding of its potential or of the problems it involves. I consider it important to bring before the international community my country's point of view on these questions.

Brazil considers that the free use and exploitation of the natural resources in its territory is a right inherent in the sovereignty of the State. Such a right cannot brook restrictions. In the case of resources which are, by nature, not static and which flow through the territory of more than one country, that right remains unalterable, those restrictions alone being acceptable that result from the obligation not to cause significant or permanent damage to the exploitation by other countries of the natural resources in their territories. To subordinate the sovereign utilization of our own natural resources to consultations of a suspending nature would be to introduce an intolerable disruption in international order, with the result of making the right that we were trying to preserve a mere "dead letter". The Brazilian Government, which does not refuse to make use of or to

resort to consultation between Governments in this as in any other matter, and which has resorted to this method of procedure frequently in the past, cannot accept the perversion of the cooperative function of consultation by questioning the sovereignty of States. For this reason, we think it is our duty to awaken the consciences of Governments to the implications of principles of consultation that would injure the sovereign right of countries to use their natural resources, and that, though seemingly constructive, would be potentially disruptive to the international order, which it is our aim to preserve, and an impediment to the material progress of nations, which it is our objective to stimulate. We should all be aware that natural resources, the use of which it is intended to regulate in opposition to the sovereign decisions of territorial Governments, do not flow over ground only. There are those that flow beneath the ground, as there are those that flow in the territorial sea. The characteristics of certain resources must be the motive for responsible behavior on the part of those who use them, rather than for hindering their use and thus benefiting no party at all.

We are experiencing all these problems in Latin America and we are seeking solutions to them based on the principles of harmony of interests, peaceful understanding and enlightened cooperation, principles that this Organization has established as the foundations of international life. If I bring to this rostrum the example of Latin America, it is because I sincerely believe that it constitutes a positive contribution to the realization of the ideals of the United Nations.

My reflections have barely touched on some items of the agenda for the present session. The reason is that I have tried to confine myself to an enunciation of Brazil's position on questions that belong to the agenda of mankind more than to the agenda of the Assembly, and on the set of fundamental problems, the solution of which will determine the shape of the coming decades.

I have chosen to concern myself with those problems that are more closely connected with the aspirations of liberty, human dignity, justice, progress and peace. On many of these questions the international community has made considerable progress. On others, the results obtained have been imperceptible. Nevertheless, there is no reason for dismay. The severity of the problems should constitute for all of us not a reason for disenchantment, but an incentive to redoubled efforts, creative imagination and fidelity to the purposes and principles upon which this Organization of sovereign States was built.

New York, September 23, 1974.

1975

1975

In 1975, as the Helsinki Conference brought to life one of the seeds of *détente*, in the African continent many confrontational situations arose as a result of the growing Soviet and Cuban involvement in countries like Ethiopia and Angola. Soviet support to North Vietnamese armies in South Vietnam, in violation of the Paris 1973 agreements of which the Soviet Union was a guarantor, was received in Washington as an insult to the spirit of *détente*.

In truth, despite its occasional variations, Brazilian diplomacy had never been deluded by *détente*. In his speech before the Thirtieth General Assembly, Minister Azeredo da Silveira reiterated the Brazilian criticism to power politics. If there is a crisis at the United Nations, he said, it does not originate, either in part or eyen primarily, in the structural faults of the Organization, "but rather in the decision, inspired by considerations of power, not to resort to such means as it places within the reach of States".

In a language of precise diplomatic technique, the Foreign Minister pointed out the mistake of withdrawing from the consideration of the multilateral forum fundamental issues, such as disarmament, thus yielding to the security interests of the superpowers. Vigorously expressed mentions to the reform of the Charter responded to the same line of concern in consonance with the Brazilian traditional posture.

Economic themes again appeared emphatically in the Brazilian speech. In a criticism of GATT, whose action, the Minister said, were mainly directed to the interests of the industrialized countries, the

negotiation of a general trade agreement between developed and developing nations was proposed. In the light of the reality brought about by the oil crisis, it was believed that negotiations between developed and developing countries might, for the first time in History, be less unequal and lead to concrete results.

The new direction of Brazilian external policy has brought about important changes in the bilateral relationship with the United States. The transformations experienced by politics in Brazil were followed with some concern in Washington, in particular the immediate recognition granted to the MPLA Government in Angola, which placed Brazil side by side with the Cuban troops that supported the victorious movement of Agostinho Neto. Not less disquieting, from the point of view of the Department of State, were the moves that led Brazil to growing closeness with the Arab countries and even the cooperation lines that Brazil sought to intensify with other developed partners, one of the main results of which would be the Brazil-FRG Nuclear Agreement, whose implementation aimed at permitting the absorption by Brazil of the mastery of the full atomic cycle, from uranium fission to its enrichment, electricity production and plutonium processing. At the start of his speech, as if to redeem decades of policies that had taken Brazil away from African countries, the Minister hailed the admission of Cape Verde, São Tomé e Principe and Mozambique in the United Nations. He expressed the fraternal understanding of Brazil with the current process in Angola, not without expressing, in an indirect reference to Cuba, the expectation that the new African nation would ensure its territorial integrity and independence free from external interferences of any kind.

Because of its symbolic character, however, the point that generated the greatest divergence between the Brazilian and American Governments was the decision taken by the Geisel Administration to vote in favor of the draft resolution that classified Sionism as a form for racism and racial discrimination.

XXX Regular Session of the General Assembly of the United Nations 1975

Minister Antonio Francisco Azeredo da Silveira [*]

Mr. President,

May my first words express the satisfaction with which the delegation of Brazil received the news of your election to the presidency of the Thirtieth Session of the General Assembly. Luxembourg has a long history of peaceful coexistence and international cooperation which, along with your personal qualities, augurs well for a particularly productive session.

It is also a pleasure for me to voice the recognition of the delegation of Brazil for the dedication and efficiency with which the Minister for Foreign Affairs of Algeria, the eminent Mr. Abdelaziz Bouteflika, guided the work of the Twenty-Ninth Session and the Seventh Special Session just concluded.

The tradition that the delegation of Brazil opens the general debate offers me the very particular satisfaction of being able to extend the first welcome to the delegations of three new Members of this Organization. These are Cape Verde, São Tome and Principe, and Mozambique. Brazil is especially linked to these nations by the ties of a past that is common in many respects and that we now wish to see projected towards a future of cooperation and understanding. I am certain that the presence of the

[*] **Antonio Francisco Azeredo da Silveira**, Born in Rio de Janeiro, RJ, September 22, 1917. Third Secretary, public selection process, 1943. First Class Minister, by merit, 1964. Minister of State for External Relations from 3/15/1974 to 3/15/1979. † Rio de Janeiro, April 27, 1990.

three Members in this Organization will be reflected in benefits for the international community.

In greeting the new Portuguese-speaking nations that have joined the Organization, I wish to express the fraternal understanding with which Brazil follows the unfolding process of decolonization in Angola. Brazil feels linked to the future new African State by ties of history and blood that underscore the community of interests resulting from a spirit of brotherliness forged over the Atlantic. We extend our wish that those who so vigorously promoted the liberation of Angola may overcome the difficulties of the present moment in order to give the new nation the political stability that will definitively ensure its territorial integrity and its independence, free from foreign interference of any kind.

Our Organization is about to conclude the third decade of its existence. For individuals, as well as for institutions, 30 years of life has a more than merely chronological significance, in the sense that that space of time usually covers fundamental changes in social life and coincides with the very rhythm by which generations succeed one another and history is renewed. The United Nations is undergoing a dynamic and critical revision which could, we all hope, renew it and prepare it for the difficult tasks of the coming years. That impulse for renewal is not generated spontaneously. It springs from all of us who compose the Organization and who are, in fact, its essence.

That is a fact frequently overlooked in evaluating the performance of the Organization during these 30 years. Thus it is that the frustrations felt by the international community are systematically attributed to the United Nations as an Organization, when, in the majority of cases, they result from the very limitations inherent in the current international order. Our Organization, however flexible its constitutional structure may be, does not operate within a closed system but in an ambience of constant interaction with the international macrostructure.

Thus, the skepticism which for some time has surrounded the activity of the United Nations often constitutes a kind of shifting of blame by which States attempt to absolve themselves from responsibility for the failures that, in the final analysis, rest primarily upon them. As far as Brazil is concerned, we prefer to avoid straying into a state of general pessimism, in the same way that we frankly avoid the illusions of an equally unrealistic international optimism. Above all, we lean towards a sober vision of the limitations and the possibilities of the United Nations, a vision that would lead us to achieving the objectives of its Charter with a maximum of efficiency.

We do not deny reality and we recognize that the United Nations has been unable to achieve the lofty objectives entrusted to it in such fundamental areas as the maintenance of international peace and, security and the creation of a more equitable international economic order.

It was customary initially to attribute the limitations of the United Nations in respect of maintaining peace and security to the trauma of the cold war, which paralyzed the will of the Organization in those frequent cases in which a conflict of interests occurred between the superpowers. Currently, the tendency is to blame *détente*, a policy which would dispense with the intervention of the United Nations and permit a direct and bilateral understanding between the two principal centers of world power. In any event, both trends reflect the same reluctance, rooted in centuries of power politics, to accept the workings of a system such as that of the United Nations, which aims at the adoption of horizontal guidelines based on the principle of the sovereign equality of States, in favor of a vertical system marginal to the Charter and founded on subordination. The so-called crisis of the United Nations, as far as the implementation of its loftiest objective is concerned, is based on that fact. It does not originate, either in part or eyen primarily, in the structural faults of the Organization, but rather in the decision, inspired by considerations of power, not to resort to such means as it places within the reach of States.

The long history of disarmament negotiations is a striking example of what I have just said. Article II, paragraph I, of the Charter of the United Nations expressly mentions "the principles governing disarmament and the regulation of armaments" as constituting the special responsibility of the General Assembly and of the Security Council, as does Article 26. Nevertheless, for some years now disarmament negotiations have been experiencing a growing bilateralization that limits all initiatives in the matter to the two superpowers, as if the security of those powers exists above or at the margin of the international community, or as if the developing nations did not have their own security interests, which are qualitatively different from the security interests of the great Powers or even of the developed nations.

The examples that may be extracted from an analysis of the conduct of the United Nations in the economic area are no less eloquent. In that sphere, we must recognize that the Charter was less precise in formulating the objectives and principles for international cooperation. But those were different times. During the past 30 years great progress has been made in the universal awareness of the real significance of economic cooperation. The United Nations rendered significant service in this respect, having

served as the principal forum for the dialogue between the major groups, the developed and the developing nations. Notwithstanding, the multiplication of specific forums for dealing with economic matters within the Organization, there has always existed, particularly on the part of the Governments of the more developed nations, an unshakable objection to considering as guidelines recommendations designed to orient international cooperation in a way that would foster the balanced development of the community of nations.

Such thoughts do not relieve us of the responsibility to rethink these mechanisms and reorder the activities of the Organization. On the contrary, they should stimulate our efforts in that regard.

Brazil has given all its support to the work of the *Ad Hoc* Committee on the Charter of the United Nations. But we understand that the updating of the United Nations must include, along with a revision of the Charter, the adoption of measures that might be put into force independently of amendments to the basic document of the Organization. In fact, this concerns two means leading to the same end, both of which must be undertaken jointly.

The revision of the Charter, as is natural in constitutional reforms, gives rise to unfounded enthusiasms and unjustified fears. We should moderate the former and dissipate the latter through an objective effort to identify those Articles that really should be amended. Above all, we should avoid overambitious plans for an ideal revision, which the Charter does not need, in favor of a pragmatic reform that transforms it in the light of what the experience of 30 years has taught us. We should bring together the results of different efforts dispersed among various organs, such as the *ad hoc* Committee on the Charter, the Special Committee on Peacekeeping Operations and the Group of Experts on the Structure of the United Nations System. Finally, we should not overlook the possibility of reforms that do not require a revision of the Charter. If these premises are observed, I believe that a revision is politically feasible, as is evident from the progress already achieved with the approval of amendments to Articles 23, 27 and 61 of the Charter, which came into force in 1965.

During the Seventh Special Session, I had the opportunity to express the position of Brazil concerning the present state and future perspectives of international economic relations. Whereas a reasonably efficient structure of guidelines prevails in economic relations among industrialized nations, a *virtual laissez-faire* prevails in the relations between developed and developing nations. The main reason for this lack of symmetry was the fact that, until recently, recessions originated

at the centre of the world economic system, that is, in the industrialized nations, and propagated themselves in the direction of the periphery, that is, towards the developing nations.

From this perspective, it was determined that the crises could be overcome by anti-cyclical regulations in the national sphere in the more developed nations, complemented by trade and monetary accords among them. Similarly, according to this reasoning, an objective solidarity of interests existed between the centre and the periphery. The latter, being the first to feel the repercussions of a crisis, would benefit from a renewed expansion of interchange among the industrialized nations.

The current crisis in the world economic system differs considerably from that model. This time, the periphery, instead of passively suffering the effects of the crisis, has also engendered pressures of a recessionary nature. The destabilizing potential of the current international division of labor and the risks inherent in the current structure of North-South economic relations were cruelly felt. Today it is no longer possible not to recognize the need to extend to the relations between industrialized and developing nations the structure of guidelines until now limited to the industrialized sector of the world.

It was in the light of these observations that the delegation of Brazil proposed, during the Seventh Special Session, the negotiation of a general agreement on trade between developed and developing nations, in order to provide a political-juridical matrix for specific negotiations. Such a general accord would not be a substitute for general agreements in force, nor would it attempt to replace existing forums and mechanisms. But it certainly would be an attempt to bridge the gaps left by these and correct the distortions resulting from a vision centered on the developed nations.

On that occasion we stated that we believed the time had come to proceed from declarations of principles and maximalist claims to a negotiation of specific guidelines to govern the economic relations between developed and developing nations.

We do not ignore the important role that resolutions adopted in the General Assembly and other forums of the United Nations have played and continue to play in the formation of a universal awareness of the problem of development. In this respect, what is declaratory or seeks vindication is not irrelevant. We find, then, that many of the ideas presented so far have already matured, especially in the heat of debates and antagonisms. We believe that the time has come to undertake negotiating efforts that will lead to concrete and comprehensive results. We wish to build on what has already been achieved by the alert warnings of the past. We believe that it

is time to proceed beyond warnings and appeals, just as we believe that is too late for palliative or miniaturized solutions.

A general agreement of the type we propose would be the antithesis of all that. It would be structured for the purpose of operational efficiency and would attack the problems of international trade in a direct manner and at the very core. For the developing nations, it is a matter of recognizing their right of access to the markets of developed nations for their export products – not only their raw materials, but also, and in a growing manner, for their manufactured goods. It is also a matter of recognizing their right of access to the markets of assets which are indispensable to the development process, be they material or cultural. For the developed nations, it is a matter of recognizing, reciprocally, their right to guarantees of supplies of raw materials under equitable conditions of price and as a counterpart to concessions offered to the developing nations.

The negotiation of such a general agreement should not interrupt the understandings arrived at within the scope of the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade, which so far have attended primarily to the needs of the industrialized nations. On the other hand, it would not prejudge the negotiation of specific mechanisms aimed at preserving the purchasing power of the export earnings of nations producing specific raw materials. All these efforts would be complementary if certain general guidelines were accepted by the parties as being capable of governing international cooperation.

The admittedly brief period available to the Seventh Special Session to carry out its mandate did not permit an in-depth examination of the proposal then made by Brazil. Nevertheless, I am certain that it will be possible to reflect on its terms during the session that is now beginning. The fact is that we have today, for the first time in the history of international economic negotiations, a real opportunity to begin the task of constructing a new world economic order. For the first time the developed nations and the developing nations are in a position to achieve concrete results, since the negotiating conditions are less unequal than before.

We have before us a long general debate and a complex agenda that will demand our best efforts during the coming three months. At the end of that period, we shall have made progress on several questions, advanced slowly on others and perhaps achieved nothing on some. The decision-making process in multilateral diplomacy is slow by its very nature and constantly challenges the subtlety and patience of those who practice it. Nevertheless, there is no more effective alternative for the

consideration of the problems that are constantly increasing today and that are of interest to a large number of States.

We must not succumb to the quantitative temptation of measuring the achievements of the United Nations by using the arithmetic applied to decisions implemented, problems resolved and objectives achieved. Its influence is more subtle and diffused. The Organization should also be assessed on the basis of the trends it impresses upon, and the directions it sets for, the international community. Also, it acts principally through ideas, which historically have constituted a more efficient agent of political change than other forces, such as power, to which homage is so frequently paid.

New York, September 22, 1975.

1976

1976

1976 was a year of significant changes in the international panorama. The passing of Mao Zedong and Chou-en-Lai opened the way for the renewal of the Chinese leadership. The election of Jimmy Carter in the United States would bring back – albeit for a short period – the Democrats to the presidency of the United States, still stung by the humiliating defeat in Vietnam.

In Brazil, President Geisel faced right at the beginning of the year the crisis resulting from the dismissal of the commander of the II Army for repeated violations of the physical integrity of political prisoners in São Paulo. At the same time, he kept the exceptionality of the regime by canceling the mandates of several parliamentarians. The security situation remained tense in the country with many attacks and kidnappings. Despite the resumption of inflation, still resulting from the oil crisis, Brazil was able to maintain its development rhythm as the year closed with a GDP growth rate of 8 per cent.

Secretary of State Henry Kissinger and Foreign Minister Azeredo da Silveira noted the interest in solidifying the channels of dialogue and bilateral cooperation in this environment of internal and external change and set up a mechanism of reciprocal consultations on issues of mutual interest and committed themselves, by way of a Memorandum of Understanding, to meet at six month intervals. While it might have been perceived otherwise and with different nuances in one or the other country, the memorandum of understanding marked an innovative stage

in the relations between Brazil and the United States, by attributing to them nominally egalitarian characteristics. For the Brazilian diplomacy, the objective was to reach an equal relationship with the USA, in which both countries could interact without the usual constraints of client or dependence situations. The spirit that presided over the negotiation of the memorandum, however, did not last long. The election of President Carter at the end of the year gave new directions to the American foreign policy that were not particularly consonant with the realism of Kissinger's visions, with which the "responsible pragmatism" of Minister Silveira was attuned.

Sustained by a "recovered" relationship with the United States, Brazilian diplomacy continued its updating in 1976. Ambassadors to Angola and Mozambique were named. In successive visits to France and England President Geisel reinforced cooperation with the European partners. The same thing occurred vis-à-vis Kapan, which the President visited in September.

In his speech before the Thirty-First Session of the General Assembly, Minister Silveira continued to criticize power politics and the growing devaluing of the United Nations, in particular the impasses that characterized the work of the Security Council especially regarding the crises in Africa and the Middle East. Brazil's emergence continued to be stressed, characterized by a rhetoric of opposition to the entrenchment in the international system, a label under which the concept of the "freezing" of world power once again appears in the Brazilian discourse, together with criticism to the false theories of interdependence.

The great emphasis of the 1976 speech is again economic. Stating that economic development was a right of the peoples, the Minister denounced the loss of relative positions in international trade by developing countries and rejects the trends already felt with growing intensity at the time to enhance the environmental dimension of development: "invoking ecological motives in order to frustrate expectations for development would be a new and unacceptable form of domination". From then on this reasoning would form the basis for the Brazilian environmental policy in the multilateral field.

XXXI Regular Session of the General Assembly of the United Nations 1976

Minister Antonio Francisco Azeredo da Silveira [*]

Mr. President,

Allow me first to say how pleased I am to see Ambassador Hamilton Shirley Amerasinghe vested with the presidency of the Thirty-First Session of the General Assembly of the United Nations. Ambassador Amerasinghe is a man who enjoys great prestige in international forums, in which he has served with particular distinction as the representative of the Government of his noble country, Sri Lanka, and his presence presiding over the work of this General Assembly is a guarantee of calm and proficiency in the lofty functions which the international community has called upon him to perform.

I should also like to address a word of sincere appreciation to the Prime Minister of the Grand Duchy of Luxembourg, Mr. Gaston Thorn, for the relevant contribution he made to the General Assembly as President of its Thirtieth Session.

Moreover, I am happy to be able to welcome the Republic of Seychelles on the happy occasion of that State's becoming a Member of the United Nations. The Brazilian delegation wishes to establish a close and friendly relationship with the delegation of Seychelles and hopes to cooperate intimately with that delegation when we deal with the items on our agenda.

[*] **Antonio Francisco Azeredo da Silveira**, Born in Rio de Janeiro, RJ, September 22,1917. Third Secretary, public selection process, 1943. First Class Minister, by merit, 1964. Minister of State for External Relations from 3/15/1974 to 3/15/1979. † Rio de Janeiro, April 27, 1990.

In recent years the United Nations has become the target for mounting criticism leveled against its operation. The time has certainly come to place these criticisms, which are at times quite blunt, in true perspective. It would not be difficult to ascertain how much of this attitude is self-serving. Such an attitude does not meet the most enlightened interests of nations, those very interests which justified the creation of the United Nations and its later call to universality. Therefore, it is always opportune to reaffirm in a constructive manner that the international responsibility of this Organization derives from commitments freely and spontaneously undertaken by States under the Charter of the United Nations, commitments which do not admit of exceptions or reservations.

The United Nations is a political organism immersed in a world which is also political. The United Nations, in reality, constitutes the only political forum of universal scope at the disposal of States. In addition to fulfilling the normative functions laid down in its Charter, the United Nations must deliberate on the international problems the Member States bring to it in order to safeguard their national interests at the international level.

Accordingly, international problems of the most varied nature are included in the agenda of the General Assembly, and those problems must be discussed according to the procedures set forth in the Charter and in the rules of procedure of the General Assembly. As is only natural, such discussion entails characteristically parliamentary behavior and attitudes. It would be illusory to think that such procedures and related behavior could ever be isolated from the political circumstances that generated the problems and from those surrounding their discussion. The United Nations does not function in a world apart from the real world where political facts take place. Events in this hall are not independent of the real context of international relations. Quite the contrary, what happens here reflects a wider political reality. That reality explains better than words the atmosphere of frustration and tension which at times prevails in this forum. The debates in the General Assembly and the resolutions that this body, more than any other major organ of the United Nations, has the capacity to adopt make equally apparent the hopes and the disappointments of the Member States and portray both the advances and the set-backs in the international political process.

In recent years international life has gained much in complexity. Not only have new States been admitted to the United Nations but also increasingly varied matters are being subjected to international rule, as

witness the current cycle of great thematic conferences held under the aegis of the United Nations. This broadening of the scope of multilateral negotiations mayor may not be of benefit to the majority of States. In many cases, it is; in others, it may also serve to direct attention towards problems of secondary importance, an attention that should, first and foremost, be concentrated upon the fundamental issues of international security and the harmonious development of nations. For the process of universal negotiation to produce lasting results, however, it is necessary to keep it under the authority of the principle of sovereign equality, a principle that ensures to States equitable participation in international decisions affecting the future of each State and of mankind as a whole.

It must perforce be recognized that, as an organization essentially devoted to promoting international peace and security, the United Nations does not present a record of important gains in recent years. The picture is rather one of institutional and operational impasses. The machinery of collective security seems to be obstructed, decisions are delayed and, when they are taken, they meet frequent obstacles in the way of their implementation.

This weakening of the central functions of the Organization is symbolized by the deadlocks that characterize the proceedings of the Security Council. The unrestricted use of the veto continues to leave room for apprehension, particularly as no special diligence can be noted on the part of some permanent members of the Security Council to seek negotiated solutions for the delicate questions submitted to that body. It seems paradoxical that two apparently contradictory tendencies coexist on the world scene, namely, a relaxation of international tension, especially between the superpowers, and a weakening of the collective security machinery of the United Nations.

Such deadlocks are found in almost all multilateral efforts in the field of international security, as can be seen from the deadlocks which over the years have dominated the negotiations for both disarmament, particularly nuclear disarmament, and peacekeeping operations.

Stalemates in the political field are one aspect of the stratification that characterizes the present international structure. Perhaps only the advances made towards decolonization allow us to discern a trend away from stratification, a trend that holds out new possibilities for positive interrelationships and for a more just international order.

We are living in an era marked by dissent and by the persistence of areas of international tension, as well as the permanence of generalized conditions of underdevelopment. I do not now intend to list these areas of

tensions but the eye is immediately caught by what is happening in Africa and in the Middle East.

Southern Africa, where racial oppression persists, is today not only seized with unrest and fear but also devastated by violence and slaughter. In the face recent events, the items now on our agenda concerning problems that afflict that region have taken on unprecedented importance. Brazil has always been in favor of peaceful solutions for those problems and has always been convinced that there was no time to be lost in arriving at them. Our opinion, repeatedly stated over the years was that, unless solutions were promptly reached, the region would be irresistibly drawn into open conflict. Unhappily, we have no reason to revise our diagnosis, but we should still like to believe that the unanimous international repudiation of the injustices committed will serve a grave warning to those that consider it possible to continue to maintain racial oppression. It is our hope that the people of Zimbabwe and Namibia, which still have not achieved their independence, may soon be able freely to exercise their true national will.

In the Middle East, alongside the Lebanese tragedy, which Brazil particularly regrets because of the ties of all kinds that we have with Lebanon, the same basic problem still exist, problems that have for years been challenging the political ability of the international community. The reactivation of these problems is a disquieting prospect, one that is always possible and always present.

The experience of the last few years confirms the widely shared perception that, in the absence of speedy and just solutions for regional conflicts or disputes, and disputes end up by acquiring a wider international character, thus disseminating to other regions and to the international system as a whole an unrest which was initially localized. Contrary to what might have been expected, the present situation of relative international strategic balance has not created favorable conditions for the prompt correction of those localized situations. The Brazilian delegation is convinced that, in dealing with these difficult issues, more intensive use should be made of the United Nations not only because the Organization offers the parties opportunities for negotiations but also because among the principles of the Charter, there is one concerning the non-use of force or the threat of force in international relations.

Sadly, it is today considered commonplace to affirm that the disparity between the developed and the underdeveloped countries has become flagrantly unbearable and that it is urgent to negotiate concrete measures to correct it. Four sessions of the United Nations Conference on Trade and Development have already been held and, ironically, not one but

two decades have, one after the other, been declared to be United Nations Development Decades. A variety of formats of negotiation have been attempted during that period. We have participated on the international level in case by case approaches; we have negotiated programs in different themes; we have been present at countless generic declarations. All those efforts have led to such scanty results that their paucity is now universally acknowledged.

There is increasing frustration, as much in practice as in theory, over the whole basic issue of international trade and the economic and social development of the less developed countries. If we exclude the oil-producing countries from our analysis, we can see that the net transfer of capital from the developed areas to the less-developed is becoming a myth. In net terms, that flow may shortly run from south to north. And while the relative participation of the less developed countries in world trade is dwindling, there is a disproportionate increase of their presence in generating the surplus that is accumulating in balance of payments of the main world business partners.

All that is all the more surprising since it can be shown that if the financial transfers of the developed countries to developing ones were directed into productive sectors they would not detrimentally affect the possibilities for economic growth of the developed countries themselves. Studies prepared by experts of the United Nations show that if, as a hypothesis, the net flow of capital to non-oil-exporting developing countries reached in the next few years levels compatible with the objectives of the Second United Nations Development Decade – that is to say, an average rate of increase of the gross national product of at least 6 per cent – the income of the developed countries members of the Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development would increase at a rate faster than the present one. Contrary to what superficial reasoning might lead one to believe, the effective implementation of measures designed to maintain the international buying power of the developing countries would not have a negative effect on the developed countries but would benefit them by increasing their income and their rate of employment. Moreover, it is possible to predict that this expansion would occur precisely in the less inflationary sectors of their economies.

The debate about the essence of the problem of underdevelopment has lost its impetus although attitudes persist that seem to wish to impute to the developing countries an alleged guilt for their conditions of economic backwardness. This determination of historical guilt lacks any practical sense and should not be used to avoid or postpone

concrete negotiations, or to lead countries to fail take more constructive stands in international economic negotiations. The so called sterile confrontations have their origin precisely in the general frustration felt by the underdeveloped countries at the diplomatic immobility that such attitudes engender or stimulate.

To this negativism, founded on alleged reasons drawn from the past, there recently has been added another, this one addressed to futurological concerns. It is alleged that for ecological reasons the economic development of the underdeveloped countries of today is no longer practicable. Now, the stagnation of the poorer areas of the globe cannot be the price to be paid to conserve the environment. What is really necessary is to proceed to a broad reorganization of the world economy so as to correct the acute disparities both in the distribution of the means of production and in the patterns of consumption. Invoking ecological motives in order to frustrate expectations for development would be a new and unacceptable form of domination that would meet with the opposition of all those peoples that have been subjected to colonialism and that, despite all the predications to the contrary, knew how to organize themselves politically in order to achieve their independence and to preserve it, as well as to struggle for their economic autonomy.

As this century draws to a close, the people of the world have a right to social and economic development, and it is a right they do not intend to give up.

The other face of the struggle for development is the increasing interdependence of States. Opening the general debate of last year's session of the General Assembly, I had the opportunity to dwell on the distinction Brazil believes should be drawn between the present vertical interdependence – that is, one based on a rigid and discriminatory international stratification – and a desirable horizontal interdependence that would be founded on a legitimate community of interest and on equitable sharing of the world's wealth by all States.

Today, I wish to add that the persistence of underdevelopment, resulting as it does in the continued political and economic marginalization of most developing countries, will inevitably hold back the evolution of the process of interdependence of States itself.

It is especially disquieting to note that, although external trade may be more and more significant for the economy of developing countries as a whole, the share of these countries in the international flow of trade – the oil exporters naturally excluded – is less and less important in percentage terms. The great majority of developing countries is losing

ground in the global exchange of goods and services, and what is more, even as suppliers of raw materials to developed countries, which more and more have taken to trading among themselves. If this trend continues, developing countries will be pushed farther and farther to the edges of the international economic system.

As a result, the integration of the world economy is being carried out at the cost of a radical disequilibrium that it is urgent to correct. It is unacceptable for the process of interdependence to continue indefinitely to accentuate exclusively the expansion of the strength of the great industrial centers, where the essential part of the world's technical and economic capacity is concentrated.

It is necessary to give a new meaning, more just and more open, to the dynamics of interdependence. The imbalance that distorts it must be speedily eliminated and the only way to do that which is consonant with the general interest is to create international conditions for the real and not just the apparent overcoming of economic underdevelopment. An essential facet of the joint efforts we should undertake along these lines is the narrowing of the technological gap, not only by transferring technology from north to south but also by establishing an international structure which will facilitate the production by developing countries of the technology they need.

An awareness of these new needs is, happily enough, being spread. There are those who think, however, that obsolescence of States will be the inevitable counterpart of the general process of interdependence. I do not think so. World economic integration cannot dispense with the role of States, which, far from being mere cartographic facts, reflect ineradicable political realities. On the contrary, for interdependence to continue on its course with a minimum of attrition and as a rational, consensual and harmonious process, it can only be based on the independence of States and on the gradual elimination of the economic disparities between them.

I have attempted to show that disequilibrium and disparities are not limited to the socio-economic field but also permeate the sphere of multilateral political negotiations. These disparities will remain as long as there is an unyielding conflict between development and underdevelopment, as long as the transition from the latter to the former economic stage is obstructed by external factors, as long as here and in other forums impasses continue to impede operative understandings for the removal of international obstacles to development.

It is in this context that the United Nations must do more than simply reflect international reality; in fulfillment of the functions conferred upon it by the Charter, the United Nations must discharge a positive role in changing the present international structure. In spite of all the difficulties, Brazil still cherishes the hope that we can carry out this task by taking the path of comprehension and understanding among States, understanding and comprehension based on sovereign equality, on equity and mutual respect.

New York, September 27, 1976.

1977

1977

The election of President Carter brought about radical changes in the American policy toward Brazil. Mentioning the Silveira-Kissinger memorandum of 1976 as an example of the Republican external policy that he intended to overcome, Carter has shown since the campaign little inclination to engage in a dialogue with the Brazilian Government which he considered part of a regional context of antidemocratic and anti-human rights militarism. Determined to make non-proliferation one of the fundamental elements of his foreign policy, Carter had already announced in his campaign, on the other hand, his decision to prevent the implementation of the Brazil-FRG nuclear agreement. Upon his inauguration, President Carter quickly put into practice his announced policies toward Brazil. He met cohesive reactions and well articulated resistance. An important consequence of this period of friction with the United States was the denunciation by Brazil of the 1952 military agreements, under whose aegis the process of interrelationshipship between the Armed Forces of the two countries after World War II. Already perceived by the Brazilian military as remnants of a situation of dependence that the growth of the country and the strengthening of the national armaments industry had made anachronistic, the military agreements were denounced by Brazil under the pretext of the remittance to the American Congress by the Carter Administration of the report on the state of human rights in Brazil.

The speech by Minister Azeredo da Silveira before the Thirty-Second General Assembly reflects this complex context and contains a number of postulations that indicate the difficult conjuncture that Brazil faced vis-à-vis the United States. The Brazilian position on the NPT was justified and the nuclear agreement with the FRG was presented as exclusively oriented toward peaceful purposes. On the other hand, in a clear message to the United States, the principle on non-intervention was reaffirmed according to what could be termed "military nationalism": "cooperation presupposes respect for national identities and for the sovereign right of States to seek the most adequate ways to reach the goals of welfare and progress of their peoples". Further down: "Non-intervention in the internal and external affairs of States and attachment to peaceful and effective means for the solution of occasional disputes, which stem very often from the very closeness of their relationship, constitute the incalculable heritage of the countries of that region. And more: "… cooperation… presupposes as a basic requirement respect for national identity and for the sovereignty of States."

In the light of the delicate situation created by the tensions between a Government that allegedly wished to liberalize Brazilian politics and the reactions to American pressure, Minister Silveira would make considerable room in his 1977 speech to expound the Brazilian policy regarding human rights. On the one hand he stated that the nuclear arms race and inequalities existing in the world prevented human rights to be in full effect at the level of the planet, and, on the other, he reaffirmed the exclusive competence of States to deal with human rights problems in their national jurisdictions.

The 1977 speech did not fail to contain the compulsory condemnation to the lack of progress on nuclear disarmament and the gaps and imperfections of the NPT. In this context the Minister explained the exclusively peaceful purposes of the Brazilian nuclear program that had been put under suspicion by the American opposition to the agreement signed with the FRG.

He also did not fail to make precise references to the question of the Middle East (in terms favorable to the postulations of the Arab countries), to the situation in the South of Africa (in favor of the aspirations of the countries in the region), and to trade and development issues (with a repeated mention to the Brazilian proposal on collective economic security).

XXXII Regular Session of the General Assembly of the United Nations 1977

Minister Antonio Francisco Azeredo da Silveira [*]

Mr. President,

Permit me to express to you the satisfaction of the Brazilian delegation at seeing you presiding over this session of the General Assembly. I bring you our congratulations on your unanimous election to this high office.

I also wish to express the appreciation of my delegation for the manner in which Ambassador Hamilton Shirley Amerasinghe conducted the work of the Thirty–First Session.

Brazil supports the principle of the universality of the Organization, to the fulfillment of which we draw nearer each passing year. It is, therefore, always a pleasure to mark the admission of new Member States to the United Nations as we now do in the case of Vietnam and Djibouti. We hope that other peoples that still seek their independence will shortly join us in the common endeavor to promote international peace and security.

The United Nations mirrors a concept of international relations based on mutual respect and cooperation among States. Although in some Articles of the Charter allowances were made for the realities of power, it is undeniable that the principle of equality among States is one of the fundamental pillars of the Charter. The cooperation which is sought is

[*] **Antonio Francisco Azeredo da Silveira**, Born in Rio de Janeiro, RJ, September 22, 1917. Third Secretary, public selection process, 1943. First Class Minister, by merit, 1964. Minister of State for External Relations from 3/15/1974 to 3/15/1979. † Rio de Janeiro, April 27, 1990.

horizontal cooperation among sovereign States, in which there is no room for hegemony or subordination. The Charter of the United Nations as the supreme instrument of contemporary international law urges each of the States here represented to cooperate and to harmonize our interests in accordance with the parameters defined in its principles and purposes. Such cooperation naturally presupposes the seeking of a point of convergence which would be of benefit to all countries. To Brazil cooperation is a spontaneous gesture flowing from the ecumenical nature of its people. As Brazil understands and practices it, cooperation presupposes respect for national identities and for the sovereign right of States to seek the most adequate ways to reach the goals of welfare and progress of their peoples. It presupposes, therefore, respect for the principle of non-intervention in the domestic affairs of States which, more than a general principle of the United Nations, is a legal obligation assumed by all States upon signing and ratifying the Charter.

The factors which contribute most to the frustration of the first of the purposes of the Organization, namely those of guarding peace and avoiding the use of force in the settlement of international disputes, still exist. The reason is that among the areas of action of the United Nations that of disarmament is perhaps the one in which the positive results have been fewest and on which the strengthening of international peace and security is most dependent.

In spite of that, Brazil continues to regard disarmament as one of the central endeavors of our time. New and redoubled international efforts in that direction must be made, for the meagre results hitherto obtained fall far short of the needs of the international community. The first of those needs, it cannot be repeated too often, is the very survival of human beings; and it is in the light of this, the greatest of all needs, that all others should be seen, such as the establishment of true conditions of international peace and security in order to benefit all peoples without distinction and to offer them tranquility and the advantages of economic and technological progress.

The States which have the greatest potential ability to jeopardize our life on earth also have a correlated specific responsibility for facilitating the progressive attainment of understanding among all nations, with a view to the setting up of a more stable and equitable international political and economic order. The international acceptance of these values is not a simple matter of convenience but, in the world of today, a condition for survival.

The inefficacy of multilateral efforts on disarmament and the paucity of results achieved up to now can only be a cause for disquiet. The ban on nuclear tests in three environments, besides being incomplete, has contributed little or nothing to the aims of disarmament or even to arms control. There is little confidence that international undertakings now in force will be sufficient to guarantee the use of outer space for exclusively peaceful ends. In relation to the seas and oceans, the only progress achieved relates to the ban on placing nuclear weapons and weapons of mass destruction on the seabed, on the ocean floor and in the subsoil thereof. The Convention on bacteriological weapons was made possible only because the countries which do not possess such weapons in their armories have made great concessions, including the relinquishment of a mechanism for verification and safeguards and the acceptance of a separate negotiation of a convention on the prohibition of the development, production and stockpiling of all chemical weapons and on their destruction.

The arms race goes on. Strategic weapons are still being perfected and multiplied. The introduction of new generations of tactical nuclear armaments seems to be accompanied by the generalization of a tolerant attitude towards their possible use. By this course – and apart from the fact that the new weapons have an enormous potential for destruction – almost insensibly a new option is open for a possible nuclear escalation. Especially cruel weapons continue to be invented. These developments, as well as the dangerous experiments being made in genetic engineering, jeopardize the rights of all peoples and the integrity of the human person, both now and in the future.

We must not forget that it is in this context – in which negotiations among States coexist with the still inexorable pursuit of the arms race – that are rightly placed the efforts being made towards the non-proliferation of nuclear weapons, although these are not the only element in the problem. It does not seem to me necessary to repeat at this moment the criticism of the gaps and grave imperfections of those efforts, as mirrored in the 1968 Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons. This criticism was put forward by the signers of that Treaty themselves, during the Review Conference which took place in 1975.

In this regard, the Brazilian Government has recently had in an official document with wide international distribution, the opportunity to state its position on the ensemble of questions related to the use of nuclear energy. The essence of our thinking bears repetition here.

Brazil is a peaceful country. The dominant concern of the Brazilian nation is its integrated, harmonious economic and social development. Brazil is opposed to all proliferation of nuclear weapons, whether vertical or horizontal, and is ready to participate in international efforts aimed at reducing and in due course eliminating nuclear arms, as well as preventing their proliferation. We believe that the true meaning of non-proliferation is to ban the diffusion of nuclear weapons, not the dissemination of nuclear technology. Given adequate safeguards, access to the technology for the peaceful uses of nuclear energy should not be subjected to discriminatory restrictions.

The Brazilian decision to implement an important nuclear program for peaceful purposes was based on a careful evaluation of the energy needs of the country and the possible options for meeting such needs. Brazil is convinced that international cooperation supported by appropriate safeguards is the best means of ensuring the objectives of the development of the utilization of nuclear energy for peaceful purposes without the risks of the proliferation of nuclear weapons. The same directive, incidentally, was elaborated in the United Nations itself, for IAEA, whose long experience accumulated over the last two decades has proved so useful, was conceived and created precisely in order to attempt to accelerate and increase the contribution of nuclear energy to the peace, health and prosperity of the whole world, ensuring that such cooperation is not used in a way that would contribute to military ends.

We trust that the next Special Session of the General Assembly dedicated to disarmament will be a positive step in the multilateral negotiations concerning the problems in this field. Having in mind the preparatory work under way we are especially confident that it will be possible to concentrate the attention of the General Assembly on the most critical of the areas of disarmament, namely, the negotiations for effective measures of nuclear disarmament.

Our community is annually called upon to pronounce itself on the Middle East, an area where advances and retreats occur on the road to peace. The Brazilian position has been reiterated in this plenary Assembly and in other bodies. True to the guiding principles of our nationality, we consider as indispensable elements for a just and lasting solution respect for the right of all States to their existence and for the right of all peoples and countries of this region to enjoy self-determination, to exercise their sovereignty and to live in peace. True, furthermore, to the principle of the non-acquisition of territory by force, we share the widely manifested concern with regard to the recent initiatives that run counter to United

Nations resolutions and that pretend to give a kind of *de facto* legitimacy to situations created by force. These initiatives make more difficult the establishment of peace in the region.

As a result of racial oppression and the persistence of colonialism, southern Africa is another region where serious tensions are widespread and put at risk the very maintenance of international peace and security. Brazil has repeatedly made plain its repudiation of racism and colonialism, together with its growing apprehension at this situation which is a challenge to the conscience of humanity. It was thus with special interest that we participated in the major meetings that took place this year in Maputo and in Lagos, namely, the International Conference in Support of the Peoples of Zimbabwe an Namibia and the World Conference for Action against *Apartheid.*

The questions of interest to the peoples of southern Africa must be solved without further ado. The international community has the undeniable moral and political duty to create conditions to accelerate the solution of these international questions. In spite of the numerous obstacles raised by those who still benefit in the region from the present situation, the path to negotiation must be trod with perseverance. The options provided by the Charter of the United Nations should be utilized, among others, so as to make it perfectly clear that the international community is determined to see that the negotiations are conducted with speed.

Discrimination, segregation and racial hatred constitute one of the most extreme violations of the rights of the human person. The practices of *apartheid* deserve condemnation both at the ethical and juridical levels and at the political level, for, in addition to offending the moral conscience and transgressing human rights they represent a factor that disturbs peace.

I should like also to mention, although very briefly, the geographical region to which we belong and with the aspirations of which Brazil fully identifies. It is with pleasure that I refer to the constructive relationship among the countries of Latin America developed on the basis of friendship and positive cooperation aimed at mutual benefit.

Non-intervention in the internal and external affairs of States and attachment to peaceful and effective means for the solution of occasional disputes, which stem very often from the very closeness of their relationship, constitute the incalculable heritage of the countries of that region.

Within the inter-American framework it is with satisfaction that I record a significant event, both for the countries in the hemisphere and for the international community, namely, the signing on September 7 of

the Treaties on the Panama Canal. This is an historic episode in which the search for convergence and an effort at cooperation prevailed. Panama and the United States of America have demonstrated a sense of opportunity and of realism in finding a mutually satisfactory solution of question of long and painful duration. The treaties are an important step towards the reestablishment of justice and of the respect that all countries deserve, be they great or small, powerful or not powerful.

As I have pointed out, cooperation – which is urged by the Charter of the United Nations – presupposes as a basic requirement respect for national identity and for the sovereignty of States. The Charter places the theme of human rights precisely within the field of international cooperation, and within that field makes the promotion of those rights one of the most important tasks of the Organization. The treatment of this question at the multilateral level might assist the creation of favorable conditions for the full exercise of those rights which, in our view, embrace not only civil and political aspects but also social and economic questions such as the right to food, to education, to culture, to work, to a life free from pauperism and to support in old age. All these matters must be dealt with within a broad and integrated perspective.

International concern over human rights is hot new and there is no novelty in the efforts of many States to see those rights respected. It would be useful to recall, even though briefly, the common conceptual heritage accumulated over the years in the consideration of this subject at the international level.

The first component of this heritage is the conviction that the problem is one of a fundamentally ethical nature, a basic fact that does not always seem to be present when the matter is being examined in this body or elsewhere. Very often intentions in dealing with the subject differ from the sincere desire to protect the rights of man.

A second component of our common heritage lies in the conviction that the question of human rights is of a universal character. To justify discriminatory treatment on the basis of national interest is to destroy the very foundations of the defense of those rights.

Thirdly, it would be unrealistic to imagine that these questions are, in practice, isolated from consideration of other problems which afflict the community of nations. The creation of conditions favorable to the generalized respect for human rights will depend on the substantial improvement of, political and economic security at the international level. As long as the nuclear arms race continues unchecked and as long as no satisfaction is given within the framework of North-South relations to

the just aspirations of the developing countries, the basic prerequisites will be missing to permit human rights, in their wider and truer meaning, being effectively respected on a global scale. The refusal to facilitate the establishment of a more just and more stable international economic order, one that would meet the claims of collective economic security for development, is a factor that cannot be ignored or overshadowed in the interest of respect for human rights.

Finally, the solution of the problems of the rights of man lies within the responsibility of the Government of each country. In a world which is still, unfortunately, marked by interventionist attitudes, be they open or veiled, and by the distortion of certain matters, no country or group of countries should enjoy the status of judge of other countries on such serious and intimate questions of national life.

Bearing in mind this conceptual heritage, Brazil has recently associated itself with the work of the Commission on Human Rights, an association which will allow it to contribute more effectively, at the normative international level, in the promotion of these rights. The machinery and procedures already available to the United Nations for the consideration of human rights problems seem to us ample and sufficient to enable the work to proceed at the rhythm required by the complexity of the subject and preserved from passing factors and circumstances.

International cooperation cannot and must not be an instrument to be resorted to for momentary convenience nor must it serve as the last resort for help in circumstances of acute crisis. It must be a continuous, constructive and creative effort. An objective evaluation of the field of international economic relations demonstrates that such an effort is truly indispensable.

Initiatives and projects succeed one another without, as we should wish, any change occurring in the harsh realities facing the developing countries. Almost 10 years after the launching of the First United Nations Development Decade, almost 15 years after the convening of the first session of UNCTAD, and more than a generation after the creation of the Economic and Social Council where the central problems of world economic relations have been discussed, the developing countries still face severe obstacles and encounter structures and machinery which no longer respond to the claims of the present world.

Brazil was among the first to understand the threat to international security necessarily constituted by economic inequality. We were able to see in the international structures as they were then, and still are today, a grave restriction on the development process. In 1974, the Brazilian

proposal on collective economic security for development proceeded from that finding to demonstrate that social justice and economic progress are essential to the system of guarantees among States and thus inseparable from the goal of peace and security.

The results arrived at after 18 months of work by the Conference on International Economic Cooperation cannot be described as encouraging. It had been expected that that Conference, even though it might have found it impossible to solve immediate problems, could have been the source of a new spirit which would prevail in the examination of sensitive and controversial questions when they were the subject of negotiations in specific forums. That did not come about, as demonstrated by the fruitless nature of the Paris negotiations. I do not wish now to begin the examination of the substance of the talks at the Conference, but I should like to recall that unfulfilled hopes and non-binding manifestations of goodwill are not substitutes for effective action.

If the weight of congealed structures and the immense obstacles raised by history in the face of those countries which arrived later to the process of industrialization is not enough, I must point out with special concern another aspect of the present picture of international economic relations: the re-emergence of protectionism in some developed countries. To overcome these additional difficulties, international cooperation is ever more necessary for the benefit of both the developing countries and the industrialized countries. Brazil expects developed countries to discourage discriminatory attitudes and to pledge themselves to give equitable treatment to exports from developing countries.

The recognition of the fact that difficulties do exist and the small margin of progress achieved do not dishearten us in our search for new ways. The developing countries must, above all, make use of their own efforts, of the growing weight of their economies and of their solidarity, which was tested under severe conditions, to continue pragmatically to act with strength, even within the present rules of the game, to overcome the difficulties and obstacles facing them.

But this, however, should not let us lose sight of the imperative need to continue to work, both at the operational and normative levels, to obtain structural changes in the intrinsically unjust nature of those rules.

It is therefore, with a confidence tempered by realism that we identify the usefulness of two important coming conferences to be convened under the auspices of the United Nations: that on technical cooperation among developing countries and that on science and technology for

development. I believe that few areas hold so much promise of beneficial results for the international Community.

We have seen within the United Nations the expansion of the capacity of countries to express their national aspirations and to influence decision-making processes the consequences of which effect everyone. We want to see this reality consolidated and strengthened. We want to see the complete abolition of the gap which still keeps many States at a distance from international consideration of questions affecting their interests. This is an urgent matter, for the accelerated technological development of some States may result in a new factor which will facilitate the survival of obsolete forms of international relations.

To allow the United Nations fully to discharge its great duties, it will be necessary to encourage the equitable participation of all States in the political process, thus reinvigorating the international system and giving new momentum to common efforts towards peace, security and development. Brazil has confidence in the world of tomorrow.

New York, 26 September, 1977.

1978

1978

In 1978 the Brazilian political process took the route of the Presidential succession. The appointment of General João Batista Figueiredo by President Geisel provoked reactions in military and in political circles. The "slow, sure and gradual" process of *détente* proposed by President Geisel met growing demands for the normalization of the political and institutional life of the country and for an ample, general and unrestrained amnesty. Institution Act no. 5 was revoked by a Constitutional amendment that instituted political reforms. The September elections renewed the incumbents of the Governments of the States; MDB succeeded only in electing the Governor of the State of Rio de Janeiro. In October, the Congress elected General for a six-year term. The President-elect expressed his determination to continue President Geisel's policy and proposed conciliation. At the end of the year, the expulsion of political prisoners exchanged for kidnapped personalities during the previous years was revoked.

Brazilian diplomatic activity continued to intensify. President Geisel visited Mexico, Uruguay and the Federal Republic of Germany. He received President Jimmy Carter in Brazil, who did not shy away from seeing important opposition leaders from the political, entrepreneurial, media and Church circles.

On the international level, the year witnessed events that later became important references: a coup in Afghanistan, the expulsion of the Shah from Iran by the Government of Ayatollah Khomeini, the election of

Pope John Paul II and the signature of the Camp David Peace Agreements between Egypt and Israel.

In the last speech of his tenure in Itamaraty, Minister Azeredo da Silveira presented before the Thirty-Third Session of the General Assembly a positive balance sheet of the results of Brazilian external policy. The attenuation of the problems with the United States could already be foreseen and Brazil could announce that its diplomatic possibilities had been considerably extended with the configuration of areas of cooperation and understanding, in particular with Latin America and Africa. One must note the careful drafting of the paragraph on Camp David, in which the Minister, calling the negotiations brokered by the United States "a new element in the search for peace in the region" expresses interest in following its receptivity by the remaining countries in the region.

There was ample criticism regarding the disarmament issues (disappointment over the meager results reached at the I Special Session of the General Assembly devoted to Disarmament), the Law of the Sea (lack of progress in the negotiations at the Conference), the North-South dialogue and the international decision-making process (Brazil cannot continue to accept that a few States claim the right to decide the political destiny of the world.

XXXIII Session of the General Assembly of the United Nations
1978

Minister Antonio Francisco Azeredo da Silveira [*]

Mr. President,

As I understand it, this year all the Portuguese-speaking countries will speak in their national language, which is what I shall be doing myself.

Mr. President, the tradition which offers Brazil the privilege of opening the general debate at the United Nations General Assembly gives me this year the very special pleasure of being the first among the speakers to compliment you on your election by acclamation to the presidency of this Thirty-Third Session of the Assembly. Without stressing the strong and traditional ties that bind our two countries, neighbors and sisters, it is for me a source of particular personal satisfaction to see the labors of this main political body of the United Nations entrusted to the skilful and experienced guidance of my Colombian colleague and friend, Indalecio Liévano Aguirre.

Nor can I fail to express to Mr. Mojsov our appreciation of the manner in which he accomplished in this past year the task of presiding over the General Assembly during its Thirty-Second Regular Session and the unprecedented total of three Special Sessions.

Thirty-three years after the creation of this world Organization we have arrived, as a result of the process of decolonization promoted and

[*] **Antonio Francisco Azeredo da Silveira**, Born in Rio de Janeiro, RJ, September 22, 1917. Third Secretary, public selection process, 1943. First Class Minister, by merit, 1964. Minister of State for External Relations from 3/15/1974 to 3/15/1979. † Rio de Janeiro, April 27, 1990.

accelerated by the United Nations itself, at a membership of 150 States. Solomon Islands now joins the community of nations with full rights, and we bid them welcome.

The tradition to which I referred in my opening words gives Brazil not only the privilege but, above all, the responsibility, which falls upon me, of opening this debate, the only one to be held every year at a high political level among the representatives of the international community as a whole, without distinction between the powerful and the weak or the rich and the poor.

This is the fifth time I have addressed the General Assembly as the Minister for External Relations of my country. When I spoke in this forum precisely four years ago as the Foreign Minister of President Ernesto Geisel's Administration, whose work was then beginning, I pointed out that we wished our language in the international field to be plain and straightforward, that we desired frank and uninhibited communication among the States Members of the United Nations and that we would explore all roads to understanding, for we held the fundamental belief that cooperation is more effective than antagonism and that mutual respect is more creative than the ambition of preponderance. I stressed, further, that we were ready, wherever Brazilian national interest might move us, to look for areas of convergence and zones of coincidence with the interests of other peoples, acting always in pursuance of objectives that were clearly identified and accepted by the Brazilian people.

That, in brief, has been the guideline followed by Brazil during these years in its external relations, both bilaterally and multilaterally. And the balance, I believe, is positive. We have greatly increased the areas of cooperation and understanding with our neighbors of the Latin American region, with our overseas neighbors, the sister republics of Africa, and with the other countries of the world. Traditional friendships have been strengthened and new and mutually beneficial friendships have been developed. Zealous for our sovereignty and independence, we have reaffirmed whenever necessary by word and deed our unshakeable adherence to the principles of non-interference in the internal affairs of States, mutual respect and self-determination. And we have lived in peace, always trying to solve with serenity our differences of opinion with, or eventual divergences, from other nations.

We have sought, as far as possible, to break obsolete patterns of international relations and to replace them with more equitable and more balanced arrangements. This has enabled us to open up new diplomatic

horizons. And we have thus revealed the true international profile of Brazil, ever sensitive to changes in the world reality.

Thus, a solid basis has been created on which Brazil can stand in the coming years, a country firmly devoted to the task of promoting its ideals of peace, justice and development in harmony with the other nations of the earth.

In that same speech of September 1974, I underlined certain grave problems afflicting the international community which were included in the General Assembly's agenda and which, directly or indirectly, also affected and continue to affect the country I represent. In some of those cases the balance of these last four years has been positive, although still unsatisfactory. In others it was clearly negative.

To mention only one of those problems, I then referred, first of all, to the general theme of decolonization and to the inhuman policy of *apartheid.* The past years have brought great rejoicing to Brazil with the independence and admission to the United Nations of all former Portuguese territories in Africa. But our attention is still turned to the peoples of Namibia and Zimbabwe, who still seek their self-determination and independence, not to mention other peoples, in other parts of the world, who still remain under the yoke of foreign domination. We anxiously await the occasion, which we hope will come very soon, to welcome to the United Nations the nation of Namibia, free and sovereign at last, with its territorial integrity fully preserved. But our cautious satisfaction with the apparent progress of that African country toward independence – the object, this year, of the historic Ninth Special Session of the Assembly – is not enough to counterbalance the continued frustration of the expectations of the international community in relation to the self-determination of the people of Zimbabwe and the abolition of the *apartheid* regime.

Nor can we be reassured by the relatively unstable peace which prevails over a great part of the world when we observe the persistence of explosive situations and, in some cases, their rapid deterioration. In a world of solidarity and interdependence, there is no peace while there remain focuses of tension, of injustice and of conflict, even when localized.

In this sense, the extremely volatile situation in Middle East gives all of us reason for the most profound concern. The continual resurgence in that region of the mistrust and hostility that have so often marked its turbulent history and, in particular, the tragic events in Lebanon, which caused the convening of the Eighth Special Session of the General Assembly this year – all contribute to create a climate of disquiet and discouragement.

The recent negotiations at Camp David are a new element in the search for peace in the region of the East. We await with interest new stages in the process that is now under way, and we are attentively observing the degree of acceptance it is being accorded by the other parties more directly involved in the question, while cherishing the hope that it will be possible to arrive at lasting solutions compatible with the principle non-acquisition of territory by force, with the principle of the recognition of the legitimate aspirations of the Palestinian people, and with the right of all parties to the survival and self-determination.

I cannot avoid making special mention of a problem which increasingly endangers the very existence of mankind. I refer, obviously, to the arms race and, in particular, to the nuclear arms race.

The situation today demands decisive action part of the international community, which has complacently and for many years contemplated the uncontrolled accumulation, by a few States, of arms of mass destruction and the terrifying and permanent refinement, by those same States, of instruments capable of annihilating human life on earth. The threat to us, to each of us in this room, and to each one of the 150 countries represented here, lies not only in the danger that those weapons may one day be used, but also in the very existence of such weaponry.

The spirit of frankness which should inspire the general debate leads me to say that, in this sense, the result of the first Special Session devoted to disarmament – the Tenth Special Session – which was held in May and June this year, were disappointing. Although we were conscious of the limitations which would inevitably follow from the realities of power, we nurtured the hope that session would be a first step, albeit a modest one, the solution of priority problems relating to weapons.

Aware of the need to ensure the cooperation of all States, particularly of the nuclear Powers, we all agree that the appropriate method of work was to seek solutions by consensus. Nevertheless, we witnessed the blockage even of successively diluted versions of texts that addressed themselves effectively to disarmament. Entire sections dealing with the really urgent problems relating to nuclear weapons were completely suppressed or made ambiguous. The Final Document of the Special Session contains serious omissions and confers disproportionate importance upon issues of secondary urgency in the general field of disarmament.

Since it was not possible to achieve significant progress on the substantive issues of greater priority and urgency during the Special Session, it is symptomatic that the main practical results of the Assembly

on disarmament lie precisely in the procedural area of machinery for future negotiations and deliberations. Willing to continue contributing, in good faith, to all constructive efforts in that area, we supported the decisions on the new negotiating body and on the new Committee on Disarmament. Within the limits of its possibilities, Brazil will exert every effort to help those bodies to achieve the results urgently required in the field of disarmament, particularly in the field of nuclear disarmament.

The obstacles that certain developed countries try to raise against the acquisition by the remaining States of technologies indispensable to development, including nuclear technology for peaceful purposes, are only one area in which some highly industrialized countries, aware of the growing political and economic importance of technology in a world of more and more limited natural resources, systematically try to hinder, restrict or block the access of developing countries to the means which are needed for the promotion of the welfare of their peoples. The situation, which tends only to become more grave, is a source of concern, especially as it fits into the increasingly bleak picture of North-South economic relations, marked in practically all its aspects by a worsening of trends, such as protectionism contrary to the establishment of a more just and equitable international economy.

It is to be regretted in this context that the lack of political will on the part of a large number of our developed partners continues to block the progress of constructive negotiations. Two weeks ago, the Seventh Session of the Third United Nations Conference on the Law of the Sea held its last meeting in these halls. Nothing would give me more pleasure than to be able to affirm that that session, the latest in a long series, arrived at positive results. Unfortunately such was not the case. During that part of the session which took place in Geneva we had noted some progress on important issues, but the continuation of the work in New York seems to have provoked setbacks and withdrawals, a fact which does not allow us to declare ourselves even modestly satisfied with what was achieved.

The prospect of having national legislation on matters under negotiation adopted unilaterally, in direct opposition to resolution 2749 (XXV), which was accepted without dissenting voices, did not contribute to better results. We cannot yet evaluate precisely just how far the consequences of such actions will go, but it is not possible to view them without deep concern. It is worth remembering that the Conference on the Law of the Sea is, in the judgment of many, the most important negotiation since the San Francisco Conference, at which our Charter was established and our Organization was created.

Another glaring recent example of this situation was the suspension some days ago of the work of the Committee established under General Assembly Resolution 32/174, known as the Committee of the Whole, a body which in principle; should have decisive influence on the progress of specific negotiations within the framework of the North-South dialogue.

Brazil will always continue to be pledged to the promotion and improvement of international cooperation, but it sees with disenchantment the gradual fading of the hopeful picture that had been sketched as a result of the Seventh Special Session of the General Assembly. This Thirty-Third Session will, consequently, be of crucial importance in determining the direction which the North-South dialogue will take.

It is in the light of these facts that we attribute special importance to the development of machinery aimed at filling the gaps in North-South cooperation. With this aim in mind Brazil has put forward and supported efforts to promote, enlarge and intensify horizontal and equitable cooperation among the countries which strive for development. The United Nations Conference on Technical Cooperation among Developing Countries, which took place recently in Buenos Aires, was an important landmark for multilateral efforts in this field.

The United Nations is the only universal body with the duty of maintaining international peace and security and simultaneously promoting cooperation for the social and economic development of all peoples. It is an imperfect system, much in need of reform. But, above all, it is a system imperfectly utilized.

The Charter of the Organization itself establishes, as the first of its basic principles, that of sovereign equality among all States. But that provision, which should be the foundation of universal cooperation for the solution of the great problems of today's world, is undermined every moment. We do not deny that certain States are immensely more prosperous and more powerful than others. What we cannot continue to accept is that a few States seek to resolve the political and economic destinies of the world, with the United Nations kept on the margin and without regard to the interests or the great majority of its Members. To these latter, participation in the process of making decisions which directly or indirectly will affect their fates can no longer be denied.

New York, September 25, 1978.

1979

1979

General João Figueiredo was inaugurated as President of the Republic in March 1979, with a political program committed to the acceleration of the process of normalization of the political and institutional life of Brazil. In August, the President signed into law the amnesty bill approved by the Congress. Political leaders who had chosen exile abroad started to return and the first pressures in favor of the reestablishment of direct elections started to be felt. However, if the political panorama was undergoing positive changes, the economy showed signs of instability with the increase of inflation.

The international scenario would turn for the worse throughout the year with the fall of the Shah and the invasion of Afghanistan in December. In Irak, Saddam Hussein came to power. Strategic relations between the United States and the Soviet Union once again became confrontational.

At the start of the new administration, Brazilian diplomacy clearly prioritized the relations with the neighbors. An understanding on the features of the Itaipu dam and its compatibility with the Corpus project was negotiated with Argentina, thus ending the acute phase of the long confrontation between the two countries. Brazil suspended diplomatic relations with the Somoza regime in Nicaragua and took important initiatives of diplomatic reactivation with Peru and Venezuela. In December, the Palestine Liberation Organization (PLO) was allowed to establish an office in Brasília.

Delivering his first statement as Foreign Minister before the Thirty-Fourth Session of the General Assembly, Ambassador Ramiro Saraiva Guerreiro expounded very confidently the evolution of Brazilian diplomatic posture. He reaffirmed the commitment of the country to the principles of independence, sovereign equality, self-determination and non-interference in internal and external affairs of States, as well as support for the principle of pacific solution of disputes. Moreover, he stressed Brazil's determination to promote respect to human rights and fundamental freedoms, characterized Brazil as a developing country and emphasized its determination to "widen and enrich the sense of solidarity and harmony" with the nations of the so-called Third World.

A *tour d'horizon* of different areas permitted the affirmation of the goal of closer relations with the "sister nations of Latin America", the mention to the "deep affinities" between Brazil and African countries, its "Eastern neighbors", and the expression of mounting concern with the problems that beset the Middle East. In unusual and unequivocal terms Minister Guerreiro demanded the end of the occupation of all territories seized by force and the recognition and implementation of the rights of the Palestine people to self-determination, independence and sovereignty.

A rigorous analysis of the panorama of the international economic relations ensued, culminating with an exhortation to developed countries to stop worrying exclusively with the problems caused by the rise in oil prices and devote their action in good faith to the North-South dialogue. Calling for solidarity among developing countries, the Minister argued for the establishment of new forms of commercial cooperation that could minimize the imbalances deriving from the oil crisis.

The statement also includes a reproach to the lack of progress in disarmament and a demand for effective participation of developing countries in the negotiations.

XXXIV Regular Session of the General Assembly of the United Nations 1979

Minister Ramiro Saraiva Guerreiro [*]

Mr. President,

As the general debate opens, I have the honor and sincere pleasure of conveying to you, Sir, the first expressions of congratulations on your election to the presidency of the Thirty-Fourth Session of the General Assembly. You have the support of the international community represented here, thanks to the esteem we have for your country and for your own personal qualifications, which we recognize and admire. Your constant dedication to the principles of sovereignty and self-determination and the remarkable contribution you have made in the efforts for peace and independence have distinguished your role in the last years as Chairman of the Special Committee on the situation with regard to the implementation of the Declaration on the granting of independence to colonial countries and peoples. You are well aware of the significant ties that exist between the African nations and my country. Endowed with a common heritage in many fields, and as partners in basic aspirations, we have striven to develop our ties into a network of mutual cooperation which already includes a wide range of activities. It is with particular satisfaction that, in this context, I refer to the imminent opening of the Brazilian Embassy in Dar-es-Salaam which will

[*] **Ramiro Elysio Saraiva Guerreiro**, Born in Salvador, BA, December 22,1918. Bachelor in Legal and Social Sciences from the National Law Faculty of the University of Bahia. Third Class Consul, public selection process, 1945. First Class Minister, by merit, 1968. Minister of State for External Relations, from 3/15/1979 to 3/15/1985. † Rio de Janeiro, January 19, 2011.

thus establish a direct diplomatic channel with one of the most important capitals of Africa.

Before proceeding, I should like to express my Government's appreciation for the very able and productive manner in which a distinguished South American – a representative of Colombia, a country to which Brazil is bound by fraternal links – Mr. Indalecio Liévano Aguirre, conducted the work of the Thirty-Third Session.

For many years and in various ways I have been associated with the work and the development of this Organization and have therefore witnessed its transformation into a true universal forum. Thus it is with satisfaction that I welcome a new Member State – a country from Latin America – Saint Lucia, to whose representatives I extend my warm greetings, anticipating fruitful cooperation in this Organization.

Upon taking office on March 15 last, President João Figueiredo reaffirmed that the foreign policy of Brazil is dedicated to the noble ideals of peace, justice and international cooperation for development. In the coming years we shall persevere in exploring new paths for understanding and cooperation with nations from all parts of the world. In this endeavor we shall be guided by our traditional capacity for friendly dialogue and by our sense of national dignity.

As we look to the future, it seems fitting to reaffirm Brazil's adherence to the principles of national independence, the sovereign equality of States, the self-determination of peoples and non-interference in the internal and external affairs of States, as well as our support for the peaceful settlement of international disputes, as provided for in the United Nations Charter. In this connection, Brazil will continue to work for the strengthening of the United Nations in the maintenance of international peace and security, in cooperation for development and in the furtherance of respect for human rights and fundamental freedoms, without distinction as to race, sex, language or religion.

For the Brazilian Government, it is a matter of satisfaction that relations with our immediate neighbors, the sister nations of Latin America, are increasingly pervaded by positive trends. Winds of change are blowing in Latin America. The countries of the region are conscious of the need to add new dimensions to their historical ties through the intensification of their political consultations, the establishment of new and dynamic cultural links and a substantial expansion of their trade and economic relations. While retaining their own features and peculiarities Latin American countries are closer than ever to each other. As the area for cooperation expands, new forms of joint action

will be required. For its part, Brazil is ready to cooperate, and our concern is that peace and tranquility prevail in our region and that the countries of Latin America face, side by side, the common struggle for development. With this aim, we are prepared to work with other nations from all parts of Latin America.

Brazil feels especially close to its neighbors to the East, the nations of Africa. The links that we have developed over the years reflect not only geographical proximity but also the deeply rooted affinities between our peoples. Together we have identified our interest in the establishment of new patterns of economic and technical cooperation and new flows of goods and services. Together we have sought common solutions in our efforts to overcome the challenges of development and independence, on a basis of mutual trust and respect.

We are particularly sensitive to the profound grief of the people of Angola over the untimely death two weeks ago of President Agostinho Neto. To his people, he was the guide in the struggle for independence and nation-building and an African leader whose personal qualifications won him great respect and esteem. In my country he was also regarded as one of the most significant contemporary poets of our common language. His death came before Africa could achieve the goal of complete freedom from political and economic domination and racial injustice. But, as he would say, the struggle continues for the self-determination and independence of Zimbabwe and Namibia and for the elimination of *apartheid.*

With the nations of the Middle East, Brazil has forged strong ties of friendship, understanding and cooperation. We view with increasing concern the problems afflicting that part of the world. During the past year, new developments have marked the situation in the Middle East. However, it would be excessively optimistic to say that the prospects for peace – a just, lasting and comprehensive peace – are, in some way, better than they were a year ago.

Nevertheless, some States are still reluctant to accept the changes that must be brought about for true peace to be attained. Some still insist on closing their eyes to the basic fact that there will not be peace in the area until all territories taken by force are vacated and until the rights of the Palestinian people – their inalienable rights to self-determination, independence and sovereignty in Palestine, in accordance with the United Nations Charter – are duly recognized and implemented. Furthermore, one cannot foresee true success in peace negotiations without the participation of the Palestine Liberation Organization, which is one of the relevant parties in the region's political scene.

We believe that all States in the region have a right to exist within recognized borders. This right implies, actually, the recognition of the right of all peoples in the region to live in peace, including those who are homeless and have suffered the most. The world can no longer afford delays in the adoption of effective measures directed towards a future of good understanding, peace and justice in the Middle East. It is the hope of the Brazilian Government that the present session of the United Nations General Assembly may help create diplomatic conditions that will allow for a new political situation to the benefit of all.

The world economy is about to enter the decade of the 1980s in a state marked by widespread uncertainties. After more than 20 years of intensive negotiations for the reformulation of relations between the industrialized North and the developing South, the results achieved did not go beyond the theoretical recognition of unbalanced situations and the need to revise them.

It cannot be denied that practical measures for the correction of the factors of economic imbalance have been essentially limited to the convening of international conferences or to the creation of multilateral organs concerned more with the debate of the problems than with their negotiation and solution.

The institutionalization of UNCTAD and the unfolding of its work over five high level meetings; the establishment of UNIDO; the addition to the text of the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade of a chapter on trade problems of less developed nations; numerous sessions of the General Assembly and dozens of meetings and conferences on a variety of subjects; the launching of two United Nations Development Decades; the so-called North-South Paris Conference – all this huge effort fell short of modifying the picture of injustice and asymmetry which deeply marks the North-South relationship.

The remarkable prosperity enjoyed by the Western economy in the post-war period is threatened today by numerous difficulties. The very essence of the economic problem experienced by the highly developed nations has changed. Formerly, during the period of accelerated growth, the question was how to minimize the elements of instability in a context of sustained expansion; now it is a matter of preventing the international system from reaching heights of intolerable instability.

At present, there is a disquieting slackening in international trade, the volume of which until 1973 grew at an average rate of 9 per cent but today increases at an annual rate of less than 5 per cent. The contraction of economic activities anticipates the increase of protectionist trends;

and introduces a disturbing element of friction in an economy which is becoming more and more interdependent and internationalized.

In the commercial field, it is increasingly clear that lines of division are being established between the North, which is as integrated as ever, and the South, where the share of countries like Brazil in international exports is less than proportional to their contribution to world prosperity. This contribution lies not only in the acquisition of goods and services, but also in well remunerated imports of technological inputs and financial resources, either direct investments or capital loans.

Paradoxically, the very difficulties which prevail in the present situation have encouraged increased integration among the highly industrialized economies. Another ambitious round of negotiations within GATT has just been concluded. We note that the results of this round benefitted above all the trade of the more sophisticated economies among the highly industrialized nations. In the Northern Hemisphere reciprocal trade is liberalized and constructive solutions are adopted, leading to greater intertwining of the respective industrial sectors, with added financial technological cooperation and increased exchanges of direct investments.

Meanwhile, the industrialized world has been drawn closer to those nations which have come to enjoy a greater availability of financial resources as a result of increases in the price of oil.

These facts are positive for the world economy and, to that extent, they deserve recognition and support.

From the point of view of the specific interest of developing countries like Brazil, however, the pattern of commercial relations with the developed world gives rise to concern, for what is taking place is not the removal of protectionist structures but their development into new modalities, which at times are more subtle, but which nonetheless are always effective.

Far from being abolished, protectionism acquires new features and is updated; it strikes with redoubled impact precisely those nations which, due to a chronic tendency towards external imbalance – an inevitable requirement of their development effort – are more in need of access to the larger world markets.

Concern for the pressing aspects of the economic difficulties – such as inflation in the developed world and the rise in the price of oil – must not overshadow the broader issue of the struggle to overcome the structures of underdevelopment. Industrialization in developing countries is being hindered at the very moment when the efforts of these countries are

starting to yield results, and when they can most contribute to the world economy also as suppliers of increasingly competitive manufactured products. Probably worse than openly practiced protectionism, in the form of trade barriers against the sales of those countries, is the omission implicit in the disregard for the problems of North-South relationships which became evident, for example, at the Tokyo Economic Summit, held from June 28 to 29, 1979.

As President Figueiredo recently stated in a speech made at the launching, by both the Brazilian Government and private businessmen, of a renewed exports drive:

> To our industrialized partners we affirm our disposition towards dialogue and understanding, and our rejection of any unwarranted attitude of confrontation. We wish to reach, together, stable and constructive solutions. Through them we expect to eliminate the specter of protectionism which has been revived by current widespread difficulties, and also open increasingly wider channels for trade and international cooperation.

In this spirit, we address our friends from the developed world. Brazil favors the resumption of the North-South dialogue through a new and intensified effort for effective negotiations with a view to reshaping the relationship between the developed world and the developing nations.

In this context we look forward to the practical results we trust will be attained by the Special Session of the Assembly to be held in 1980.

We trust that the developing world will maintain its fundamental solidarity before the highly industrialized countries. But the developing world cannot have its unity based exclusively on the coincidence of interests vis-à-vis the developed nations. This unity must reflect an effective sense of understanding and cooperation. In order to be authentic, the solidarity of the developing world must be increasingly geared to concrete action. I refer here particularly to the present energy crisis. New forms of commercial cooperation between developing countries must be established. Direct economic and financial flows among developing countries must increase on a mutual basis so as to ensure that situations of acute imbalance do not become a permanent feature in the third world. With this aim we think that developing countries should maintain urgently all necessary consultations, which should also serve as a preparation for the dialogue they will have with the industrialized countries.

Brazil, for its part, is undertaking a major effort to increase its relations of trade and cooperation with other developing countries. We have shared, to the limit of our possibilities, the experience we have

accumulated as a tropical country with a relatively high and diversified level of industrialization. Our trade relations with nations from Latin America, Africa and Asia, which in the 1960s accounted for 9 per cent of our exports and approximately 23 per cent of our purchases, represent today 25 per cent of our sales and more than 40 per cent of our imports. More than a billion dollars was allocated by the Brazilian Government in the last few years to the opening of lines of credit in favor of other developing nations. We have provided technical cooperation, though still on a modest basis, to some 40 countries in Latin America and Africa, and we have today approximately 15,000 foreign students in Brazilian technical institutions and universities.

In the field of renewable sources of energy, we are opening an entirely new area for our cooperation with other countries. Thanks to substantial investments in the production of alcohol for fuel purposes and the development of a technology for its use, Brazil can become the focus of a broad effort of developing alternative sources of energy with beneficial effects for all countries, producers and consumers, which seek the rational use and adequate conservation of oil reserves, as well as greater stability and predictability in the market development of such an essential product. We are thus contributing to the maximum of our possibilities, to broadening and enhancing the sense of harmony and solidarity in the developing world, which is an indispensable condition for success in the task of revising the patterns of relationship between North and South.

Serious political and economic problems with worldwide repercussions have made us all acutely conscious of the importance of dialogue and cooperation among States. Developing countries have awakened to the fact that they can and should seek each other to solve their common problems. They are also aware of the fact that they are denied access to negotiations and to the international decision-making processes which directly affect their legitimate interests and aspirations in so many ways.

It can no longer be ignored that all States, without discrimination, have the right to participate equitably and effectively in the decisions affecting their national destinies. It is not only in the energy, trade, monetary and other issues in the economic field that such participation is required. I wish also to consider the present situation in the field of disarmament. Although the Tenth Special Session of the General Assembly held in 1978, on disarmament, fell far short of producing a clear-cut commitment to nuclear disarmament, it did produce what appeared to be a more open and democratic machinery for disarmament negotiations.

But the results of the first year of work of the Committee on Disarmament have not been encouraging. The Committee concentrated on debating its rules of procedure and other procedural questions, while negotiations on basic substantive questions continued to be conducted directly by the two main military Powers.

The agreements reached as a result of the second round of the Strategic Arms Limitation Talks hailed in some quarters as a major breakthrough in the field of nuclear disarmament and described in others as not more than a limited step towards what might be called the rational management of the arms race, are a result of such direct negotiations between the two main military Powers. Presumably all other States will be asked to commend the agreements during the present session of the General Assembly. We shall not stand in the way of such a request. But we see the second round of these talks primarily as an intermediate stage which should lead to the early start of negotiations on the third round of SALT, with its promised substantive reductions in nuclear armaments. At any rate, SALT negotiations should be integrated in a broader effort open to the participation of all States, with a view to general and complete disarmament under effective international control.

The Committee on Disarmament itself did not have the opportunity even to begin meaningful negotiations on two measures that had been on the agenda of its predecessor, the Conference of the Committee on Disarmament for a great many years. Neither the trilateral talks on a nuclear weapons test ban, nor the bilateral discussions on the prohibition of chemical weapons led this year to the long-awaited presentation of concrete proposals to the Geneva Committee on Disarmament. Instead, the multilateral negotiating body was presented at almost the last moment, with a draft on radiological weapons produced by the two major military Powers with tile recommendation that it be speedily approved and forwarded to the General Assembly for endorsement. While welcoming the initiative, the Committee wisely decided that it was entitled to discuss the proposed text more thoroughly. Furthermore, it is significant that the only major disarmament effort in 1979 open to the participation of all States had to do, not with the top priority area of nuclear weapons, but with certain specific conventional weapons.

Before concluding, I wish to refer to two issues which received ample consideration at the United Nations during this year. I refer to the law of the sea and to science and technology. The Brazilian Government has actively participated in the work of the Third United Nations Conference on the Law of the Sea, spurred on by the desire to reach, with all members

of the international community, a universally acceptable legal structure for the use of maritime space. The results of the latest session of that Conference seem to indicate the path towards solving some of the most delicate points of what would be the future convention. However, we are under no illusion about the difficulties still facing us, difficulties which can only be resolved in a constructive mood and in a serene atmosphere. It is regrettable that untimely initiatives should disturb the natural pace of the Conference's work, which is now moving into its decisive phase. I refer, *inter alia,* to the possible adoption of unilateral legislation on the exploitation of the resources of the seabed beyond the limits of national jurisdiction, defined by this Assembly as the common heritage of mankind. Brazil hopes that in this case as well the sense of collective responsibility, which is essential for the success of such a complex and vast project, will again prevail.

Brazil has also participated very actively and with great interest in the United Nations Conference on Science and Technology for Development. We hope that the Vienna Program of Action and the Intergovernmental Committee on Science and Technology for Development, to be established, as well as the continuation of negotiations, including those in conferences already programmed within the United Nations, will lead North and South to solutions on the issue of the transfer of technology and the revision of rules which regulate industrial property, in accordance with the needs of the developing countries.

In concluding, I should like to assure the Assembly that as in the past the delegation of Brazil stands ready to work together with other delegations for the solution of the issues before the General Assembly. I should also like to state that in Brazil we remain confident and optimistic regarding the future, despite the frequent and serious adverse changes which in the present international situation have opposed our efforts. We are convinced that we are able to overcome the various obstacles facing our country and we are determined to continue to cooperate on an equitable basis in international efforts, here at the United Nations and elsewhere, for the promotion of justice, development and peace.

New York, September 24, 1979.

1980

1980

The fall of the Shah in Iran, the invasion of Afghanistan and later on the episode of the Soviet brigade in Cuba would be perceived in Western circles as threatening signs of a process of expansion of the Soviet influence. After the invasion of Afghanistan in December 1979 there remained no doubt that the era of *détente* had reached its end. The Soviet arms buildup was deemed capable of breaking the strategic parity, thus making possible a nuclear confrontation. The withdrawal of the United States from SALT-II marked the new trends in the international macrostructure: the instrument that had symbolized *détente* had become incompatible with the impulses toward confrontation that once again prevailed.

With the election of Ronald Reagan, the United States endeavored to reverse the Soviet gains in the global strategic scene. A new phase of the arms race was opened. The program "Star Wars" increased military budgets to unprecedented heights. The tendency to subordinate all international developments to the logic of confrontation between the superpowers reappeared. The distinctive view of the policy of blocs was retrieved, with both the United States and the Soviet Union endeavoring to reinforce and solidify their respective supporting bases.

It would no longer be feasible, however, for the blocs to return to their original configuration. Even in their primary areas of influence, the superpowers had to face significant challenges. The liberation movements in Nicaragua and El Salvador, on the one hand, and the recognition of the

"Solidarity" labor union in Poland, on the other, would defy the rigidity of the patterns of behavior inside the blocs and would provoke reactions less based on the ostensive application of the power of tutelage by one or the other superpower.

The war between Iran and Iraq, on its part, would open a process of instability, not yet concluded, in a region vital for the interests of political and economic security of developed countries.

Brazil would face this period of revival of the Cold War with diplomatic action aiming chiefly at the consolidation of relations with Latin-American countries. Presidential visits to Paraguay, Argentina and Chile as well as the visits of the Argentine and Mexican Presidents to Brazil ensured the progressive recovery of diplomatic and cooperation spaces.

The internal political scenery showed ambivalent signs, sometimes in tune with the dynamics of the progressive reclaiming of political and individual franchises and sometimes giving way to reactions of an authoritarian nature. The Riocentro episode (a foiled attempt against the audience of a show in Rio de Janeiro commemorating Labor Day, which was ascribed to the information services of the armed forces) revealed in a dramatic way the extent of the resistance of certain sectors among the military to the process of political opening. In November, the Congress approved an amendment establishing direct elections for state governorships and abolishing the so-called "bionic Senators" (freely appointed by the Executive).

In his statement before the Thirty-Fifth Session of the General Assembly, Minister Guerreiro expressed difficulty in finding grounds for optimism about the international situation. Criticizing the vertical and centralizing character of the international decision-making process, the Minister employed vigorous expressions to condemn the claim of "any country (…), however strong, to legislate for the whole world, as would a suzerain". The tone of the Brazilian discourse became harsher. The opening of the decision-making process to the wide and representative participation of the community of nations was emphatically demanded.

The essence of the text was of inconformity and demand. Lack of progress in disarmament was negatively appraised; elements in the Law of the Sea negotiations were said to be missing; South Africa was condemned and the Israeli policy regarding occupied territories and Jerusalem was rejected.

However, more encouraging words were used about the situation in Latin America. The Minister underscored the Brazilian effort to build regional unity on the basis of the recognition of political

diversity. It is evident in this formulation an endeavor to rationalize, by means of diplomatic language, the state of institutional exception still prevailing in Brazil.

Bitter and harsh words were used to describe the international economic situation. The systemic crisis of industrialized economies, of which the energy crisis was an element, was blamed for the slowing of the rate of growth of gross production in the world. In this 1980 statement, Minister Guerreiro presented the most consistent and extended explanation ever made by Brazil in the general debate on the problems of development and North-South relations, ending with an exhortation in favor of the widening of the bases for South-South understanding and cooperation.

The 1980 speech is a paradigm of what became to be considered the prevailing "Third World" view in the discourse and in the diplomatic operation of Brazil.

XXXV Regular Session of the General Assembly of the United Nations 1980

Minister Ramiro Saraiva Guerreiro [*]

Mr. President,

May I offer you the first compliments in this general debate. I do so with sincere satisfaction and in the certainty that my words will be a part of a general expression of recognition of the qualifications which so well entitle you to provide the leadership in the work that we are about to begin. With you in the Chair, we have every certainty that the debates on the items to be dealt with at this Session will be conducted in an efficient and equitable fashion.

Before going any further, I should like to express my thanks to the President of the Thirty-Fourth Session, Mr. Salim A. Salim, who was repeatedly called upon during the past year to give us the benefit of his guidance in diverse and complex situations. It is fitting here to recall once more his impressive performance at the head of the Special Committee on the Situation with regard to the Implementation of the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples, a task that he performed with wisdom and prudence.

I take this opportunity of welcoming two new Members of our community of nations, the Republic of Zimbabwe and Saint Vincent and

[*] **Ramiro Elysio Saraiva Guerreiro**, Born in Salvador, BA, December 22, 1918. Bachelor in Legal and Social Sciences from the National Law Faculty of the University of Bahia. Third Class Consul, public selection process, 1945. First Class Minister, by merit, 1968. Minister of State for External Relations, from 3/15/1979 to 3/15/1985. † Rio de Janeiro, January 19, 2011.

the Grenadines, and I congratulate you and the Assembly on this occasion. Both countries have our best wishes for a future of progress and peace.

It is particularly auspicious to see among us the delegation of Zimbabwe, as that means the culmination of a long process of struggle. When I recently visited that country brief as my stay was, I could appreciate the spirit with which its Government and people face the task of building a society both just and efficient.

We again welcome the delegation of Saint Vincent and the Grenadines, whose presence in this Organization is an effective contribution to the consolidation of the principles of self-determination and independence among the Caribbean nations. Its admission will enrich the group of Latin American States, where it will be fraternally received.

In opening this general debate, I reaffirm my country's commitment to the general principles of international conduct which are prescribed in the Charter of the United Nations and which are the heart and soul of this Assembly. Brazil will dedicate its best efforts to the preservation of international peace and security, to cooperation for development and to the promotion of respect for human rights and fundamental freedoms, without any distinction as to race, language or religion, just as the Charter of our Organization provides.

It is difficult, unfortunately, to find causes for optimism in the present world situation. Since last year, tensions that have already caused mankind so much anxiety have grown still stronger; risks of upsetting world peace have become far graver; the world economic crisis has become more severe; and famine and poverty persist, with their accompaniment of deep imbalances among nations. There is little reason for us to be proud of or even to accept the present state of things in the community of nations.

The process of international decision-making has itself too often proved short-sighted. That process, shaped in an era prior to decolonization and to the global spread of economic and political problems, and unchanged in its essence, has shown itself to be painfully defective. At the political level, it reflects and reinforces the imbalances which so much affect the lives of our peoples. It fails to include the participation of new political forces. Its centralizing character does not reflect the philosophy of our Charter, and as a result has become unworkable. On the one hand, an important and essentially positive development has taken place in recent history: no single country, no condominium of Powers, has the ability effectively to control events in the different regions of the world. On the other hand, the use that the main Powers make of their strength, which is

still tolerated by the international order, is inadequate to the new realities and needs of the world. Those Powers continue to think and act according to specific strategic interests; they continue to show perplexity and immobility regarding the crucial problems of peace and development; they continue to magnify regional tensions instead of contributing effectively to the resolution of the root causes of such tensions.

Neither the ideal of justice nor the recent course of events allows us to suppose that the maintenance of the present international order may lead to peace and prosperity. We have become used to references to interdependence in the world of today. At times, however, we have the feeling that no attention is paid to the fact that that word obviously conveys the idea of reciprocity. Interdependence is a two-way road. Its political dimension is mutual respect among nations. Its institutional foundations lie in universal obedience to the principles of the Charter such as equal sovereignty among States, self-determination, non-intervention and the peaceful settlement of disputes. There is no need here for further definition and qualification. Equality means equality, sovereignty means sovereignty and non-intervention means non-intervention. It is necessary for those basic principles to be observed in their entirety by all Members of our community, for quibbling about their implementation means adding new and serious threats to already tense international relations.

That means that no country, however strong, can presume to legislate to the world, as if it were a kind of overlord. That means that matters which affect everyone must be decided by all, and those which relate to the life of only one country must be decided by that country alone. That means that the international system must not be vertical and centralizing, that the international decision-making process regarding issues of global interest needs to be opened to the wide and representative participation of the community of nations.

There is no better channel for dealing with world problems than dialogue and the effort to defuse tensions as they arise. A mature attitude is needed. The so often illusory prospects and temptations of immediate gains which characterize confrontation strategies should be resisted. Beyond immediate concerns, self-discipline and courage are required if we are to talk and negotiate rationally and objectively. A mistake frequently made is to believe that public opinion in each country and at the international level is incapable of perceiving the long-term common interests. There is no serious reason to prevent the more powerful States from adhering to truly common goals, while they use their imagination and wisdom to move beyond routine approaches.

In the context of the recent increase in tension, it is encouraging to note the political ability demonstrated by Western Europe and by the third world. The developing countries with their voice and their vote in the General Assembly have clearly shown the importance they attach to respect for the basic principles of international law and their determination not to be used as pawns on the chess-board of crisis. They have reaffirmed their faith in non-intervention, in dialogue and in the relaxation of tension. They have demonstrated, and surely will continue to demonstrate, a will to play a constructive role, each one acting in accordance with its particular situation.

We are appealing to precisely that constructive approach and spirit of international cooperation. We do not restrict ourselves to the criticism of attitudes and the denunciation of injustice. We are ready to cooperate in the establishment of a more just and effective international order. My country, within the limits of its resources, has given repeated demonstrations to that effect. We are committed to fostering a climate of trust among nations; we are always alert to the possibilities of cooperation on an egalitarian basis; we repudiate the formation of Power blocs; we seek to give a forward thrust to existing opportunities for development. We have the right to expect the United Nations to work effectively for the creation of a better future, one of peace and prosperity, free of hegemonies, intervention or war.

The wide-ranging work of our Organization requires the adoption of an equitable scale of priorities in the consideration of the problems we must face. But peace and development are inseparable goals. No distinction should be made between them, Peace – not a state of precarious balance among heavily armed nations, but indeed a just and reliable international order – will never be attained without development. Development – not just economic growth in some areas, but indeed the redressing of the grave imbalances among nations – can be a realistic undertaking only if peace prevails.

The quantitative and qualitative increase in the nuclear arsenals of the great Powers continues to pose a paradoxical contrast with the unmistakable desire of the immense majority of nations to live in peace. It is embarrassing to see that the concentration of scientific and technological knowledge of those Powers is being wasted on research in and development of constantly improving deadly devices. New strategies are planned with a sinister logic, as if it were possible to survive a nuclear war.

The new momentum in multilateral discussions on disarmament arising from the commitments entered into at the Tenth Special Session

of the General Assembly has met with reluctance on the part of countries with intercontinental offensive power. Nevertheless, the Committee on Disarmament, a body which has our fully participation and support, has kept on trying, only to be blocked by an inversion of priorities which postpones the consideration of nuclear disarmament in all its forms.

The Ninth Session of the Third United Nations Conference on the Law of the Sea has adjourned at Geneva, on August 29 last, with significant results to its credit. However, there are still gaps in the informal text of the draft articles which are to become the future convention, and additional efforts will be required in order to improve upon it. If the constructive spirit, serenity, and sense of collective responsibility which we have advocated throughout the Conference are allowed to prevail, we trust they will result in the adoption by consensus of a well-balanced charter of the seas that will guarantee the interests of coastal States and give substance to the principle of the common heritage of mankind in the international seabed area.

Like the overwhelming majority of nations, Brazil deplores the haste of countries which, in the course of negotiations, have enacted unilateral legislation on the exploitation of resources of the seabed beyond national jurisdiction. Such acts bring undue pressure to bear on the negotiations and contravene resolutions of this Organization and should, therefore, be repudiated by the international community.

In our own region of Latin America this is a period of disturbance, but the prevailing trends are essentially positive. Relations among Latin American nations are deepening and there is more room for them to cooperate with each other as equals on the basis of balanced and mutual advantage.

Thanks fundamentally to the operation of endogenous factors, a new and dynamic Latin American reality is being created. Political and economic stagnation is being replaced by a more complex situation, one richer in opportunities for change. Diplomacy is increasingly active and the strengthening of a network of bilateral dialogues certainly facilitates the launchingof new Latin American regional efforts and the building of a more homogeneous, more creative stand for the region in its comprehensive debate with the rest of the world.

Brazil's stance is that regional unity should be based on the purposeful exploitation of the countless affinities among our countries. It also depends on the mature and balanced recognition of the political, economic and cultural diversities existing among us. Latin American unity is a project for democratic, egalitarian and mutually trusting

coexistence among our countries. Such unity rejects hegemonies, interventions, axes or blocs.

President João Figueiredo has pledged himself to provide additional impetus for these positive trends and to increase his contacts with other heads of State in Latin America. During the last 12 months the President of Brazil has paid official visits to Caracas, Asunción and Buenos Aires and in turn has been the host in Brazil of President Morales Bermudez of Peru, President Lopez Portillo of Mexico and President Jorge Videla of Argentina. Brazil thus participates with its sister nations in the common effort for the construction of a truly operative and dynamic understanding among the Latin American nations.

In the course of the present session we will be celebrating the twentieth anniversary of the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples, a basic instrument for the affirmation of the right to self-determination, sovereignty and independence.

We must now concentrate on the questions of Namibia and of the elimination of *apartheid* in South Africa lest we face the continuing frustration of those peoples there and of all of us at the United Nations. Every effort must be made to ensure that prompt and fruitful results are gained from the work accumulated throughout these years at the United Nations towards a solution for the problem of Namibia, whose people are represented by the South West Africa People's Organization. The risk we have been running since Security Council resolution 435 (1978) was adopted two years ago is that of having placed too much trust in negotiations that have not developed in accordance with legitimate expectations.

The persistence of military aggressions conducted by the Government of South Africa against Angola and Zambia is unacceptable. Political contrivances such as the installation of the so-called national assembly of Windhoek are also unacceptable. The very latest exchange of messages with the Secretary-General betrays the evasive and delaying attitude of South Africa. In this, as in other problems pending on our agenda, the position of the Organization of African Unity (OAU) and, in particular, that of the frontline States, is fundamental inasmuch as, on June 2 last, they have reaffirmed at Lusaka the priority they accord to the question of Namibia on the basis of documents already adopted by the United Nations.

The responsibility of this Organization for the preservation of international peace and security does not allow us to ignore the present

escalation of intransigence, arbitrariness and violence which render the prospects for peace in the Middle East increasingly remote.

Particularly serious are the implications of certain measures – recently adopted or announced – of consolidation of illegal occupation and of formal annexation of territories taken by force. The Security Council has already firmly expressed in its resolution 478 (1980), its universal rejection of the measures which purport unilaterally to modify the status of the City of Jerusalem.

In connection with the establishment of the basis for a comprehensive, just and lasting peace, Brazil reaffirms that it is indispensable for the consensus to prevail so as to ensure the following: the complete withdrawal of occupying forces from all Arab territories; the exercise of the inalienable rights of the Palestinian people to return to their homeland, to self-determination, to independence and to sovereignty in Palestine in accordance with the Charter and the relevant United Nations resolutions; the participation of the Palestine Liberation Organization (PLO) in peace negotiations: and the recognition of the right of all States in the region to exist within recognized boundaries.

We can also expect the Council to provide a more complete and appropriate framework for the consideration of the question, in which the rights of the Palestinian people are duly recognized.

I also wish to make a particular reference to the tragic situation in Lebanon, the country of origin of so many Brazilians who have greatly contributed to our national life. Lebanon deserves our full solidarity, and its independence, sovereignty and territorial integrity must be preserved.

When I addressed the General Assembly last year, I noted that the world economy entered the decade of the 1980s in a state of generalized uncertainty. The aggravation of the global economic situation, throughout the last 12 months, only strengthens the evidence that we are all facing an entirely new situation in qualitative terms.

We are going through much more than a simple transitory stage, that of a slackening of the rate of growth of world output and of a simultaneous increase of inflationary tensions. There is a profound and comprehensive system-wide network crisis which affects industrialized economies and accentuates the distortions and imbalances of their relations with the developing world.

The so-called "energy crisis", as central as it may be today in our concerns and as dramatic as may be its economic impact, should be recognized for what it really is: not as something accidental or exogenous, but as a component part of an underlying structural crisis of a broader and

more lasting nature. The energy problem is felt essentially in the North-South dimension. Therefore, in order to be effective, its solution can be sought only within the context of efforts aimed at a global revision of the relations between highly developed countries and the developing world as a whole.

This finds eloquent proof in the fact – which no one would dare deny – that developing countries have recently assumed an increasing and even decisive role in the fabric of the international economy, either as providers of raw materials, as markets, as increasingly competitive industrial suppliers, as areas for new investments or as users of capital often lacking alternatives for application in developed economies which are either in a state of stagnation or reduced growth.

This role of the third world has been attained not because the world markets have become more responsive to the aspirations and needs of the developing countries but, in fact, it was achieved despite persistent and in many cases increasing obstacles such as the new and more effective forms of protectionism, the transfer of inflationary tensions and the generalized increase of interest rates in capital markets.

In the last few years the third world has been a weighty factor in sustaining the level of economic activity of the developed world. Nevertheless, possibly under the pressure of its own difficulties seen from the narrow viewpoint of the present state of affairs the developed world has in practice adopted an increasingly distant attitude towards the problems of underdevelopment. It is obvious in the summit meetings of the so-called "Seven" and in several multilateral forums that less attention has been given to the structural problems of the North-South relationship and an attitude has become prevalent which practically limits itself to considering marginal measures and to assigning the responsibility for the evils that now afflict the world economy to increases in the price of oil.

Another and more subtle expression of the aloofness of the North towards the South is the attempt to introduce restrictive categories for developing countries, grouping them according to level of income or industrialization or classifying them either as importers or exporters of oil. An entire conceptual arsenal is being put together to bolster this effort to produce divisive and diversionary effects. In fact, this categorization is just one more proof of the protectionist attitude of the developed world and of its lack of interest in grasping the problem of underdevelopment in its entirety, with all its economic, technological and social aspects.

It is time to realize that the full, true integration of developing countries into the international economy cannot be brought about by

imposing upon them an institutional framework which is unilaterally predetermined by the major economic Powers but rather can be achieved only by allowing them adequate access to decision-making processes for the problems affecting the international economic situation. It is an illusion to presume that in the new international scene which we face it is possible to maintain privileged structures and, at the same time, solve global problems. The attempt to preserve obsolete structures of domination over international flows in matters of trade, finance and technology can only prolong and even aggravate the present difficulties. In the world today, the exercise of power is contradictory with the objectives of prosperity. The time has come for us to interpret anew the ties between nations of the North and the South and to replace the rhetorical affirmation of interdependence with the practical construction of mutuality.

In order to do so, the developed countries must recognize that solutions will not spring spontaneously from piecemeal deliberations in different multilateral agencies and forums if the present elitist decision-making structures are maintained and operational criteria remain unaltered. These might have been adequate in the past, but they no longer serve their purpose. The essential meaning of the so-called "global negotiations" is precisely that of offering to all of us what may be one last chance to seek an integrated and harmonious set of measures to reformulate the North-South relationship. This opportunity can materialize only if we are able to undertake the urgent task of devising a political thrust which can generate from the universal forum – that of the General Assembly of the United Nations – significant modifications in multilateral economic institutions, so as to make them more open to the participation of the developing countries and more receptive to their specific needs.

Therefore, the Brazilian Government cannot conceal its grave concern regarding the stalemate which occurred a few days ago during the Eleventh Special Session of the General Assembly. In our opinion, the failure to launch global negotiations is not in any way compensated for by the existence of a consensus reached on the text of a new International Development Strategy. Such a text, as my Government sees it, is not satisfactory, for it does not even take into account substantive progress related to previous agreements reached in other bodies, and it will still be subject to reservations and declarations of a restrictive or interpretative nature from the developed countries.

A most meaningful fact is that the third world has been able to preserve its fundamental sense of unity, despite the legitimate differences

in interest which might occasionally arise and regardless of external pressure, as I have mentioned.

The present crisis necessarily leads to an increasing unity among the nations of Latin America, Africa and Asia in a common effort to revise the patterns of their relationship with the North. However, the crisis does not cease to present us with renewed challenges and obstacles. Our unity should be continuously reaffirmed and reinvigorated even more so when the effort – legitimate in itself – to increase the value of scarce and non-renewable resources causes effects of a dramatic nature in other developing countries.

The time has come for us to deploy, within the South-South relationship, an intensified effort to diversify and enlarge the bases of understanding and cooperation. Concrete, substantive and effective flows of trade and financing among developing countries must be added to the political ties and to the common platforms in the North-South context.

The industrial, technological and financial potential which now exists in the third world – added, of course, to its immense natural and human resources – opens to the nations of the three developing continents broad prospects of a fruitful direct relationship, avoiding the often politically or economically onerous procedure of going through the main centers. The challenge before us is, in short, to create for the third world a profile of its own, based on its internal reality and dynamism, and not merely on the expression of the differences between us and the developed nations.

Success in this truly pioneer effort of establishing ties of effective partnership among developing countries rests on a clear political commitment. Only the common will to draw closer will allow us to reach concrete results. Such a decision must be as firm as the difficulties are great in establishing ties among nations like ours, which for a long time have remained far apart and which, even today, are predominantly oriented in the economic and financial fields towards the great industrial centers.

Brazil, for its part, fully trusts that the nations of the South will be able to take advantage of the present difficulties in order to reaffirm their own personality, strengthen and enrich their unity and solidarity – an element indispensable for the success of their struggle to overcome underdevelopment – and revise the terms of their relationship with the industrialized North.

These are, in the main, the remarks that I want to make on behalf of the delegation of Brazil as the debate at the Thirty-Fifth Session of the General Assembly opens.

If throughout all these years we have reiterated our concerns it is because the march of international events proceeds at an inexorable and even accelerated pace while solutions lag behind. Therefore, our work cannot but reflect the ever-growing problems and the shortcomings of the international decision-making process. It is fitting that my delegation stress that it awaits the day when contentious subjects in our annual agenda are replaced by matters of common cooperation and understanding.

Throughout the three months of work before us the delegation of Brazil will spare no effort to help create better conditions for participation and international dialogue, in the certainty that the United Nations is still the most adequate instrument at the disposal of the international community for the achievement of the objectives of peace and development.

New York, September 22, 1980.

1981

1981

The internal conjuncture in Brazil remained under the rule of the vicissitudes of the process of political opening. The sequels of the 1980 Riocentro episode provoked divisions within the military and reduced the margin of support for the government in civil society. A recession that severely affected the industrial sector and provoked unemployment complicated the political panorama.

Not surprisingly, the Brazilian view of the evolution of the international situation remained negative in 1981. The exacerbation of the East-West confrontation, the competition of spheres of influence, the acceleration and sophistication of the arms race, the stagnation of disarmament negotiations and of the Law of the Sea as well as of the North-South dialogue made up a disheartening picture. In the Middle East and in the Gulf, the situation would deteriorate further with the murder of Egyptian President Anwar and the destruction of a nuclear reactor in Iraq by the Israeli air force.

For Brazilian diplomacy, change in this negative scenario was indispensable. And in this context, just as Minister Saraiva Guerreiro would state in a lecture at the Superior War College, "Brazil requests that the international order be changed so that it no longer condones, but rather overcomes, political and economic inequalities (...) This is the gauge of our identity as a developing country. This is most significant coincidence between our interest as an individual nation and as part of the Third World. Developing countries are the chief promoters of the new international

order. Our countries have the highest degree of responsibility to respect and enforce respect for the norms of good coexistence, and oppose shifts or manipulation of the principles of International Law… Our task is to ensure that equality among nations prevails… We promote dynamism and change, and we are convinced that these are necessary not only for our own country, but for the entire international community…"

This is an eloquent quotation. It constitutes, at the same time, an expressive explanation of the world view then put into practice by Brazilian diplomacy, as well as a program of action.

In reality, neither the internal crisis, nor difficulties raised by the unfavorable international panorama prevented Brazilian diplomacy to maintain intensive activity. Presidential visits to France, Portugal, Colombia, the Federal Republic of Germany and Peru reinforced Brazilian interaction with traditional interlocutors in Europe and strengthened links in the Latin American area.

In his statement before the Thirty-Sixth Session of the General Assembly, Minister Saraiva Guerreiro sketched a gloomy picture of the international conjuncture, both from the political and the economic point of view. He dwelled for a long time on the analysis of the wants of the economic-commercial-financial system. Referring to the summit set for the following October in Cancún, he proposed the restart of a North-South dialogue capable of promoting a true negotiating process between the developed world and the Third World. Moreover, there was special emphasis on Latin-American issues, in a context that the Minister characterized as "movements of regional assertion by developing countries". The need for full respect to the principle of non-intervention in El Salvador was also mentioned.

Other themes taken up were:

- Africa: strong condemnation of *apartheid* and of South African intransigence regarding the process of Namibian independence.

- Middle East: Previously expounded positions on the need for complete withdrawal of occupation forces from all Arab territories and the right of the Palestine people to self-determination, independence and sovereignty were reiterated.

- The attack to the Iraqi nuclear plant was condemned and Brazilian solidarity with the government and people of that country for the aggression was reaffirmed. Afghanistan: Soviet intervention was condemned.

XXXVI Regular Session of the General Assembly of the United Nations 1981

Minister Ramiro Saraiva Guerreiro [*]

Mr. President,

As the first speaker in the general debate, it is my privilege to extend the first words of congratulation to you upon your election as President of the General Assembly at its Thirty-Sixth Session.

Relations between Iraq and Brazil, based on the solidarity between our two nations and strengthened by our converging action towards common objectives, fit into the broader context of cooperation between developing countries on an equal basis.

Your election is certainly a tribute to your country, but just as certainly a tribute to your personal and professional qualifications. I am confident that under your leadership the work of the present session of the General Assembly will be conducted with the greatest skill and efficiency.

I should also like to express our appreciation for the able and confident manner in which Mr. von Wechmar presided over the Thirty-Fifth Session. His performance fully justified the international community's decision to entrust him with this important role in such particularly difficult times.

[*] **Ramiro Elysio Saraiva Guerreiro**, Born in Salvador, BA, December 22, 1918. Bachelor in Legal and Social Sciences from the National Law Faculty of the University of Bahia.Third Class Consul, public selection process, 1945. First Class Minister, by merit, 1968. Minister of State for External Relations, from 3/15/1979 to 3/15/1985. † Rio de Janeiro, January 19, 2011.

On the occasion of Vanuatu's admission to membership in the United Nations, I should like to express a cordial welcome to this new Member of our Organization.

In the Latin American tradition of support for decolonization, I congratulate Belize upon its accession to independence. Brazil wishes for that country a future of peace and prosperity.

Conflicts and tensions of both a political and an economic nature exist in various parts of the world, adversely affecting the Organization and the functioning of the international system. Beyond those tensions and conflicts which are almost inevitable given the present state of relations among nations, what causes us even greater concern is the perception that the international order's ability to contain and resolve those conflicts is diminishing. The ideal of a community of nations is being gradually replaced by an attitude of conformity and the acceptance of perpetual conflict. The strategy of mutual challenge tends to limit the efficacy of the means for peaceful solutions of international disputes. Purportedly for the purpose of strengthening peace and security, the arms race has resumed, particularly in the nuclear field, to the detriment of essential priorities for the building of the future.

For some years now, we have been living in the age of overkill. What was once to have been the final absurd chapter in a spiraling race has now proved to be only the groundwork for building new nuclear arsenals. Nevertheless, no country is more secure now that it was then. Despite the fact that the stockpiled capacity for nuclear destruction has now reached the equivalent of two tons of dynamite for every living human being, the diversification and sophistication of strategic weapons continue. But the risk of war is as great as ever. Hundreds of billions are spent on activities which are, at best, unproductive. International cooperation to improve living conditions and to create a more equitable international society receives a lesser priority, as if the problems of development should, or even could, wait for a better opportunity.

That irrational allocation of resources and the very international order that endorses it neglect the real problems that beset most of mankind. This state of affairs only favors the perpetuation of inequality among nations.

We do not face a purely moral or ethical issue. What is at stake is the future of the international system itself. A new sense of direction is urgently needed in order to reverse this trend. The second Special Session of the General Assembly devoted to disarmament scheduled for next year therefore takes on a very special significance.

Even though the nuclear weapon States bear the responsibility of reversing the arms race, the search for satisfactory and lasting solutions must take into account the aspirations of the international community as a whole. Full use should therefore be made of the negotiating machinery provided by the United Nations, which plays a vital role with regard to disarmament.

The present world economic crisis has been with us now for a decade. Yet no clear signs of recovery are in sight. This lack of progress is in itself the strongest evidence of the international community's incapacity so far to adapt to changing circumstances and to react in a creative way to new realities.

Besides the very complexity of the economics involved, perhaps the worst crisis we face is one of management. What is still lacking is due recognition of a basic fact: that however traumatic its immediate consequences may be, the meaning of the rapid and unique process of change in the world economy is essentially positive.

The new, more dynamic, and increasingly diversified role played by developing countries in all areas of international trade is a healthy event. Its overall effect has been to expand opportunities for growth in the world economy as a whole. The maintenance of relatively high rates of growth by several developing countries in the 1970s was an important factor in sustaining basic rates of expansion in certain highly industrialized countries, which otherwise would have been in even greater difficulties than the ones they currently face.

What is missing now, particularly on the part of the developed countries, is the recognition of the need properly to manage the process of change so as to maximize the numerous opportunities for creative partnership between developed and developing countries. That process of change, I might add, cannot be halted and should not be hampered, because it is healthy and desirable for us all.

The unprecedented expansion in trade and capital flows over the past decades, together with the increasing trend towards the internationalization of the factors of production, far outstripped the resources and managerial capacity of the structure devised at Bretton Woods to carry out an orderly evolution of international trade.

As regards the third world, there was a widening of the gap between its needs for external support and the resources available for development cooperation. Insufficient progress in the improvement of the rules and mechanisms of multilateral agencies has made even more acute the inadequacy of the institutional framework to meet the new, larger, and often more complex needs of developing economies.

The international agenda has thus been broadened to include new issues. In many cases, linkages have become apparent between problems that formerly seemed amenable to topical, isolated treatment. In a complex and increasingly diversified world economy, it is not enough to proclaim the fact of interdependence. A serious attempt must be made to resolve the problem of underdevelopment, which affects nearly two thirds of mankind.

For too long the third world countries have been told that development in the South must come about as a byproduct of prosperity in the North, as if high levels of demand in the industrial world for products from the developing countries would by themselves ensure the solution of problems that are qualitative in nature and are directly related to the unequal patterns of trade with the highly developed countries.

Almost three decades of accelerated growth and hard, though mostly fruitless, work on the North-South issues have demonstrated that prosperity in the central economies does not necessarily lead them to a higher predisposition towards progress in redefining obsolete and unfair patterns of trade with the third world. Recent events have shown that difficulties in those countries tend immediately to harden their position vis-à-vis the developing world, while the remedies resorted to often have a strong negative impact on the situation of the latter.

We think it would be a mistake besides being a waste of precious time to hold the North-South issue in abeyance until the major economies succeed in recovering. On the contrary, we hold that what the international community needs in the present circumstances is a concerted effort to draw up, for the first time in history, an integrated, comprehensive set of principles and measures capable of sustaining world trade, finance and technology flows on a sound course, while paying due attention to the needs of the developing countries.

The North-South issue has passed the stage of confrontation – which, incidentally, was never inherent in the exercise – but it has yet to move on to the stage of true dialogue. This will come about only when the developed world shows itself ready to engage in a negotiating process with the third world. Moderation is, after all, required on both sides, and its expression by the North will have to take the form of a constructive position on development issues as a whole.

The basic premise underlying the whole North-South issue is that it affects all nations, rich and poor alike. In this context, differences of perception need not stand in the way of negotiations about what ultimately are common interests, provided that issues are tackled in a broader,

longer-range perspective. The North-South exercise is not a win-or-lose game; it is not a matter of redistributing existing wealth, but, rather, an attempt to define a framework of relations that will provide all countries, developed as well developing, with greater opportunities for growth.

An inescapable conclusion should be drawn: the time is over when benefits in the economic sphere would be best assured by continued additions to a country's power. When the world economy becomes highly diversified and problems assume global dimensions, the challenge is no longer how to gain unilateral advantages, but rather how jointly to define viable ways of managing an increasingly unstable system. It is our hope that the major developed countries, precisely because of their global responsibilities, will not fail to acknowledge the need for multilateral action on global issues.

The international community has at its disposal a vast heritage of concepts and ideas to use as a basis for a serious commitment to settle the North-South issues. It is high time to take a decision to that effect. The meeting of 22 Heads of State or Government of North and South, to be held in Cancun, Mexico, next October, will provide a unique opportunity for the major Western Powers to regain the trust of the third world by showing that there will be no relapse into unilateral attitudes and negative judgments on the relevance of North-South problems. It is essential that this exercise be conclusive. We expect it to result in a clear-cut commitment to contribute to the early launching of the global negotiations, to be conducted in the universal forum of the United Nations. We also hope that a basic consensus will be reached on principles and premises to inspire thereafter what will only then become worthy of the term "North-South dialogue". I am instructed to assure this Assembly that President Figueiredo has a deep personal commitment to the success of the Cancún meeting, and that he will spare no effort to help bring about the results we all look forward to.

The prospects for concluding this year the long work of codification of the new law of the sea were frustrated by the sudden decision of one country to revise its entire position on the draft convention. This setback, with its serious implications, gives rise to real concern among all those devoted to the success of the multilateral cooperation effort. However, it served to demonstrate that the vast majority of the countries represented at the Third United Nations Conference on the Law of the Sea firmly adhere to the principles subscribed to in the Declaration incorporated in resolution 2749 (XXV) and show no disposition to reopen the fundamental points in the draft convention.

Thus the Conference succeeded in advancing its mandate and formalizing the draft convention. A sign of the firm determination of the international community to adopt the convention and to open it for signature next year was the selection of the headquarters of the International Seabed Authority and of the International Tribunal of the Law of the Sea. I take this opportunity to congratulate once again Jamaica and the Federal Republic of Germany which were chosen, respectively, to host those two international bodies.

At this time, when there is so much international instability, the movements being made by developing countries towards regional affirmation must not be wasted, since they may well be one of the most efficient means of containing international differences. Regional affirmations supply a basis that cannot be dispensed with if we are to safeguard the complexity and variety of the international scene and to relaunch the drive towards peace, justice and development, in all their aspects.

The efforts of Latin American countries to act on the international scene on the basis of their own national profiles fit perfectly into this larger movement effectively to reduce the levels of international tension.

The Latin American inclination for international cooperation stems from no artificially created option. Attitudes that favor the peaceful settlement of disputes are deep-rooted in Latin America. These attitudes define the mechanisms of international cooperation and demand from States mutual respect, equilibrium and equity in bilateral relations.

Just as deeply implanted in Latin America is the disposition towards multilateral efforts, towards working together to mould the international system, on the basis of the principles of justice and progress. In fact, the Latin American contribution is its understanding that acceptance of change is the minimum prerequisite for the construction of peace. The processes of change must be democratic, open to participation and based on freedom. The objectives of change must be generous, shaped by ideals of justice and the contours of tolerance.

I do not wish to paint an idealized portrait of Latin America. The countries of Latin America have differences of opinion since areas of controversy still remain. There are still disputes over boundaries. The political processes are subject to difficulties. There are structures of dependency that have not been eliminated. Painful problems of development cry out for urgent solution and our countries lack the immediate means to deal with them.

Nevertheless, through all this diversity there is a clear perception that we must work together. We are proud of the values we have forged from our rich historical experience, in which the defense of the principle of non-intervention is outstanding. Our efforts are inspired by our own ideals and do not attempt to repeat what may have been successful elsewhere. Our major contribution to the international system, a disposition towards negotiation and peace, has never been denied, even in the most difficult and controversial situations.

Brazilian diplomacy has always been faithful to these ideals. One of the cornerstones of our foreign policy has been the stimulation of dialogue with our neighbors at every opportunity and at every level. President Figueiredo has had meetings with his Latin American colleagues, accepting as his own the responsibility for promoting the ideals of regional cooperation.

Brazil views the situation in El Salvador, as well as in any other part of Latin America, in the same spirit of full respect for the principle of non-intervention. It is the hope of the Brazilian Government that all States will respect the sovereignty of that country and the right of the people of EI Salvador to solve their own problems without foreign interference. Brazil believes in the importance of intensifying consultations among the countries of the region so as to avoid the weakening of the fabric of Latin American unity and solidarity by specific issues to the detriment of our common interests.

Brazil is proud of its African roots and, faithful to them, is open to cooperation with the developing countries on the opposite shore of the South Atlantic. I should have preferred to confine my remarks to the accomplishments in the process of bringing Brazil closer to Africa. However, one cannot speak of Africa without dealing with two crucial questions which remain unresolved – those of *apartheid* and of the independence of Namibia.

Brazil emphatically condemns the institutionalized practice of racism which characterizes the regime of the Republic of South Africa. The universal conscience of mankind, and more specifically the Brazilian national conscience, totally rejects such a way of life, which is incompatible with any idea of justice and equality. Brazil associates itself with the community of nations in the renewal of efforts to ensure South Africa's total compliance with the purposes and principles of the United Nations Charter, to which we are all committed.

The question of the independence of Namibia has been dealt with by the international community on the basis of Security Council resolution 435 (1978) and of the plan drawn up by our Organization which the Council

has embraced by that resolution and which has been internationally accepted. Brazil fully supports the independence and territorial integrity of Namibia founded on the efforts of the United Nations. The problem, however, has not yet been solved, owing to the intransigence of South Africa, which persists in its illegal occupation of Namibia and deliberately undermines international attempts to achieve a negotiated solution, in sharp contrast to the flexibility and willingness for negotiation shown by the other parties involved. And that is not all. Using illegally occupied Namibia as a base for operations, South Africa carries out systematic acts of aggression against Angola which culminated recently in the invasion and prolonged occupation of areas in the south of that country. These violations of the United Nations Charter, international law and elementary rules of international behavior have been compounded by acts of aggression against other countries that border on South Africa.

The attitude of the South African regime constitutes a flagrant disservice to the cause and interests of the West which it absurdly claims to defend. It is a permanent source of tension and polarization in southern Africa, contributing towards turning it into one or more areas for East-West confrontation, to the detriment of the freedom of the peoples of the area. These South African acts of aggression must stop immediately. The illegal occupation of Namibia must cease at once so that it can achieve its independence forthwith and so that all countries of the region, freed at last from the tensions of war, its burdens and commitments, may devote themselves, in favorable circumstances, to the just cause of their own development and to the authentic expression of their national existence in independence and sovereignty.

In the Middle East a succession of crises bears witness to the deterioration of the general situation. The issues relating to the future of the Palestinian people, that is to say, to the creation of the State of Palestine, and to the conditions that exist in the occupied Arab territories, seem to perpetuate themselves. Furthermore, we have had to witness the aggression against the nuclear reactor of Tamuz and the renewed aggression against the territory of Lebanon.

In the face of such a worsening of the situation, it becomes more and more urgent to implement the resolutions of the United Nations that reflect the international consensus regarding the search for a comprehensive, just and lasting peace. My Government firmly holds to the proposition that the conditions indispensable for peace are the complete withdrawal of occupation forces from all Arab territories; the exercise of the right of the Palestinian people to return to Palestine and recognition of their right

to self-determination, independence and sovereignty; the participation of the Palestine Liberation Organization (PLO) in the peace negotiations; the recognition of the right of all States in the region to live in peace within recognized borders.

The absence of a comprehensive solution helps to increase tension and provokes localized crises. By the same token, it lessens the possibility of resorting to means for a peaceful solution provided for in the Charter and leads to further violation of its principles. The attack on the nuclear plant in Iraq comes within this context. Despite the attempt made to classify this act as "preemptive", the attack on Tamuz was a flagrant example of the use of force incompatible with the Charter of our Organization.

Although the position and reactions of my Government in this case have already been expressed, I should like to reaffirm our solidarity with the Government and people of Iraq in the face of the act of aggression they have suffered, in violation of their sovereignty. Moreover, I cannot fail to convey the anxiety we feel about the turmoil and violence in Lebanon, which has so often been the victim of aggression. I reiterate our support for the preservation of the independence, sovereignty and integrity of Lebanon, which has made such a great contribution to the progress of Brazil through the efforts of its emigrant sons.

I could not conclude my remarks on the Middle East without expressing my concern about the status of Jerusalem, particularly the steps most recently taken by the Israeli Administration regarding the Holy City.

Our position concerning events in Afghanistan is clear, and coincides in essence with that of the broad majority of the developing countries. We are opposed to the violation of the principles of non-intervention and the self-determination of peoples. We are equally in opposition to the manipulation of domestic political conditions in a country in order to create a facade of legitimacy for acts which amount to foreign intervention. Legitimacy cannot be imposed from the outside, and any attempts in that direction only aggravate the situation they purport to resolve. Our support for these principles is universal in scope. Any attempt to interfere in internal political processes in Asia, in Africa or in Latin America, as well as in Europe, will forever be the object of unconcealed, open condemnation by the international community.

Looking back on the year just past, we see once again that events give us no reason to be optimistic. Serious problems continue to plague international relations, due less to an inability to balance them properly than to an absence of the political will to make use of the mechanisms designed to resolve them. In these circumstances, we should lose neither

our confidence nor our analytical spirit, neither our creativity nor our realism. We reaffirm that the international system, to be both just and efficient, must allow for broad, effective and representative participation by the entire community of nations in the decision-making process on world issues. We reiterate our respect for the United Nations Charter, for its purposes and principles, to be equally observed by all. We renew our pledge of confidence in the Organization under the Charter, for which there is no substitute as the legally competent instrument for the achievement of our highest aims.

Mr. President, I wish every success for the work of this Thirty-Sixth Session of the General Assembly under your able guidance in dealing with the issues on our agenda. The Brazilian delegation will always stand ready to give you its best and most attentive cooperation to help make that success possible.

New York, September 21, 1981.

1982

1982

The economic results in Brazil showed a negative inflection in 1982 as a consequence of the changes in the commercial and in the industrial structure of the country due to the oil crisis, of the government decision to keep a policy of growth at any cost and more immediately of the Mexican moratorium of August 1982. The slowing down of economic growth foreshadowed the exhaustion of the authoritarian model. The GDP, however, would still show positive growth (1.4 per cent) and inflation did not move far from the rate of the previous year (99.7 per cent). The political timetable called for general elections in November. For the first time since 1965 state governors would be elected by direct vote. For the government, it was essential to prevent a recession from influencing voters in favor of the opposition. This result was achieved. Despite the fact that the opposition parties obtained 59 per cent of the total votes and the governorship of nine States, among which São Paulo, Rio de Janeiro, Minas Gerais and Paraná, the central government kept control of the national Congress.

Abroad, the panorama remained negative. The Iran-Iraq war went on, jeopardizing the security of the supply of fuel for Brazilian energy generation. In the Middle East, repeated Israeli military actions against Palestine sanctuaries in Lebanon kept the situation at a high level of tension.

Simultaneously with the start of an opening toward Cuba by means of the organization of a private Brazilian trade mission, President

Figueiredo visited the United States in May. The visit was somewhat affected by the Argentine invasion of the Malvinas and the British military intervention in the South Atlantic. Later on, in November, President Reagan visited Brazil. Both sides were trying to recover a relationship that seemed to shift toward divergence rather than cooperation, in spite of the huge interests involved.

Addressing the Thirty-Seventh Session of the General Assembly, President Figueiredo became the first Brazilian Head of State to take the floor at the general debate. His speech reflected the difficulties that Brazil was going through and contained an expressive call on the developed world to avoid a global recession crisis similar to the one of the 1930's. For this it would be necessary to reform the structures of the IMF, the World Bank and GATT in order to recover the correct sense of the concept of interdependence, based on mutual understanding and solidarity. The President did not shirk from condemning the concept of *graduation*, with which at the time the financial institutions intended to establish distinctions between developing countries for the concession of credits, a move that Brazil perceived as contrary to its interests.

The evaluation of the international situation remained negative. Never, President Figueiredo said, threats to peace and security and to the advancement of nations had been as serious. The President reaffirmed the main lines of Brazilian diplomacy with regard to the issues of disarmament, Middle East, Southern Africa and Afghanistan. He recalled the need for the conflicts then taking place in Central America to be resolved without foreign intervention. Reiterating Brazilian support to Argentine sovereignty over the Malvinas, he demanded a peaceful and permanent solution for that dispute, which had brought instability to a region of strategic importance for Brazil. He also took care to express Brazilian identification with African and the other Third World nations.

The statement closed with an expressive exhortation in favor of North-South dialogue with a view to solving both the structural aspects of the crisis and their most immediate manifestations, which required emergency measures to unblock the international flow of trade and finance. President Figueiredo also warned that developing countries could not be the first to eliminate trade barriers, for this would cause an unacceptable increase in the already large deficits in their external accounts.

XXXVII Regular Session of the General Assembly of the United Nations 1982

President João Figueiredo [*]

Mr. President,

On behalf of the Government and people of Brazil, I wish to congratulate you on your election as President of the Thirty-Seventh Session of the General Assembly.

I warmly greet the representatives of the Member States gathered together in this Hall. I extend warm greetings to the Secretary-General, Mr. Javier Pérez de Cuellar, a brilliant diplomat who is a credit to Latin America. I also wish to extend my sincere compliments to Mr. Ismat Kittani, representative of Iraq, who with assurance and ability presided over the work of the Thirty-Sixth Session.

At this time, as the general debate begins, I wish to express my hope that this session of the General Assembly will effectively contribute to a just solution of the controversies which are jeopardizing international peace and security and to the removal of the threat to the stability of the world's economy.

A few decades ago, an unprecedented economic depression and uncontrolled political tension brought about a catastrophic war. The society of sovereign States decided then, in 1945, to create a vast network

[*] **João Baptista de Oliveira Figueiredo**, Born in Rio de Janeiro, RJ, January 15, 1918. Embraced the military career and in 1978, the year of his election by the Electoral College to the Presidency of the Republic, he received his fourth star as General. President of the Republic from 3/15/1979 to 3/15/1985. After the end of his term he withdrew from political life. † Rio de Janeiro, December 24, 1999.

of institutions to further cooperation between Governments in order to avoid a repetition of such severe economic crises, promote economic and social development, ease political tension and spare future generations from the scourge of war.

Symptoms dramatically reminiscent of the events of the 1930s are reappearing today. A new economic crisis of global dimensions indiscriminately affects countries under different systems and resists orthodox therapies.

Paradoxically, the United Nations, which was established in order to examine and resolve controversy between States, has all too often been transformed into a forum for sterile confrontation. We are aware, however, that alternative forms of organizing international life inevitably depend on the arbitrary will of the most powerful States which, at times, runs counter to the cause of freedom and justice among nations and men.

Having these considerations in mind, the Government of Brazil renews its pledge to work together with the other Member States in order to make the United Nations a true centre for harmonizing the actions of States. I do not hesitate to call on all Governments represented here to adhere strictly in their international behavior to the purposes and principles of the Organization. I launch a pressing appeal that we rededicate ourselves to the task of building peace.

There is no future – nor can there possibly be one – in that sad, unacceptable substitute for peace which is the balance of terror. We cannot persist in the illusion that world harmony can be founded on an excess capacity for destruction. Decades of talks and attempts at negotiation have not prevented the increase, improvement and diversification of nuclear arsenals capable of destroying mankind in various ways and under various circumstances, several times over.

I view with great apprehension the persistence of the Middle East crisis, the major features of which are the conflict between Iraq and Iran and the consequences of the military action that has engulfed Lebanon, a country with which we have close fraternal relations. The recent massacre of Palestinian civilians in Beirut has deeply shocked the world public. We are all aware that the question of the Middle East will be solved only when the Arab territories now under military occupation are evacuated and when the right of the Palestinian people to a sovereign State is recognized, as well as the right of all countries in the region, including. Israel, to live in peace within recognized borders.

In southern Africa, also, there persist situations of tension caused by the occupation of Namibia and by repeated acts of aggression against

independent countries, notably Angola. Brazil cannot fail to condemn racial discrimination, particularly its institutionalized forms, which threaten international peace itself. The success of the ongoing negotiations for the speedy independence of Namibia on the basis of United Nations resolutions is the right way to remove the tension which has so terribly frustrated the just aspirations of the peoples in the area to economic development and true independence.

My country is deeply troubled by the increasing transfer to the less developed areas of the tension generated by the confrontation between the superpowers. The policy of prestige and power applied to the third world engenders divisions and seriously affects the prospects for cooperation among developing nations. It is the firm stand of Brazil that such a process should be immediately stopped and reversed, and we are ready to continue our efforts to that end.

We cannot accept that, as a result of power-bloc policies, sovereign countries should be occupied, their domestic affairs subjected to interference and their freedom restricted, as is the case in Afghanistan. The principle of the non-use of force should be strictly observed in today's main areas of tension.

In Central America, there are recurring symptoms of a deep crisis of historic proportions, with social, political and economic implications. In accordance with the principles of self-determination and non-interference in the internal affairs of other countries, Brazil believes that a political solution to Central America's problems must be found by the peoples involved, free from any overt or covert outside interference. In the economic sphere, one cannot isolate the difficulties of Central America from the world crisis or minimize the responsibility of the industrialized countries to work for the creation of conditions favorable to the resumption of economic and social development. Peace and stability in that region are basic prerequisites for sound hemispheric cooperation.

In the South Atlantic, the mechanisms of violence were recently set in motion for a while. My Government has made considerable efforts during the last few months to help find a permanent political solution to the question of the Malvinas, and we are determined to pursue these efforts in the interests of peace, security and harmony among nations. Since the beginning of the controversy in 1833 Brazil has recognized the sovereign rights of the Republic of Argentina over the Malvinas, and it continues to insist on the necessity for negotiations as a suitable means of solving that problem.

I wish to stress the importance of consideration by the General Assembly of the question of the Malvinas. An initial step must be the implementation of all the provisions of Security Council resolution 502 (1982). It is time for those who so vigorously condemn the use of force in the solution of controversies to demonstrate the consistency and sincerity of their designs. Negotiations must start in order to avoid the risk of increasing tension in an area naturally inclined to cooperation and prosperity.

Brazil lives in peace with its neighbors in Latin America and with all nations which observe the principles of sound international behavior. Relations between Brazil and friendly countries of Latin America are clear testimony to the success achieved when the path of mutual respect and non-interference is taken with determination and when the search for harmonious and profitable cooperation prevails over controversies or topical divergences.

As part of Latin America, Brazil trusts that its neighbors will know how to resolve their differences, including those of a territorial nature, by peaceful and conciliatory means, and hopes that our sister countries in Latin America will strengthen their capacity for dialogue and understanding at the regional level. We must all work to see that our region attains higher levels of development and cooperation and engage in positive actions on the world scene.

With sister countries of Africa – our neighbors across the sea, with which we are linked by a common history – Brazil's objective is to develop close, direct and cordial relations. Equally friendly purposes guide our policy of strengthening ties with the other nations of the third world.

As part of the Western world, Brazil strives to fulfill its national aspirations with total respect for freedom, democracy and human rights. These lofty values and the Western tradition of pluralism and equality among nations provide Brazil with a framework for action outside the constraints of the hegemony of the superpowers and of the pressures of opposing ideologies.

With the Eastern European countries Brazil seeks to maintain correct relations, particularly in the economic and commercial fields, on the basis of mutual interests and reciprocal respect for the principle of non-interference in the internal affairs of other States.

For my country, peace and development are not ideals detached from the goals of and action on foreign policy. Brazil is firmly committed to the principles of universalism, friendly cooperation and national dignity.

It is the seriousness of the international situation that, for the first time, has brought the President of the Federative Republic of Brazil to the United Nations. Never in the history of the Organization have the risks and threats to the peace, security and progress of nations been so serious. Never have the challenges been so great. I call on the Governments of all Member States to make a determined effort together to tackle the mounting international problems and turn back the tide which leads to despair. It is our common duty to fulfill the expectations of our predecessors, who, having themselves experienced the direct consequences of political disorder, economic depression and war, pledged their resolve, as well as ours, to promote peace and development.

There are too many shortcomings in the present international order. It is a picture poor in accomplishments, yet rich in problems; poor in creativity, yet rich in disorder; poor in efficacy and justice, yet rich in waste and imbalances. It is not possible for me to remain indifferent to this picture. I believe it to be imperative to correct the serious flaws that so clearly stand out.

The society of nations is essentially a political community. Just as domestic decisions cannot be taken without consulting the interests and yearnings of the people, so it is impossible to ignore in this forum the just and legitimate claims of the great majority of nations, thus preserving vertical structures of international power.

The United Nations has a crucial political role to play in the struggle against conformism, intransigence and ambitions for absolute victories. Only through the Organization can a truly democratic framework of relations among States be created.

The extraordinary release of productive forces on a worldwide scale in the post-war period wrought within a few decades the intricate patterns of a different world, a complex and unstable world, but also a diversified and promising one. The interdependence of nations has thus become a historic necessity.

Yet the improvements we have been able to introduce in the structures of international life have been few and unsatisfactory. Regrettably, even the efforts towards international cooperation for development, however meager, are being scaled down. The practice of the interdependence of nations appears at times to degenerate into attempts to reconstruct hegemonic situations or systems of subordination, which in no way contribute to prosperity, either in the industrialized or in the developing world. As actually practiced in many cases, interdependence seems to have become a new name for inequality.

The interests of the North and the South are not in contradiction. In truth, there is no crisis between North and South; there is, rather, a profound crisis in the international economic system itself. The same situation affects both groupings. It is a uniquely adverse situation, which can be overcome only through mutual understanding and solidarity, not through a retreat into acrimony and confrontation. The challenge faced by all countries alike is that of adjusting to the new realities of the 1980s.

The North must understand to its full extent – and its potential for enriching international trade – the inescapable fact of the definitive emergence of the third world as a dynamic partner, and of its search for a position of greater prominence in the world economy.

As for the South, the moment has come for us to give effective expression to the cohesion we have been able to preserve above external difficulties and internal differences. We must move towards the consolidation of a truly solidary interdependence between Latin America, Africa and Asia. We must make it clear, by deeds as well as words, that the diversity within the third world contains unsuspected opportunities for economic complementariness, and is a uniting element, not a fact to be used as a pretext for initiatives – such as the arbitrary discrimination among developing countries embodied in the concept of "graduation" – which aim at undermining the cohesion of the third world international cooperation for development and North-South dialogue.

We must also demonstrate our capacity for seeking, in a serene and constructive spirit, the fulfillment of our claims. However legitimate, our claims should not lead us into rigid and maximalist negotiating postures – lest we weaken our own principles and ideals and exacerbate even further the intransigence which characterizes certain sectors of the developed world.

The efforts of the third world to change normative frameworks, decision-making structures and discriminatory rules in institutions such as International Monetary Fund, the World Bank and GATT, among others, have been fruitless. Claims repeated for years or even decades clash against the impenetrable wall of the veto power of a few countries, which are in a position to oppose the most obvious considerations of rationality or the soundest requisites of equity. But initiatives multiply whenever the interests of the great powers are at stake.

GATT's role should not be diverted towards new normative tasks in areas such as the export of services and investment policies, with a view to creating rules which might hamper access of developing countries to international markets and even hinder their capacity to regulate their

own internal markets. By the same token, fundamental questions related to the improvement of GATT and to the satisfaction of the claims of the developing countries should not be neglected.

In financial institutions, measures are devised, sometimes adopted against the will of the majority, as a result of inadequate decision-making processes which restrict the flexibility of operations, add to the requirements of conditionality, and unjustly discriminate against the developing countries. Paradoxically, certain countries endeavor to maintain control over organizations which they appear to condemn, if not to disappearance, at least to insignificance, so great is the disproportion between the growing needs of the developing countries and the financial resources placed at the disposal of those organizations.

The principle of free trade must not be applied selectively and arbitrarily to the flow of capital, while the transfer of technology is inhibited and the capacity for action by capital-importing developing countries is restricted. The ideals of free trade cannot be in contradiction with the preservation and even strengthening of the autonomy of the countries of the Third World. Interdependence should not be a concept inimical to national sovereignty.

The developing countries, which for so long have striven for the principle of permanent sovereignty over their natural resources, today face the new challenge of maintaining sovereignty over their own economic space. That does not mean, however, that the developing countries should oppose or show lack of interest in greater interaction at the international level, with respect to the flows of capital and technology and even operations of multinational corporations. Quite the opposite. It is undeniable that the vast majority of developing countries – beginning with those which have a clear Western identity, such as Brazil, but including others with a different political and economic organization – aim at improving and diversifying their links with the developed West, which is a valuable source of the factors of production necessary for their development.

The preservation and strengthening of the national economic space of those countries will not hamper the expansion of the international economic system, but will rather be a factor in the broadening of the global economic space, for the benefit of us all.

Although I was unable, for reasons of health, to attend the International Meeting on Cooperation and Development, which was held at Cancún in October 1981, I followed that event with interest and hope, and even with emotion. I cannot therefore fail to voice here, on behalf of

the Government and people of Brazil, the feeling of deep disappointment at the lack, so far, of any practical follow-up action to the Cancún meeting.

We are watching with anxiety the continuous and even accelerated erosion of the instruments and institutions which should bring about a solution to international problems.

We see with even greater concern the resistance of important sectors in the industrialized world to what had been the most important conceptual achievement at Cancún: the recognition of the fact that the road to the solution of the current crisis must also pass through the South and must include cooperation among nations without relying only in the uncertainties of the market. We are now experiencing a global crisis in more than one sense: it touches practically all countries and is at the same time financial and commercial. It is as wide as it is deep: productive investment is being choked up on a planetary scale, under the impact of high interest rates and of the incertitude about the prospects for international trade and the financial system.

It seems as if suddenly a great economic power in the developed world had come to a standstill: 30 million highly qualified workers cannot currently find jobs in North America and in Western Europe.

But the effect of such a situation of crisis is even more devastating in Southern countries. Developing economies that do not export oil have experienced in the past three years an unprecedented deterioration in the terms of exchange. In other words, increasing efforts to export are being nullified, with decreasing foreign exchange income, resulting in spiraling pauperization.

Years of persistent investment aimed at creating an exporting structure to permit consumers in developed countries to purchase goods from the South in advantageous conditions are being erased by insurmountable protectionist barriers.

The persistence of high interest rates wipes out financial profitability from long term investments and threatens to render economically unfeasible projects that are indispensable to overcome current difficulties.

The rise in the cost of servicing the external debt creates unsustainable situations for some countries, as shown by recent developments that dramatically affected some of the most promising countries in the South.

All that sacrifice could still be tolerated if its consequences would be such as to permit recovery to be forecast within a reasonable delay. Unfortunately, this is not the case. The economic policy of the great powers is destroying wealth while not building anything in its

place. The hardening of financial flows and the process of constraining international exchanges shatters the prospects of overcoming the current predicament.

The present times impose on all of us an attitude of mutual understanding and flexibility. It is imperative to add without delay to long term efforts – for which the launching of global negotiations is so necessary – a debate on the short term aspects of the crisis.

The shaping of the future world economy necessarily requires the overcoming of our present problems. The task of reformulating the international economic system cannot be deferred but, in the present circumstances, we must begin it by an effort to prevent the disruption of the system itself.

Therefore, it is essential that the major international organizations begin immediately to undertake an integrated and objective examination of emergency measures which can unblock the international flow of trade and finances. It is essential that the developed countries agree to take initiatives in order to liberalize trade, expand international financial flows, adopt a new policy on interest rates, and urgently start revising the international monetary system. The developing countries, because of their structural tendency to deficits in current accounts, cannot be the first to eliminate trade barriers, a measure which would only add to their deficits without creating sufficient momentum towards a recovery in the world economy. The developed countries have to accept the idea that a restructuring of their economies is inevitable. Only when the developed countries give up the protection of sectors which are no longer competitive can the manufactured and semi-manufactured goods from developing countries take their place in international markets, thus benefiting both the consumers of the North and the producers of the South.

It is urgent that there be an increase both in the availability of resources controlled by the international financial organizations and in the participation of monetary authorities in the preservation of the liquidity and stability of the international financial system. Only thus will the international community, particularly the developing countries, be freed from the strait-jacket resulting from the simultaneous contraction of trade and of official financial flows.

As for the question of interest rates, there need be no discrepancy between the major objectives of the economic policies of the countries of the North and a management of the interest rates compatible with the economic and financial viability of the developing economies. Indeed, it is

in everybody's interest to avoid a dislocation of the developing economies which would result in an undesirable destabilizing effect on the countries of the North.

Furthermore, it must be recognized that one of the essential conditions for reactivating world trade is the recovery of a minimum of stability in the international monetary system, which must not become a factor of turbulence, left to the whims of unilateral changes in the economic policies of a few great Powers.

The solution of the present crisis lies not in aid for developing countries but in ensuring conditions that would enable them to meet their obligations through a fair return for their work.

I have come here to express the most legitimate aspirations of my country. I am motivated, above all, by the desire to ensure my people's well-being. We have made considerable efforts towards economic development, with promising results which fill with hope not only the people of Brazil but also all peoples yearning to attain standards of living compatible with human dignity and present day levels of social, economic, scientific and technological development.

It is my duty to seek international conditions propitious for the pursuit of this noble effort by my people, for Brazil will never give up its rightful place in the concert of nations.

I hope that the competition from the South will be understood as a valid expression of the political and economic dynamism of peoples that aspire to development. I hope that this competition will not serve as a pretext for the compliant preservation of unjust and inefficient patterns of exchange but will instead be a motivation for a courageous search for renewal. I am convinced that the most powerful countries will respond creatively to the reality of the emergence of the developing world as an active partner in the many sectors of international life. I have unshakable confidence in the international society's capacity for renewal.

Today, however, the climate of conflict among nations in the political and economic fields is reaching threatening levels. It is in times like these that the moral and political imperative of international cooperation has to be fully acknowledged if the destinies of the society of nations are to be rationally assured.

The awareness that the international community today faces the broadest challenge to its capacity for action makes necessary bold and urgent efforts in the following areas: negotiated solutions to the tension and disputes which are poisoning international relations, both on the East-West level and in third world areas; greater use of dialogue and

compromise and the strengthening of international institutions, starting with the United Nations itself; effective resumption of the North-South dialogue, including the launching of global negotiations, as a token of the will to respond to the expectations of the great majority of nations; concrete and immediate action, without prejudice to the resumption of that dialogue, on the most pressing economic questions which present a short-term threat to the international community.

I express my hope that this session of the General Assembly will be most successful. I urge representatives of the Governments assembled here to shoulder to the full their inalienable historic responsibility to live up to the hopes and expectations of those who founded the Organization in 1945 and to build for future generations a broader road to peace and development. We are on the threshold of a new world. May God grant that, thanks to our efforts, it will be a better world. Brazil, I can assure the Assembly, is ready to undertake its share of this task.

New York, September 27, 1982.

1983

1983

The consequences of the Mexican moratorium of August 1982 were felt in Brazil in 1983, provoking a serious crisis in payments. In January, the government signed a letter of intention with the IMF in which it agreed to put into practice strong measures of adjustment in exchange for disbursements aiming at balancing external accounts. The recession and the inflation accelerated: Brazilian GDP fell 5 per cent in 1983 and inflation reached 211 per cent.

The political scenery became more complex due to the growing demands of the civil society for the return of direct presidential elections. In June 1983, a number of popular rallies sprang up, with the participation of important political leaders, in favor of "Diretas já" (Direct elections now).

On the external level, a trend developed in 1983 to prioritize the African angle of Brazilian foreign policy. Recovering from the heart surgery he had undergone in July, President Figueiredo visited Nigeria, Guinea-Bissau, Senegal, Algeria and Cape Verde.

In his statement before the Thirty-Eighth Session of the General Assembly, Minister Saraiva Guerreiro insisted on what he called a "state of crisis". He recalled the proposals made by President Figueiredo at the previous Assembly and regretted the lack of progress in the international panorama, which he appraised with gloomy tones. Not neglecting to press the Brazilian views on the main global issues, such as disarmament, Middle

East and Southern Africa, the Minister devoted a large part of his speech to the situation in Central America and the Malvinas crisis. Pointing out that Brazil was one of the countries most affected by the crisis, he insisted at length on the Brazilian theses on the North-South dialogue.

XXXVIII Regular Session of the General Assembly of the United Nations 1983

Minister Ramiro Saraiva Guerreiro [*]

Mr. President,

It is with great pleasure, Sir, that I congratulate you on your election as President of the Thirty-Eighth Session of the General Assembly. This choice does justice to the services you have rendered to the United Nations. I am certain that thanks to your professional and personal qualities our work will be conducted in a most able and competent manner.

At the same time, I wish to express my Government's recognition of the solid and productive work done by your predecessor, Mr. Imre Hollai, in presiding over the Thirty-Seventh Session.

I greet you as a representative of a Latin American nation in the year in which we commemorate the bicentennial of Simón Bolívar. It is both just and gratifying for us to pay homage to the Liberator, whose ideals should be recalled at this moment when Latin America must give renewed proof of its historic commitment to peace and to the causes of concord, progress and dialogue. In this context, allow me to stress the important contributions made by your country, Panama, at the international level.

I wish also to congratulate Saint Christopher and Nevis on its admission to membership in the United Nations. We extend our best wishes to the new Member State for a future of peace and prosperity.

[*] **Ramiro Elysio Saraiva Guerreiro**, Born in Salvador, BA, December 22, 1918. Bachelor in Legal and Social Sciences from the National Law Faculty of the University of Bahia. Third Class Consul, public selection process, 1945. First Class Minister, by merit, 1968. Minister of State for External Relations, from 3/15/1979 to 3/15/1985. † Rio de Janeiro, January 19, 2011.

The general debate traditionally gives us the task of presenting an assessment of the international situation, and this makes it essential for us to reflect upon what is today an unprecedented state of crisis.

At the last session the unparalleled seriousness of the international situation brought, for the first time, a head of State of my country to the General Assembly. On that occasion, President João Figueiredo gave a much-needed warning about the risks and dangers that threaten the very existence of international society.

In the face of a situation that evoked dark memories of the crisis of the 1930s, the head of the Brazilian Government made a vehement appeal that we once again combine our efforts in the task of building peace and making a fresh start on international cooperation for development. I am certain that President Figueiredo expressed hopes and concerns shared by the vast majority of peoples and nations.

In the past 12 months, however, our reserves of faith and confidence have been harshly tested. In his first report to the Assembly, the Secretary-General warned that we were "perilously near to a new international anarchy". Despite the seriousness of these words, little has been done to relieve the extraordinary tensions that affect us all at both the political and the economic level.

The fact of the matter is that tensions are growing, trade and the economy languish in a cycle of depression, and the recovery of some coincides with worsening difficulties for others. Misery and disorder prevail; the nuclear arms race prospers; and the powerful seem reluctant to seek moderation and dialogue.

The Thirty-Eighth Session of the General Assembly is being held under the negative sign of an organic and lasting crisis that demands structural solutions. It should be recalled that the word "crisis" comes from a Sanskrit root that also means "to clean", "to untangle", "to purify". At its very roots, then, crisis is an invitation to purification and renewal. It behooves us all to reach decisions that will lead to evolution without rupture, to change within a context of order. International order is based upon an adequate understanding of the different needs of each nation, and the achievement of such an understanding is precisely the role of the United Nations as an institution dedicated to the democratic and egalitarian coexistence of States.

While calling to mind the obvious imperfections of the international order, Brazil is not departing from its traditional policy of moderation and balance, inspired by the pluralistic background of its national society. Brazil is both a Western and a third-world country, with a foreign policy that

reflects internationally the invaluable wealth of our historical experience. As inheritors of different cultures, we have a natural and deep-rooted respect for diversity – an indispensable condition for harmony.

In the political sphere, many years have elapsed without a single truly significant multilateral success, without a single solution to any important question: the Middle East, Central America, southern Africa, South East Asia, Afghanistan, the Malvinas, strategic and medium-range nuclear missiles – the list is long.

When positions of strength, such as that of the Soviet Union in Afghanistan, seem to become consolidated instead of giving way to justice and reason, it is the international system as a whole that deteriorates. Likewise, the incident that led to the destruction of a South Korean commercial airliner by Soviet aircraft, with the unpardonable loss of innocent lives, is a cause of acute concern and condemnation. The principle of rejection of the use of force – one of the essential foundations of the Organization – admits of no devious application in any areas of tension.

With respect to the problems affecting Central America the Brazilian position is clear and known to all. The basic principles of self-determination and non-interference in the affairs of each country must be applied in this context. We favor a diplomatic and negotiated handling of the tensions so that a climate of understanding may be created, in lieu of confrontation and ideological polarization, and so that the process of transferring global tensions to that area may come to an end.

We have confidence in the spirit of responsibility and independence of the Central American countries. We have confidence in democracy and pluralism, not only as a system of internal coexistence but also as a norm of coexistence of countries. We hope that in Central America no nation will become, *nolens volens,* a satellite or an instrument of any other.

However, we should not restrict ourselves to the current aspects of the Central American crisis. The real problems will not be solved until the basic structural deficiencies – decades or even centuries of unending frustration – and blatant internal and external imbalances have been overcome. We believe that a serious and concentrated effort of international cooperation must be undertaken, particularly in socio-economic terms, with the aim of effectively eradicating the chronic problems that beset Central America.

In Latin America, practical actions towards peaceful solutions of controversies and respect for the basic principles of international law are deeply rooted. For that reason, Latin America – acting particularly through

the nations belonging to the Contadora Group – is in the best position, through proximity and cultural affinity, to make a valuable contribution towards working out a peaceful solution to the problems of Central America. We should all give our support to the selfless efforts made in this context, which give the greatest hope of a positive and diplomatic approach to this grave situation.

The current difficulties cannot be isolated from the extended context of the international crisis we are undergoing. The Central American problem cannot be reduced to ideological confrontation. Nor is it possible to remove its evils by force. Further to initiatives taken to reduce tensions, the solution to the problems of the region clearly calls for efforts on the part of each nation to demonstrate that it is not a danger to the security of its neighbors. Experience has taught us that polarization does not favor lasting solutions. In the case of Central America, the small nations would be the major victims of an undesirable radicalization of the situation. There again, it is absolutely essential to re-establish a climate of confidence conducive to dialogue.

The fundamental principles which orient Brazilian foreign policy are identical with those governing the best traditions of Latin American diplomatic action. Brazil reaffirms its immutable resolve to strengthen its relationship with all its neighbors, on the basis of solidarity and cooperation, equal to equal. Mutual respect, seeking for legitimate grounds of agreement, and strict adherence to the rules of law and good neighborliness, in practice as well as in theory, are the best patterns for international comportment. In this regard, the Brazilian Government reiterates its support for the full implementation of Security Council resolution 502 (1982), on the issue of the Malvinas. The role that the United Nations can and should play in seeking a peaceful and negotiated solution for this question, which closely affects the Latin American countries, is of fundamental importance. In this respect, Brazil reaffirms its support for Argentina's rights of sovereignty over the Malvinas Islands and expresses its growing concern over any militarization of that area. It is the position of Brazil that the South Atlantic must remain an area of peace and harmony.

I cannot fail to express the anxiety that we feel before the picture of insecurity and violence in Lebanon, a nation so often victimized by aggression. It is urgent to stop this new escalation of violence. I reaffirm Brazil's determination in favor of preserving the independence, sovereignty and territorial integrity of that country, whose sons have contributed so much to the progress of Brazil.

It is increasingly urgent to implement the United Nations resolutions which express an international consensus in favor of a comprehensive, just and lasting solution to the successive crises in the Middle East. My Government firmly adheres to the terms of those resolutions and vehemently condemns the policy of *faits accomplis* that has hampered negotiations in that region. We must insist upon justice prevailing, upon the evacuation of territory held by force, upon the implementation of the rights of the Palestinian people, upon the creation of conditions that will make it possible for all States in that region to live in peace within their own frontiers.

As a country dedicated to the ideals of social and racial harmony, Brazil reiterates its emphatic condemnation of the institutionalized practice of racism that characterizes the regime of South Africa. The policy adopted by Pretoria feeds the hotbeds of tension in southern Africa and is a disservice even to the ideals and interests of the West. The military incursions into Angola, Mozambique and Lesotho must end. The illegal occupation of Namibia, whose independence is being delayed by the intransigence of South Africa, must urgently cease. There is no pretext to justify evading the implementation of Security Council resolution 435 (1978).

On the other hand, my Government wishes to congratulate the Secretary-General on his efforts to fulm the mandate received from the Security Council to carry on consultations with the aim of finding a solution to this grave problem.

It is the task of our generation not only to reconstruct a world in crisis, but, above all else, to prevent its destruction. As President Figueiredo stated at the Thirty-Seventh Session:

> There is no future – nor can there possibly be one – in that sad, unacceptable substitute for peace which is the balance of terror. We cannot persist in the illusion that world harmony can be founded on an excess capacity for destruction.

The desire for absolute security on the part of one State constitutes a threat of absolute insecurity for all others. Peace will not result from the multiplication of arsenals. It is urgent to seek objective understanding, to create a minimum of mutual confidence and information, and to recreate the mechanisms of the dialogue to reduce tensions, opportunities for misunderstandings and risks of incidents.

The United Nations cannot be kept out of the truly important negotiations on disarmament. It is understandable that any concessions

in this field must be extremely complex. But whatever affects all must be considered by all. Realism should not lead us to forget that the balanced use of political intelligence is, in the end, more powerful than the unilateral use of force.

It is alarming to note that, in 1983 alone, the resources spent on weapons came to $800 billion, which is more that the total of the foreign debt of the developing countries. That figure is enough to make us understand the magnitude of the challenge which we must face.

On May 16, 1975, Brazil acceded to the Antarctic Treaty. Ever since then, Brazil has followed a program which is compatible with its economic possibilities and entirely geared to the development of scientific research. Our decision to participate fully in the Antarctic Treaty is also based on the fact that this document is the only legal instrument applicable to the sixth continent. It can be said that this Treaty has brought about a new objective juridical situation.

On September 12 of this year, the consultative parties to the Treaty, meeting at Canberra, recognized Brazil as a consultative party. In taking on this responsibility, Brazil reaffirms its adherence to the principles of peace, cooperation and freedom of scientific investigation enshrined in the Treaty and in the recommendations adopted over a period of more than 20 years by the consultative parties.

The current recession is the longest and possibly the most serious contraction of economic activity in the past 50 years. It is no longer possible to cherish the illusion that this is a passing crisis. Its deep-rooted causes are to be found in the very structure of international relationships, as demonstrated by the global dimensions of the crisis.

Despite the depth and extent of the crisis, precious opportunities have recently been lost to halt the process of deterioration, which is now accelerating. Ever since the International Meeting on Cooperation and Development held at Cancun in 1981 the North-South dialogue has been losing ground. The crisis has followed its painful path from the commercial to the financial, bearing living witness to the interaction among the many aspects of the world economic system and to the fragility of the mechanisms of multilateral cooperation.

The total foreign debt of the developing countries is quickly approaching the trillion-dollar mark. The rates of growth of such debt, pushed upwards by absurdly high levels of interest, are far higher than the real growth rates of any country in the world. They are even higher than the most outstanding rates of growth achieved during the most favorable periods by the countries which developed most rapidly. What is unbearable today will be considerably worse tomorrow.

International trade, until recently the great lever of progress for North and South alike, has entered a period of stagnation and retrocession, asphyxiated by growing protectionist barriers – an inadequate response to the problems of recession and unemployment – and also by the burden of foreign debt – which together restrict to an unbearable extent the import capacity of the debtor countries, thus making it impossible for them to sustain the levels of economic activity needed to meet the requirements of their peoples and to generate the very resources necessary to meet their commitments.

The international community needs innovative and effective proposals, but it is still operating with outdated conceptual and institutional instruments, which can only provide standardized and mechanically applied responses. That is the dominant intellectual response, but at the factual level there is just as much frustration: there is more and more protectionism at a time when increased foreign trade is more necessary than ever; financial burdens are increasing when it is absolutely necessary to reduce them; lending capacity is contracting when its growth is a basic requirement; recessive policies are proliferating at a time when development is more necessary than ever.

Last June, the Sixth Session of the United Nations Conference on Trade and Development was the most remarkable demonstration of the constant frustration that has marked multilateral economic negotiations. At the start of the meeting, which was held at Belgrade – for which the developing countries made careful preparations – I stated that the international community could not afford a further failure, and that a wide-ranging cooperative effort between the North and the South should be launched as a matter of urgency. Unfortunately, the moderate and constructive attitude taken by the developing countries failed to induce the developed countries to adopt a more flexible position. From Cancun to Belgrade, both the North and the South lost precious opportunities for dialogue and understanding, and at this moment, all that is left to the international economy is an uncertain and risky gamble on the results of *ad hoc* emergency measures that were adopted to solve problems which, by their very nature, are structural and lasting.

In the face of such instability and uncertainty, would not this be the moment for the international community to think seriously about readjustments to be made in the Bretton Woods institutions and in GATT, to make them better adapted to the conditions and needs of today's international economy? These conditions and needs are profoundly different from those which, for three decades after the Second World

War, made it possible to keep high rates of growth in world trade and economic output.

Brazil is one of the countries that has been most seriously affected by the current crisis, and this is, to a great extent, an ironic consequence of the fact that the development model adopted by the country was based on a vote of confidence in the international community's capacity to provide all countries with greater opportunities in international trade and on financial markets.

My country has made and will assuredly continue to make heavy sacrifices in order to adjust to the new and more difficult financial circumstances and to fulfill its commitments as a capital borrower. However, the Brazilian people cannot be denied the prospect of development, particularly when the major causes of its hardships are to be found, not in intrinsic limitations to the nation's productive structure, but rather in an unusual combination of external factors related to the economic policies and negotiating positions of some of the great Powers.

In these circumstances, the problems that afflict us are not exclusively ours but also concern those countries that have benefited so much from exports of capital, at costs which they are able unilaterally to define and alter. It makes no sense that such countries, often acting against their own interests in the repayment of their loans, deny their debtors, through the application of a most stringent protectionism, the export opportunities they need to pay their debts.

This was the reason why President Figueiredo said, when he addressed the Assembly last year, "The solution of the present crisis lies not in aid for developing countries but in ensuring conditions that would enable them to meet their obligations through a fair return for their work".

Before concluding my statement, I must refer to a specific problem of a critical nature that must not be seen from an emergency viewpoint only.

For five years my country has been suffering from the tragic effects of drought. The semi-arid North-East of Brazil is going through a particularly difficult period which defies the courage and severely tests the endurance of the local population and creates enormous obstacles to the implementation of plans for Brazilian regional development. The effects of this protracted drought are a national responsibility of Brazil's and are the object of integrated action on the part of the Government, but they cannot fail to have an impact on the nation's activities abroad.

Brazil has consistently supported the activities of the United Nations to combat desertification, especially with regard to the

recovery and progress of the Sudan Sahel region. We have also closely followed the debate on the measures designed to provide resources for the implementation of the Plan of Action to Combat Desertification approved in 1977. We share the opinion that the question of climatic phenomena such as drought and desertification should be examined within the broader context of international cooperation and from a long term perspective.

If the present crisis is to have a renovating and purifying effect, the international system must be revitalized in an authentically democratic sense. At the international level, democracy corresponds to respect for national individualities and recognition of the sovereign equality of States. This means, in essence, that international coexistence should be based on the strict observance of the principles of self-determination and non-intervention and should pursue peaceful, rational and balanced solutions.

The fact that the United Nations is now approaching its 40th anniversary is one more reason for us to learn a lesson of renewal from the contemporary crisis. It is essential that we preserve the spirit of those who took part in the construction and consolidation of the United Nations. A critical review of the past will be truly meaningful only if it is useful as a practical guide to present and future action.

The pace of history is accelerating, and the Organization cannot remain static. There is wisdom inherent in the purposes and principles of the Charter of San Francisco. It is particularly urgent to apply these purposes and principles in keeping peace, preserving security and resuming development.

As President Figueiredo said in the statement he made last year, the main point is that "it is our common duty to fulfill the expectations of our predecessors, who, having themselves experienced the direct consequences of political disorder, economic depression and war, pledged their resolve, as well as ours, to promote peace and development".

New York, September 26, 1983.

1984

1984

The year 1984 was very intense on the political level. It started in the midst of the campaign for "Diretas Já" [direct elections now] and ended (in fact, in January 1985) with the election of the Tancredo Neves-José Sarney ticket. Twenty years of institutional exception since March 1964 came to an end. The developments that had led to the break in support for the Government since the Constitutional amendment reestablishing direct elections for President monopolized the attention of political circles and of the society at large amid considerable worsening of the situation.

Despite the political vicissitudes, the Brazilian diplomatic agenda remained intense. President Figueiredo visited Bolivia, Morocco, Spain, Japan and China. He received in Brazil the Presidents of Uruguay, Mexico, Peru and Guinea-Bissau, as well as the King and Queen of Sweden. An initiative by the Presidents of Brazil, Argentina, Mexico and Colombia showed unity and strength of views on the crisis. The four Presidents sent a letter to their counterparts in the G7 requesting the adoption of concerted measures to confront the high interest rates in force in the international market and the serious debt crisis that developing countries, particularly in Latin America, were going through.

In his last statement before the General Assembly, in 1984, Minister Saraiva Guerreiro made a substantial evaluation of what he called "the crisis of our times". According to Brazilian diplomacy, it was a crisis that expressed itself in the economic field but possessed an essentially political dynamism.

The Minister did not leave aside the main topical points of the agenda: Namibian independence, condemnation of *apartheid,* persistence of a policy of *faits accomplis* in the Middle East, inobservance of the principles of non-intervention and self-determination in Afghanistan, Kampuchea and Central America, Malvinas and finally, disarmament. However, he concentrated the bulk of his argument on an analysis of the world economic and financial crisis and of the crisis in the United Nations, which he ascribed to the fragmentation of political will in the international community. Affirming the unity of Latin-American views as shown in the Cartagena consensus, he devoted special emphasis to the issue of external debt, whose serious consequences were already been particularly felt in Brazil. In an express allusion to the fundamental concern of Brazilian diplomacy, Minister Guerreiro said that in spite of all adversities, Brazil would never renounce its development aspirations.

XXXIX Regular Session of the General Assembly of the United Nations 1984

Minister Ramiro Saraiva Guerreiro [*]

Mr. President,

On behalf of the Government of Brazil, it gives me great satisfaction to congratulate you, Sir, on your election to the presidency of the Thirty-Ninth Session of the General Assembly. I am certain that I express the confidence that all delegations present here in this Hall place in your experienced and balanced guidance for the success of our labors. I also take the occasion to greet you as a representative of Zambia and the African continent, with which my country has strong cultural, historical and political ties.

At this point, allow me also to pay a well deserved tribute to Mr. Jorge Illueca for the competent and able manner in which he presided over the work of the Thirty-Eighth Session of the General Assembly.

It is a privilege to congratulate the people and Government of Brunei Darussalam upon their new membership in the United Nations, and I hereby renew my best wishes for the peace and prosperity of that country, with which Brazil already has diplomatic relations.

It is our daily experience to live with international tension and crises. Clearly, the crises overlap successively in a vicious and self-reinforcing process. More than ever, orderly change is required.

[*] **Ramiro Elysio Saraiva Guerreiro**, Born in Salvador, BA, December 22, 1918. Bachelor in Legal and Social Sciences from the National Law Faculty of the University of Bahia. Third Class Consul, public selection process, 1945. First Class Minister, by merit, 1968. Minister of State for External Relations, from 3/15/1979 to 3/15/1985. † Rio de Janeiro, January 19, 2011.

To face this challenge, Brazil believes in the commitment to the fundamental principles of international life contained in the Charter of the United Nations. My country reaffirms that its foreign policy adheres to the high aim of seeking solutions consistent with the universal causes of peace and development. It maintains a balanced approach to current international issues.

We understand that only confidence can create a lasting basis for dialogue and cooperation among nations.

These values and this will to change guide my words in opening the general debate.

Epochs of crisis, such as the one we are going through, evidence themselves not only in facts but also in ideas and in the political culture. The United Nations cannot remain immune to the crises of our times.

From the generation that founded the United Nations we inherited a message that repudiates double standards in judgments. More than ever, it is necessary to recover the meaning of that message. The strong and the weak, the allied and the adversaries must understand and abide by the criteria that govern international life. Only thus, can dialogue become truly possible. This is one of the fundamental reasons for the work performed at the United Nations.

Although authoritarianism may assume many guises, it does not seem right, in this year of 1984, to confuse the ideal of peace with the obsessive proclivity to war. Freedom, justice or progress should not be invoked to cloak a desire to dominate. There can be no quibbling about respect for the universal principles of the Charter. Equality means equality; sovereignty means sovereignty; non-intervention means non-intervention. Those who give in to expedient temptations to the detriment of the values essential to the credibility of the United Nations are only deluding themselves.

Brazil has taken clear, well-known positions on the great foci of political tension that continue to challenge the international community's capacity for action. After years of debate and negotiation on some of these questions, sizeable margins of consensus have been reached.

It will not be denied that the best road to self determination and independence for Namibia is the implementation of Security Council resolution 435 (1978). As long as this directive is followed, the recent signs of flexibility on the part of South Africa are auspicious for dialogue and negotiation. In addition, the conscience of the international community has remained unequivocal in its repudiation of racial discrimination, and for this very reason the United Nations cannot compromise nor waiver in its absolute condemnation of *apartheid*.

Time has shown that a comprehensive, just and lasting solution in the Middle East cannot be foreseen outside the parameters originally established by the United Nations. A succession of crises resulting from the non-acceptance of those parameters has for more than a generation prevented the building of peace in that disturbed area.

In the Middle East as in other regions, Brazil condemns the persistence of a policy of *faits accomplis* in defiance of the Charter of the United Nations. Among the many victims of the recent and persistent crisis in Lebanon, we must mourn the loss of many soldiers of the multinational forces operating there. This should make us all, even the most powerful, reflect on the role that the United Nations can and should play in the conduct of peacekeeping operations in fulfilling the mandates of the international community with the full backing of the Security Council.

In all areas of tension, such as Afghanistan and Kampuchea, the principle of non-intervention should admit no exceptions to its application. Wherever attempts are made to interfere in national political processes, whether by force or by infiltration under the cover of technical excuses, they will deserve the condemnation of the international community. It is no longer possible to believe that public opinion can still be deceived by facades of legitimacy for acts of real intervention which seek strategic advantages or mere prestige.

In Central America there will be no long-term solutions without whole-hearted observance of the basic principles of self-determination, mutual respect among all nations and democratic life. For that reason it is vital that the work of the Contadora Group should go forward and be carried to a successful conclusion, since that Group is best able to promote awareness of the problems of the region in all their historical, social, political and economic complexity. Good relations in the hemisphere today depend, in a very critical way, on stability in Central America.

The spirit of the Charter must prevail so that we may have dialogue and negotiation. In this regard, it behooves us to express our thanks to the Secretary-General, who, whenever called upon, has given his good offices and played the role of mediator, even under adverse circumstances, with a sense for the opportune and a discretion appropriate for each occasion.

The same applies to the question of the Malvinas. The contribution of the United Nations continues to be indispensable for reaching a positive solution and should include providing encouragement for diplomatic understanding between the parties. This is a question that directly affects the Latin American countries, which have a solid position on the merits of the case, recognizing the rights of Argentina and desirous of dispelling

the risk of tensions in an area that has a vocation for peace and harmony. This is the time to demonstrate consistency and authenticity, to honor the principles of the Charter by implementing Security Council resolution 502 (1982) in its entirety.

For all the critical problems I have just mentioned, the United Nations has not failed to take stands and prescribe cures. But the scarcity of effective solutions does not derive from flaws in assessment: the problems persist because of fragmentation in the political will of the international community. While the decision-making machinery and even the implementation of decisions of the United Nations remain stalled, painfully negotiated formulas for consensus are subject to a process of erosion. The practical result is, very often, a lamentable retreat from the bases of understanding officially endorsed by this forum. To use an eloquent example, I recall the Final Document of the Tenth Special Session of the General Assembly, which was devoted to disarmament.

Thirty-nine years ago, still under the impact of a conflict without precedent, the United Nations was born under the sign of universality and equality among nations. The Organization, in its very name, mirrors the ideal of solidarity and union and, in addition, the recognition that no longer can any nation afford to live in isolation. If there was a generous utopianism apparent in this vision, there is also a lucid grasp of the real needs for mankind's survival and well-being.

In our century, no nation, however powerful, can defy the international community as represented here nor can it cut itself off from dialogue with other nations. No single State can enact laws for the whole world. In other words, to be effective, international leadership must be vested with real democratic meaning. It will be strong as long as it maintains this intrinsic value.

The international system should not be vertical and decentralized. Whatever affects everyone must be decided upon by all. This argument applies specifically to two themes of global interest that cannot be dealt with separately: peace and development. But it is precisely in these themes of such vital importance for humanity that the political deadlock makes itself and equations of power override democratic dialogue.

Last August I had the opportunity to address the Conference on Disarmament, where I reiterated my country's growing apprehension at the acceleration of the arms race. I then announced Brazil's endorsement of the Joint Declaration issued on May 22, 1984 by six Heads of State or Government to the nuclear Powers, and I quoted the following excerpt from it: "It is primarily the responsibility of nuclear weapons States to

prevent a nuclear catastrophe, but this problem is too important to be left to those States alone".

In order to discharge such a task, which is of priority, international decision-making must effectively incorporate broad and representative participation by the community of nations. This will curtail the current monologue of intransigence which replaced the negotiating process among those who through dialogue should have the primary responsibility for the security of us all. Under such a paralyzing influence, discussions on "arms control" run the risk of completely missing their mandatory final objective: general and complete disarmament under effective international control.

The dynamics of confrontation, in its various doctrinal disguises, only lead to higher levels of terror, not of security. Political intelligence has already identified this tragic rationalization of the will to power.

Peace must not be turned into a mirage; it must not fade in the spiraling arms race. There is no substitute for peace, and peace emerges from a just and credible international order, not from a balance of mistrust. That is a fundamental lesson of the Charter of the United Nations.

It is on the economic plane that the contemporary crisis has its most sensitive dimension, but its dynamics are essentially political. The roads to peace and development cannot fail to be parallel. We are in an extreme situation which forces us to examine its roots without illusions or pretenses.

Brazil will not give up its development prospects; it cannot accept a reduction in the place it has gained for itself in international trade within legitimately agreed rules. For a long time my country has been fighting in the proper forums for correction of the defects in the world economic structure, of which we are today one of the chief victims.

Several times in the General Assembly I have voiced Brazil's concern at the course the international economy has been taking during the last few years. In many different ways I have reiterated a call for a determined international effort to overcome the effects of the grave world crisis. I have reaffirmed the need to reverse a growing tendency towards the erosion of a most valuable asset, something for which we all worked hard during the post-war period; namely, international cooperation in the service of development as an indispensable factor for the management of a trade and finance system that is undoubtedly precarious and unstable.

At a certain stage I stated that "when the world economy becomes highly diversified and the problems are universal in scope, the challenge

is no longer that of how to obtain unilateral advantages but is that of how jointly to define viable ways to govern an increasingly unstable system."

Recent occurrences, such as the reduction of inflation and the resumption of growth in some developed countries, seem to demonstrate the validity of recourse to unilateral policies by one or other of the main developed countries. However positive the recovery now taking place in some developed economies may be, it cannot be denied that it is limited and that it is leading to an excessive escalation of the coefficient of instability in the international economic system.

Nor can it be denied that, because of recourse to unilateral policies, perverse mechanisms have come into existence whereby debtor countries are led to transfer resources that subsidize the prosperity of wealthy nations. Worse still, those debtor nations see their prospects for development stultified under the impact, often overwhelming, of actions taken by the great industrial Powers.

The solution of the pressing problems of the international economy cannot be found in individual actions or short-term approaches; nor can it be ensured as a by-product of the recovery of one or other developed country. This is all the more true when such recovery, which is subject to strong elements of uncertainty and risk, has a restrictive effect upon the possibilities of expansion of other countries, particularly those most deeply in debt.

The way to a sustained and healthy recovery of the international economy cannot, therefore, be through the precarious reactivation of a few economies and an attempt, inevitably doomed to failure, to maintain an economic policy with restrictive effects upon the prospects for development of the nations of the third world.

The social and political tensions to which those countries have been subjected cannot continue much longer, nor can their peoples continue to live indefinitely at the mercy of abrupt fluctuations in the already intolerably high interest rates, in the availability of financial flows and in the conditions of access to international markets.

Over the past few years there have been recurrent episodes of resistance to concerted international action on the part of the developed countries, as shown by the lack of results at the International Meeting on Cooperation and Development, held at Cancun in 1981; the obstacles posed to the launching of global negotiations; the failure of the latest session of the United Nations Conference on Trade and Development; and the non-compliance with the principles and commitments of the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade. In view of the extremely adverse situation

confronting us, the time has come to open new avenues in the direction of the objectives which President Figueiredo defined – when addressing the General Assembly at its Thirty-Seventh Session – as the need to restructure the international economic order.

The rejection of dialogue and concerted action among Governments has had particularly harmful consequences over the past two years, which were characterized by the emergence of the debt crisis, with devastating results for Latin America. Countries whose efforts to maintain adequate rates of growth in the 1970s, which were important at that time to sustain the level of economic activity in the developed world, today see themselves, because of events beyond their control, punished by severe recessive pressures. This is certainly not the reward they deserve for the important contribution they made to the prosperity of the world's economy.

The developing world has not failed to give, clear indications of its willingness to enter into a realistic and constructive dialogue, as evidenced by several statements delivered in such varied forums as the Economic and Social Council, UNCTAD, GATT and the IMF. Their willingness to do so has been strengthened by a growing internal movement at the level of South-South cooperation and of interregional contacts.

As regards Latin America, three important steps in search of a dialogue with the developed world were taken this year with the holding of the Latin American Economic Conference at Quito in January and, more recently, the meetings held at Cartagena in June and Mar del Plata earlier this month by 11 countries particularly affected by the question of indebtedness.

At Quito, Cartagena and Mar del Plata, Latin American countries, acting in a moderate, objective and pragmatic manner, put forth a body of political principles which, in their view, should govern the relationship between debtors and creditors. They laid emphasis on the need for the creditors to recognize their share of responsibility in the solution to the debt problem, as well as the importance of symmetry and equity in sharing the burden of the adjustments required.

At Cartagena, especially, the participating countries took a significant step by clearly and strongly expressing their political will to act together in search of a dialogue with the Governments of the creditor nations on the general aspects of the debt issue. As indicated in the Cartagena Consensus, the question of the debt requires adequate political consideration at the international level, as it has obvious political and social consequences. Only the will of the governments of creditor and debtor countries will make it possible to modify the conditions which

hamper the attainment of lasting solutions to problems which cannot be dealt with exclusively through a dialogue with the banks, by isolated action on the part of international financial institutions or by the mere behavior of the markets.

The Ministers for Foreign Affairs and Ministers of Finance of the 11 countries that had met at Cartagena gathered at Mar del Plata, on September 13 and 14 to call for a dialogue with the Governments of the creditor nations. In the Mar del Plata Communiqué, they stressed the need for a meeting dedicated to the debt question and the means to alleviate the burden now faced by indebted nations. This dialogue, which will of course take into account the interests of all parties involved, is considered indispensable for the solution of problems that cannot remain subject to the vagaries of a highly unstable international economic environment. Let us hope that this time our appeal will not be in vain.

Like peace, development also threatens to become a mirage in the eyes of the weaker countries. If I insist on this correlation, it is to stress that in the political sphere, as well as in the economic, the difficulties we face arise from the very structure of the international system, resistant to change not mediated by power.

We can no longer avoid recognizing that if current distortions persist, the existing crisis will culminate in decisively hurting everyone, poor and rich, debtors and creditors alike. As we approach the end of the century, the economic world, like the political world, has become indivisible. Interdependence is not a rhetorical image: it is a historical necessity that demands political action in the sense of cooperation and not of regression or isolation.

To conclude, I should like to return to my initial remarks on the role of the United Nations in the present day world.

Too frequently, the Organization has seen itself transformed into a "forum for sterile confrontation", as President Figueiredo stated when he addressed the General Assembly in 1982. In acknowledging the virtual paralysis of the machinery of multilateral diplomacy, Brazil seeks a higher objective: the preservation and perfection of the United Nations, to make it what it should be, the forum *par excellence* for settling controversies between States and promoting international cooperation.

Brazil does not subscribe to the allegation that the United Nations is condemned to becoming an anachronism. What would be more properly anachronistic would be the rejection of democratic dialogue within the community of nations; the rejection of genuine aspirations and formulas of consensus resulting from lengthy and wearing negotiating efforts; the

prospect of the geometrically expanding gap in the distribution of wealth between the nations of the North and South.

There will be reason for comfort and optimism if we profit from the lessons of accumulated experience. As the United Nations approaches its fortieth anniversary, it has a more sorrowful, albeit clearer, perception of its limitations. This perception is courageously reflected in the reports on the work of the Organization submitted to the Assembly by the Secretary-General in the past three years. His suggestions for improving the potential of the United Nations are both timely and valuable. This notwithstanding his warning that we are "perilously near to a new international anarchy" remains frighteningly vivid.

Never has humanity been so indissolubly associated in destiny, and yet, to our peril, the international community's capacity to act is weakening every day.

The United Nations is once again suffering acutely from the corrosive effects of the rivalry between the superpowers. It would be unwise to ignore the realities of power international life. Nonetheless, it is also realistic to note that the justification of coercion is, in fact, the acknowledgement that political intelligence and creativity have failed. A greater threat is in the offing: that of a tragic doctrinal retrogression with regard to the rules governing relations among nations. Times of crisis always foster national egotisms.

Once again it must be stated that the Charter of the United Nations is a common heritage of political wisdom. The United Nations is not the monopoly of any country or bloc of countries, nor is it committed to immobility. Efforts to attain harmony must respect differences between individuals as well as between peoples. To reaffirm this philosophy, which is the responsibility of all, rich and poor, strong and weak, is also to preserve an arduously gained spiritual legacy, one to which Brazil remains faithful.

New York, September 24, 1984.

1985

1985

At the dawn of the eighties, Brazil had already overcome authoritarianism and recovered political and institutional franchises. By its turn, the international panorama was changing, especially in the light of the accession of Mikhail Gorbachev to power in the USSR.

Springing unexpectedly in March 1985 from the incapacitation and ulterior passing away of President-elect Tancredo Neves, the administration of José Sarney had to face simultaneous processes of change in the internal and external fields. It befell on him to preside over the final achievement of the political transition, to lead the process of constitutional drafting and ensure the realization of direct elections in 1989. At the same time, he had to restore the international image of Brazil as a constitutional State under the law. For this it was necessary, on the one hand, to rectify a number of policies previously carried on under the preeminence of views inspired by the military and, on the other, to enhance the political element represented by the democratic restoration in the country.

The Sarney government moved within the main lines of political reform and economic adjustment, of which the "Cruzado Plan", launched with great success in 1986, would become the main element. Those two main parameters conditioned the reinsertion of Brazil in the international scenario and its relations with its principal partners. Democracy allowed Brazil to become more responsive to the internal and external demands unleashed in the period. By its turn, the establishment of economic reform provoked the search for multilateral and bilateral partnerships with a view

to the configuration of new mechanisms of insertion in the international economic and financial picture.

The external scene was constantly marked by constraints and reactions, closing of spaces, both due to the crisis and the demobilization of the developing world, and to the control exerted by developed nations on the international agenda. Eastern Europe started to attract priority attention from the developed world and to appear as a competitor to Latin America for financial resources. China, which was initiating its process of reform, and the USSR, where the *perestroika* still gave rise to expectations for a controlled transformation of Soviet productive structures, were additional points of compulsory attention, to the detriment of Latin America.

Facing these variables, Brazilian diplomacy employed a "double track" activity: on the one hand, continuity, stemming from the fact that a large part of Brazilian external concerns followed the logic of the political and economic clout of the country, and also of the transformations occurred in its productive structure and the mode of its insertion in the world; and on the other the innovation rendered possible by democracy as a factor facilitating dialogue with the international and the regional communities.

The re-democratization of the country, in fact, would provide the starting line of action for Brazilian diplomacy in the Sarney period. That would make it possible to overcome the mistrust stemming from the authoritarian years and unclog certain channels of communication which in fact existed, despite the rhetoric of closer relations used by previous governments, both regarding the developed and the developing world.

The area of human rights was perhaps the one where Brazilian diplomacy found a new course. As soon as 1983, Brazil adhered to the Human Rights Pacts at the United Nations and to the Convention Against Torture.

The understanding with Argentina demonstrated the priority accorded to Latin America, which was materialized in the Declaration of Iguaçu (Sarney-Alfonsín), in the start of talks with Cuba and in the incorporation of Brazil to the Contadora Support Group. The new African policy was signaled by the prohibition of any cultural, artistic and sports exchanges with South Africa. The projection of Brazil in non–traditional areas was expressed, in particular, by the cooperation agreements signed during the visit to Brazil of the Prime Minister of the People's Republic of China, Zhao Zyiang.

All these circumstances were reflected in the statement titled "The Sentiment of the World", which was delivered by President José Sarney in 1985 before the Fortieth Session of the General Assembly. In it, the President asserted that Brazil was reconciled and that the guiding philosophy of his government would be "political liberalism with a social vision". Referring to the independent foreign policy, the President pointedly restored the qualification of "independent".

The lines of continuity were made clear in the speech through the reiteration of the principles historically respected by Brazilian diplomacy (self-determination, non–intervention, pacific solution of disputes, non–use of force, etc.), as well as by the explicit description of previously established positions about several issues like the Middle East, the revitalization of the United Nations, East-West distension, disarmament, racism, etc.

The innovative lines were apparent in (a) positive reference to the problems of human rights; (b) the analysis of the situation in Central America, emphasizing the action of Brazil in the Contadora process; and (c) express mention to the adherence of Brazil to the Treaty of Tlatelolco, an element which foreshadowed the process that would lead to the reform and full entry into force of that instrument for Brazil.

As for the North-South relationship, to which the President devoted a large part of his statement, one notes an inclination to prioritize the issue of the external debt, due to the circumstances of the moment in Brazil and which would lead to the moratorium decreed in 1987.

XL Regular Session of the General Assembly of the United Nations
1985

President José Sarney [*]

Mr. President,

I still have before my eyes the suffering that Mexico has just undergone. I landed there to see for myself the tragedy, to see what had happened and to affirm to the people of that country Brazil's solidarity. In so doing, I dare to hope that I conveyed the feelings of the rest of the world, and I begin my statement here today by assuring Mexico of the solidarity of the entire world.

This tribune instills respect and dignity. It is the loftiest in the community of nation. Here, both the mighty and the weak are diminished, so much greater is the burden of mankind's history in the exercise of the task which is the essence of the organization's work namely, the preservation of peace, tackling the problems that beset it and the efforts to transform divergences into solidarity.

For 40 years my country, Brazil, has been privileged to open the general debate of the General Assembly of the United Nations. It is with profound emotion that I now exercise that prerogative.

Grave problems and immense responsibilities weigh heavily upon me. In expressing my feelings I turn to the greatest poet of my land, and I do so because I believe that poetry is neither inappropriate nor anachronistic in the scenario of great debates. The poet wrote:

[*] **José Sarney de Araújo Costa**, Born in Pinheiros, MA, April 24, 1930. Graduated in Law, he is also a journalist and writer. Governor of Maranhão from 1966 to 1970. Senator in 1970, reelected in 1978. Acting President of the Republic from 3/15 to 4/20/1985, assumed the post until 3/15/1990, after the passing of Tancredo Neves on 4/21/1985.

What rare dream could be
More pure or more beautiful
And more profound than this
Living machinery of the world?

It is with this feeling about the world that I speak on behalf of one of the largest nations of the globe, a complex and dynamic society, the eighth largest economy in the Western world, a country of contrasts and of greatness – the Brazil made up of several Brazils, in which affluence and poverty, aridity and fertility, drought and flood create a geography of contradictory features and, in so doing, enclose in a vast continent a unified people who have known how to construct a racial democracy and a cultural unity that are the invincible force of their destiny.

I am a simple man. I was born and have lived in one of the most severely tested regions of our land, the heavily populated and poverty-stricken Brazilian North-East. I have followed a political career for 30 years, but it was in the midst of tragedy and awe, in an abrupt and unexpected way, that I was called upon to lead our nation.

As President of the Republic, I am proud to be a writer for whom a taste for words has not restricted the spirit to mere aesthetic expressions. From words I forged an element of profound identification with the people, sharing in the aspirations of individuals and of society as a whole. Literature and politics force on us a social and humanistic vision of the universe. I cannot conceive of the pursuit of material gain without a spiritual substratum that endows human adventure with the dimensions of the eternal. I have faith, and woe unto the man who thinks of the world without the company of God. Brazil has just lived through a long night. Its eyes are not reddened by nightmares. Its lips display an open gesture of confidence and sing of its love for freedom. He who is a prisoner of the past cannot see the future. Moses never turned his back on the Promised Land.

The instrument that worked our transition from authoritarianism to democracy was our capacity to reconcile and understand, without violence or traumas. Our determination, courage and resilience were so strong that we managed to survive the loss of our hero, Tancredo Neves, on the very night in which our skies were lit up with the fireworks of victory. Our suffering then was transformed into strength and a resolve to make his dream our dream and to remain united.

The values of transformation proved stronger than death. We applied those values to all classes of society, and, in so doing, we abolished

distances and barriers in a patriotic convergence of all schools of thought and in the quest for the effective ideals of justice, conciliation and the institutional consolidation of civilian power. We believe that social vision is the very life-blood of modern liberalism. Freedom concerns itself with actual living conditions, with the complete achievement of individual happiness, with universal franchise and with the right to be free.

I come to this rostrum to pay a tribute to the United Nations on its fortieth anniversary. Brazil was there at its birth; it is here today, and it will be here in the future, to defend the spirit of the organization.

This spirit is not to serve as a mere instrument of the strong, but as the voice of the weak – of those who have neither armies, nor arsenals, nor a veto to impose in an effort to nullify decisions.

I am here to say that Brazil no longer wishes its voice to be timid. Brazil wants to be heard – without aspirations to hegemony, but with a clearly determined presence. We shall not preach to the world what we do not say within our own borders. We are at peace with ourselves. Consistency has become our strength. Our domestic discourse matches our international stance. We wish, as of now, to give new life, with renewed emphasis, to our presence in the debate of nations, by espousing an independent, dynamic foreign policy aimed at resolving international issues which have a social content.

We shall not be held captive by great Powers nor enslaved by minor conflicts. Forty years ago, our founding fathers established, despite the death throes of war and the ruins of oppression, the very foundations for the building of peace and the concert of nations, as well as unlimited cooperation among peoples. The major Powers and the emerging countries were called upon to put an end to colonial exploitation. They proclaimed to the universe the worth of the democratic principles of equality and justice. They condemned racism and intolerance. They gave legitimacy to the universal right to health, well-being and education. They reaffirmed the dignity of labor and the enhanced power of culture.

At present, now that we have lived without a global conflict for twice the number of years allotted to humanity between the First and Second World Wars, we are in a position to state that the role played by the United Nations has not always been recognized; indeed, its performance has almost never measured up. Nevertheless, its role, far from being useless, has been, is and will continue to be necessary. Its founding fathers were quite right.

On behalf of Brazil, I congratulate you, Sir, on your election to the presidency of the Fortieth Session of the United Nations General

Assembly. I also congratulate the representatives of the Member States assembled here to commemorate the four decades of active existence of this organization. I address my sincere compliments to the Secretary-General, Mr. Javier Pérez de Cuellar, of whose talent and diplomatic experience we Latin Americans are so justly proud. It is only natural that the first topic I take should be that of Latin America. Latin America's extraordinary effort to create a democratic order is the most stunning and moving political fact of recent years, a fact that remains unacknowledged by the uncaring eyes of the centre of world power. Little attention has been given to the institutional maturation of our region and to its drama and triumphs. With neither assistance nor interference, tempered only by the force of conviction, we have confronted the threats posed by the temptations of totalitarianism and by the greed of those who see only through the eyes of exploitation.

We have emerged synchronized in a movement of solidarity towards the flourishing of free institutions. We have made our choice as one, irreversibly opting for the trinomial of open society, free institutions, dynamic economy. Using this threefold democratic definition as a basis, we shall pursue dialogue as a bridge between the East and the West, the North and the South, old and new cultures, regimes and ideologies.

Gandhi, the Mahatma, said that the true mission of the man of law is to throw a bridge across the abyss that separates adversaries. The United Nations is the law; we are the men of the law. New winds are blowing over our continent and are breathing new life into our democratic tradition, as reflected in commitments that preceded the creation of the United Nations.

We therefore champion the principle of the self-determination of peoples and of the duty of non-intervention, of the peaceful settlement of disputes and of the relaxation of East-West tension. We reject the sharp antagonisms of bloc politics. We advocate the primacy of negotiation over perilous demonstrations of force.

In true democratic spirit, we have campaigned for many years on behalf of disarmament and we have shunned as precarious, violent and irrational the idea of a peace maintained by the parity of atomic arsenals. Brazil believes that there can be no quibbling over these ideals, nor can any concession be made to their suspension, at any level or for any reason whatsoever.

It is also because of our loyalty to the universalistic creed of democracy thate are anti-racist – profoundly, viscerally and intransigently anti-racist. Brazil is a great melting pot of a nation – one that is proud of

its identity. Some of the most highly creative expressions of our culture come from mixture and from ethnic cross-fertilization. The greatest, most sensitive author we have produced, Machado de Assis, was a mestizo, as were also, in the plastic arts, the great baroque sculptor Aleijadinho, and in music, the world-renowned Villa-Lobos. I wish to remind the Assembly how much Brazil's culture owes to the genius of the blacks and to the spirit of the American Indian.

Brazil has determined that racial discrimination is not only illegitimate, but illegal; it is a crime covered by the penal code. We consider repulsive the upsurge of racial conflict dictated by racist intolerance or the persistence of colonial configurations. I solemnly reiterate our total condemnation of *apartheid* and our unreserved support for the immediate emancipation of Namibia under the aegis of the United Nations.

We cannot conceive of the United Nations commemorating its age of reason without an all-out offensive against all the vestiges of racism on earth.

As President of my country, I reconfirmed a few weeks ago the ban on licenses and patents to South Africa, as well as on exports of oil and its by-products and arms and ammunition; I also suspended all cultural artistic or sports activities with the Government in Pretoria.

Racism is against humanity and against the future. Racism, a different version of colonialism, which is both amoral and perverted, must not besmirch the golden page of decolonization.

Decolonization will rise above the hecatombs of world conflicts and the sterile confrontations of the cold war as the greatest contribution of the twentieth century to the history of mankind.

The success of decolonization was the result of the common international will. A similar search for consensus solutions will pave the way towards overcoming the frustration which we currently experience and which has been caused by the challenge of the arms race and the proliferation of tensions and conflicts.

Human rights have a fundamental dimension which is intimately linked to the very practice of coexistence and pluralism. The world that the creators of the League of Nations did not live to see, the structuring of which we still await, is a world of respect for the rights of the human person, such as the United Nations promote in the international covenants on human rights.

The Universal Declaration of Human Rights is undoubtedly the most important document signed by man in contemporary history, and it was born in the cradle of the United Nations.

It is with pride and confidence that I announce to this Assembly Brazil's decision to accede to the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights, the Convention against Torture and Other Cruel, Inhuman or Degrading Treatment or Punishment and the International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights. With these decisions the people of Brazil take a step towards the democratic affirmation of our State and reiterate to themselves and to the entire international community a solemn commitment to the principles of the Charter and the promotion of human dignity.

In this task, I wish to stress the promotion of women's rights, which has gained new impetus in Brazil through the creation of the National Council for the Rights of Women, as well as the decisive participation of women in the transformations which are occurring in Brazilian society. This in turn is interrelated on the global level with the extraordinary movement of self-affirmation by women, the impact of which is causing a profound reappraisal of human relations as the century draws to a close.

We are at one of the many crossroads that have marked the 40 years of existence of the United Nations. The peoples are aware that concessions made to the realities of power are a one-way process. Only the united will of the majority to adopt a new attitude can remedy the scenario created by confrontation and by the mechanisms of power.

"Not all is East or West in the United Nations ... The world has other cardinal points", said Ambassador Araújo Castro, who represented Brazil at the XVIII Session of the General Assembly. Brazil recognizes many negative aspects in international relations, but we have always sought to view the world from a generous, multifaceted perspective.

Let us use our time for cooperation and for science; natural differences should not now endanger coexistence. Celestial space has always been the purest image of peace. Let us preserve the infinite sky as a frontier that weapons must never violate.

Brazilians believe in such values as respect for the individuality of each country and a united responsibility in the face of the impasses and dilemmas of this waning century. We witness with dismay the innumerable conflicts that affect the developing countries, paralyzing their efforts towards progress. These conflicts aggravate the difficult conditions created by the persistence of an unjust international order and place us at an even greater distance from the attainment of the ideal of peace and security. The transposition of themes from the East-West confrontation to the scenes of many of these conflicts adds a weighty element of exacerbation and disguises their true causes. We are surrounded by examples.

Brazil associates itself with other Latin American countries in proclaiming the urgent need for a political, lasting and stable solution for the conflicts that are tearing Central America apart. It is for this reason that Brazil fully supports the Contadora initiative, which reflects the feelings of all Latin America seeking a solution that will preserve peace and understanding on the continent keeping with the will of the peoples of Central America.

My Government joined with three sister nations in the creation of the Contadora support group in an effort to translate the broad backing that Contadora has been receiving into concrete initiatives.

The political and deeply ethical character of the Contadora Group is the Latin American response to theories of confrontation; it supports dialogue rather than radicalization; it is an invitation to substitute negotiations for the threat of the use of force; it is a vigorous defense of self-determination and non-interference against attempts to internationalize the conflict.

Brazil feels linked to all peoples in the Middle East by bonds of great friendship. The Brazilian society is greatly concerned about the disheartening atmosphere in Lebanon and recognizes the right of all peoples of the Middle East, including Israel, to live in peace within internationally recognized borders. Brazil wishes to see the creation of a national State of Palestine, this being the aspiration of that great people which has suffered for so long, withdrawal from the occupied Arab territories and acceptance of United Nations resolutions concerning the region.

Brazil, which is linked to Iran and Iraq by growing ties of friendship and cooperation, exhorts those two countries to take a peaceful, negotiated route toward resolving their differences.

We are very concerned about Afghanistan and Kampuchea. There will be no end the violence in those countries as long as foreign troops remain there and as long as the right of their peoples freely to express their will is not explicitly recognized.

It is also incumbent upon us to press for constructive vision and stance with regard to the question of the Malvinas. Since 1833, Brazil has given its support to the just Argentine claim to sovereignty over the Malvinas Islands, stressing that a negotiated settlement is the only way to resolve the problem.

Brazil will make every effort within its power to ensure that the South Atlantic is preserved as an area of peace, shielded from the arms race, the presence of nuclear arms and any form of confrontation

originating in other regions. In keeping with its firm commitment to the effort to ban nuclear weapons from the continent, Brazil signed and ratified the Treaty of Tlatelolco, whose pioneering goal is to transform Latin America into the first denuclearized zone on territory inhabited by mankind. The denuclearization of Latin America should be the first step in a new movement to deter the vertical and horizontal accumulation of nuclear arms, thereby releasing the $ 1.5 million squandered every minute on the arms race to be used to combat hunger, disease, ignorance and poverty.

The marathon arms race is a symptom of the evil which threatens lucidity and a somber hiatus on the human conscience.

We are experiencing a new scientific revolution which is moment by moment, transforming the world under our very eyes. Control over the advances which occur at dizzying speeds in state-of-the-art sectors of science and technology has become a vital matter of survival. The program of work of the United Nations in the next few years must contain a strategy to prevent the world from becoming fragmented into closed technological blocs; it must place scientific and technological knowledge at the service of the basic needs of all humankind.

Those are the visible problems. But there is another, greater problem, one which permeates international relations and which insidiously threatens all, poor and rich alike – the poor, through destabilization; the rich, through insecurity; everyone through the possibility of total collapse should we persist in our posture of immobility.

I should like to address the economic problem, which concentrates its virulence in the third world, and in particular in Latin America. Crushed under the weight of an enormous foreign debt, the countries of the region are living through a scenario of severe difficulties with domestic repercussions resulting in recession, unemployment, inflation, increased poverty and violence. Ensnared in a vicious network of economic factors – namely, the rise in international interest rates, falling prices of commodities and the selectivity of markets in the developed countries – we are confronted with a crisis comparable only to that which assailed the market economies in the early 1930s.

The burden of foreign debt imposes an economic policy geared towards achieving trade surpluses earmarked for interest payments. The international organizations propose policies involving inadequate adjustments. This approach leads to recession, to unemployment and to giving up the capacity to grow. Such a policy weakens civilian leadership, renders the social crisis explosive, threatens institutions, jeopardizes

order and, as a result, constitutes a threat to democratic structures. To add to our difficulties, the markets of the developed countries are being closed to our exports. Protectionist barriers are proliferating and we are unjustly accused of unfair trade practices. The protectionism that is sought to shield the obsolete sectors of the developed countries is even confused with the legitimate right of developing countries to create favorable temporary conditions for the installation of emerging industries incorporating modern technologies essential for sustaining growth in the exercise of our sovereignty and independence.

And the paradox stems from the fact that all our efforts are being made precisely in an effort to transfer foreign exchange credits to the very quarters that beleaguer us and discriminate against us. We are thus caught between the threat of protectionism and the spectre of default.

We are doing our utmost to compete. Our firms export with meager profits and our labor force receives low wages. It is sad to have to confess that our minimum wage is US$ 50 per month.

To round out our difficulties, we are obliged to maintain a trade-balance surplus to pay, within four years, interest amounting to approximately US$ 50 billion.

That is the situation confronting a country which has potential, which has a broad and diversified range of exports comprising commodities and petroleum derivatives, manufactured goods, machinery and even aircraft. One can readily imagine the impact of these factors on other countries lacking our advantages.

It has been our tradition to honor our foreign commitments. However, we have the obligation to alert the world to the fact that the existing scenario must be changed. It must be restructured, for it is unfair. And anything that harbors the germ of injustice or of the absurd simply cannot survive.

Brazil has no desire to make an ideological issue of the matter of indebtedness, nor does it wish it to be transformed into a source of confrontation between North-South and East-West. Brazil is a country of ingrained Christian and Western ideals. We believe that wherever free enterprise has collapsed, freedom itself has likewise disappeared. Hence we believe in enhancing the world market rough competition, and, in denouncing the present order, we are not moved by any political motivation. We wish solely and exclusively to defend our most sacred interests – the sacred interests of Brazil. And we shall fulfill this duty by urging the international community to join us in seeking a solution. Moreover, this solution cannot be based solely

on the laws of the market. At the end of the Second World War, the victorious Powers understood that to achieve peace it was essential to establish a new disciplined international order to govern economic and financial relations among nations.

Fundamental to the establishment of this economic order was the perception that rebuilding Europe was indispensable for stability and international security itself. The success of the program for the reconstruction of Europe demonstrates the ability to carry out projects of cooperation amongst nations when they are conceived with a broad vision of the reciprocity of interests involved and a clear awareness of the connection between political and economic problems.

At present we are experiencing anew a situation which clamors for a creative vision for renewal. The pillars of the current order are eroded and obsolete. It is necessary for us to discuss concrete measures to adjust the international economic order to present day realities.

Following upon the period of prosperity, with the advent of the recession, was Hobbes's predatory jungle which began to reign rather than the harmonious, fruitful anarchy of Adam Smith.

The indebtedness of Latin America is no longer merely a regional problem, given the extent of its impact on the stability of the financial mechanisms of the Western world. Awareness of this problem led to the Cartagena consensus, a manifestation of solidarity amongst the Latin American countries most affected by the problem of foreign indebtedness, in an effort to devise a solution through dialogue and understanding.

From the Latin American point of view, it is imperative for the indebtedness crisis to be negotiated in terms of its political dimension. Today, just as was the case 40 years ago, the Governments of the creditor nations must be made aware of the fact that there is an exceptional situation the solution of which transcends the mere interplay of economic forces.

In calling upon the leaders of the industrialized nations to come forward with uncerted political action to resolve foreign debt problems, I do so with the serenity of a country which has not spared any effort to meet faithfully its international commitments.

We have made gigantic efforts. Nevertheless, even if we were to maintain our current rate of growth, only in 1990 shall we have matched the per capita income level we had attained in 1980.

Our people have reached the limits of what is bearable. It is impossible to demand additional sacrifices of a population as impoverished as ours. On the contrary, we must assure the Brazilian people that opportunities for employment will be increasing in the coming years.

Our vulnerability to rises in international interest rates is so great that all we have accomplished will collapse if exorbitant rates are renewed.

We shall face greater difficulties in shaping a liberal and pluralistic society if we do not maintain and expand our contacts abroad. However, the foreign debt crisis has been forcing our economy into a process of isolation and autarchy, resulting in minimal import possibilities and weakened and unsatisfactory ties with international financial markets. We do not want isolation and autarchy; we have the right to expect of our international partners equitable and fair forms of operation and also that they will democratically accept a concrete share of responsibilities. We cannot rely merely on the rhetoric of economic adjustment, on the assumption that sacrifice is all that is required of a third-world debtor for the settlement of his foreign accounts. This narrow view disregards the fact that we are dealing with populations which have a right to a respectable standard survival and with countries with legitimate national aspirations. Either we realize that the solution to the foreign debt problem is a joint task for creditors and debtors alike or we run the risk of setting fire to the powder-keg that threatens the whole continent.

This picture explains the social cauldron of Latin America, defenseless against Messianic and demagogic seductions, and the call of totalitarian ideologies and trapped in an unfair situation resulting from accumulated errors of the past. It is a miracle that the glow illuminating Latin America at this time comes from the torch of liberty and democracy and not that of turmoil.

Brazil has taken its position. Debt does not lead to doubt. We have chosen to grow without recession, without submitting ourselves to those adjustments which would entail relinquishing development.

Brazil will not pay its foreign debt with recession, nor with unemployment, nor with hunger. We believe that in settling this account at such high social and economic costs we would then have to surrender our freedom, for a debt paid with poverty is an account paid for with democracy. I thus wish to affirm with all seriousness and firmness that there is no solution possible without a thorough reformulation of the international economic structures.

Lastly, I must speak of peace, the loftiest ideal of mankind. But what is peace? Is it merely the absence of war, of war between nations, of war between men? Or is peace something more transcendental which signifies the freedom of men from all forms of violence, from all forms of conflict? I believe it to be an inner state of mind projected by man as the

conduct to be followed by all nations; but realistically we know that many generations will pass before this goal is actually achieved.

The reality that sustains us is quite different. The raw material of our work is provided by the harsh landscape of our times: one beset with violence, egotism, retaliation, dependence, backwardness, servitude, nuclear war, the ills of starvation, cultural disparities, assault on the ecology, pollution, terrorism, greed and exploitation.

The peace of today is not yet true peace. It is war in disguise. The first path, leading to peace is freedom; and the political organization of freedom is democracy. Free peoples do not wage war; there will be no war between democratic peoples that decide their own destinies without submitting to personal tyrannies and to ideological fanaticisms. War and democracy, war and freedom are incompatible terms. As Clausewitz pointed out, war exists only when sovereign states exist. Likewise, we can affirm that peaceful, consensual solutions prevail when free and democratically developed nations exist, with permanent institutions, with fully operational powers, and with the people themselves making the decisions. Thus the best way for the United Nations to work for peace is to work for democracy. We Brazilians follow this example. We emerged from conflict through democracy. On the day the people felt they could decide, they did not choose violence. They opted for dialogue, for negotiation.

We are approaching the end of the century. The task of the United Nations has been to manage circumstantial conflicts. It is time for us to react vigorously against this marginal role, restoring to the Organization the prerogatives and rights deriving from its overall responsibility to all peoples in matters pertaining to peace and security.

The priority for the fifth decade in the life of the United Nations should be a program of revitalization with the following objectives: to help defuse the tensions of the renewed confrontation between the two power blocs; to create a new economic order based on development and social justice; to explore the entire negotiating potential of the organization to promote solutions for the regional conflicts which are proliferating in the third world; and to regain a major role in the negotiations for the reduction, control and elimination of arms, with emphasis on those with greater destructive power.

However, freedom is not restricted to the exercise of a political right. As a component of the well-being of each of us we have a great social debt, a moral debt to the poor of the entire world who are the human beings we call brothers but whom we treat as though they were not.

The meaning of freedom for contemporary man is not merely the absence of coercion or of interference. It is the prospect of a happy life for oneself and for one's own. Thence, the concept of freedom, which concerns itself specifically with the actual conditions of a free life and strives to promote the broadest possible equality of opportunity. Modern man is one whose life today reflects Jefferson's dream of the personal and collective pursuit of happiness.

Equality of opportunity is the mainstay of social freedom, enabling the market to serve mankind rather than mankind serving the market. Without a diversity of values and multiple ways of life, freedom does not flourish, but languishes in privilege and drowns in oppression.

Shortly before the creation of the United Nations, Churchill and Roosevelt held a dialogue at Hyde Park. Roosevelt asked how peace could be assured and Churchill replied, "By an Anglo-American alliance." But Roosevelt retorted, "No: by improving living conditions throughout the world."

I repeat, that for there to be peace there must be democracy and freedom: a freedom without hunger. The world cannot enjoy peace so long as there is a single hungry mouth anywhere on the face of the earth, a single child dying for lack of milk, a single human being suffering for lack of bread. The coming century will be the century of socialized food. The image of the *mater dolorosa* in the African desert is humiliating to us. Foodstuffs cannot continue to be mere speculative commodities on the exchange markets. Science and technology are here, announcing a new era of abundance through genetic engineering. Man, who has been able to break through the barriers of Earth and take off for the distant stars, cannot be incapable of eradicating hunger. What is required is a universal will to do so. That is a decision which must be taken without vetoes. It is urgent to have a plan of peace for the elimination of hunger.

Brazil, which experiences the paradox of being a major producer of food while struggling to eliminate pockets of hunger from its own territory, is willing to take part with enthusiasm in an effort to mobilize the international community to wipe out the scourge of hunger before the end of the century. This challenge may prove to be an opportunity for the United Nations and its agencies to rise above the present discredited state of multilateralism, thus demonstrating their effectiveness and validity in order to accomplish this, man must have a humanistic vision of politics, otherwise he may be able to think of nothing and produce nothing but nuclear missiles and warheads.

The conquest of the seas brought to man the humanism of the renaissance. The conquest of the cosmos broadens our view to an infinite solitude: the world has become larger and yet at the same time smaller. We must be united on this voyage where all men are condemned to face the greatest temptations of life. The new humanism must be centered on solidarity and peace. Peace can exist only hand in hand with freedom, freedom with democracy, and democracy when we provide for the segregated for the starving, for the unemployed. It will exist when in the poor nations we love our poorer regions, when in the rich nations we love the poor people, and when in the poorer nations we love the poorest people.

Forty years ago we built upon the stark ruins of war. Today we must work to prevent the ruins of an anonymous war, which is hunger. Poverty is the very negation of life.

This is the great mission of mankind: to transform life by transforming the world. The twenty-first century is in sight. Let us look upon the new times with the eyes of the lover of nature, with the eyes of the pursuer of dreams. Let us have the courage to proclaim that freedom and peace will spell the end of poverty and hunger.

New York, September 23, 1985.

1986

1986

Despite external constraints, Brazilian economy grew at a rate of 8.3 per cent in 1985. To sustain this growth, it was imperative to contain inflation, which reached an annual rate of 454 per cent according to projections from the start of 1986. Enacted at the beginning of that year, the "Cruzado Plan" consisted of a "heterodox" set of measures aiming at curbing inertial inflation.

The early success of the Plan granted additional credibility to Brazilian diplomacy, which had already benefitted from the recovery of democracy. The priority given to Latin America was evident in two important external policy decisions: the re-establishment of diplomatic relations with Cuba, in June, and the start of the process of integration with Argentina.

The relationship with Cuba had become a taboo due to the consequences of the armed struggle that had taken place in Brazil in the decade of the seventies. To overcome that constraint was necessary not only for the affirmation of civilian preeminence in the internal order but also for reasons of external interest: Brazil would not be able to assume a preeminent role in the regional scenario without availing itself of appropriate channels of dialogue and cooperation with Cuba.

Relations with Argentina had already been intensified since the solution achieved for the compatibility between Itaipu and Corpus during the Figueiredo administration, of which Brazilian support to Argentina in the Malvinas question from April 1982 onwards was to a certain

extent a corollary. Only the coincidence of civilian regimes, however, would provide the conditions for the factors of competition and rivalry arising from a complex coexistence of several centuries to be superseded by growing and well-grounded impulses in favor of association. More than thirty Protocols signed in 1986 would lead in 1988 to the Treaty that established the Brazil-Argentina Common Market and in 1990 to the Treaty of Asunción, which created MERCOSUR.

In parallel with the full recovery of the Latin-American angle, Brazilian diplomacy turned to the task of building of an atmosphere of understanding and cooperation with the United States. The civilian government had inherited a relationship with the U.S. contaminated by contentious issues in the area of trade and jeopardized by the question of the external debt. The situation had become more serious with the American decision to utilize Brazil as an example for its trade legislation, availing itself of the Brazilian practice in the pharmaceutical industry (lack of patents for the processing of products) and of the informatics law (protection to the infant national industry) to unleash retaliatory measures affecting important sectors for Brazilian exports (footgear, ironworks, airplanes, etc.). On a visit to the United States in September 1986, President Sarney had two objectives: to present to the U.S. a new Brazil, once again democratic and on its way to economic adjustment and stability, and at the same time to convince the administration, the Congress and public opinion in America, that global relations between the two countries overshadowed sectorial problems and accordingly should not be contaminated by transitory circumstances.

In his statement before the Forty-First Session of the General Assembly, Foreign Minister Roberto de Abreu Sodré mentioned expressly the presidential visit to the United States and reaffirmed Brazil's re-establishment of democracy as a distinctive element of its diplomatic action. At the same time he made a prudent analysis of the international panorama, of the trends to "re-polarization", of existing inequalities on the development level, of restrictions imposed on developing countries regarding access to capital markets, of trade barriers and of the new protectionism. The issue of the debt again dominated the analysis of the situation in Latin America. The Minister stressed the need to consider the political aspects of the indebtedness crisis in Latin America and announced measures taken by Brazil and Argentina with a view to integration.

In accordance with previous manifestations of Brazilian diplomacy Minister Sodré's speech did not fail to include the mandatory mentions to disarmament (with emphasis on the commitment to full military

denuclearization of Latin America), to *apartheid*, to the Middle East and the Iran-Iraq, Afghanistan, Kampuchea and Central American conflicts. The question of the Malvinas again was the subject of an express mention. The theme of human rights was duly characterized as a fundamental element of the recovery of the democratic image of Brazil.

The statement ended with a cogent presentation of the Brazilian proposal to include the item "Zone of Peace and Cooperation in the South Atlantic" on the agenda of the Assembly. The initiative aimed at giving relevance to diplomacy in the South Atlantic space and at the configuration of a set of pressures against military activity from South Africa in the Southern part of the African continent.

XLI Session of the General Assembly of the United Nations
1986

Minister Roberto de Abreu Sodré [*]

Mr. President,

On behalf of the Brazilian Government it is my privilege to congratulate you, Sir, upon your election to the presidency of the Forty-First Session of the General Assembly. I am certain that I interpret the trust of all delegations present here in your wise and inspired leadership, on the basis of which our work will attain the desired success.

Let me also pay tribute to Ambassador Jaime de Pinies for the competent and skillful manner in which he presided over the last session of the General Assembly, the session which marked the fortieth anniversary of our Organization. For 41 years Brazil has had the privilege of opening the general debate of the United Nations General Assembly.

At the Fortieth Session last September it was the President of my country, José Sarney, who gave the opening address. He began by paying homage to this tribune: "This tribune instills respect and dignity. It is the loftiest in the community of nations. Here both the mighty and the weak are diminished".

In my capacity as minister for External Relations of Brazil, I come to this podium of the United Nations with emotion and reverence. This is the highest forum of mankind. As such it must be resolutely preserved.

[*] **Roberto Costa de Abreu Sodré,** born in São Paulo, SP, June 21, 1918. Bachelor in Law from the Faculty of Law of the University of São Paulo. Governor of the State of São Paulo from January 1967 to October 1970. Minister of State for External Relations from 2/14/1986 to 3/14/1990. † São Paulo, September 14, 1999.

I spare no words, therefore, in praising it. Its occasional setbacks do not detract from its intrinsic value an instrument for dialogue and peace. Its shortcomings, far from rendering it invalid, rather enhance the imperative need to strengthen it.

Brazil knows of no alternative to the United Nations. If the Organization did not exist, human talent and ingenuity would have to conceive it, create it – in short, reinvent it. It certainly does not lack adequate institutional means, a precise legal framework, or clearly defined and lucid objectives. Truly, what is most missing in the Organization, to translate all its immense potential into the most profitable cooperation between peoples for their common good, as a sincere political universal will to sustain it without faltering in the consistent and dedicated affirmation of the noble purposes consecrated in the San Francisco Charter.

Just when international society is becoming practically universal, it would be contradictory, as well as foolhardy, to condemn the United Nations to extinction or to inertia, thus depriving the world of its basic tools for democratic dialogue and fruitful understanding. For Brazil, strengthening the United Nations is the best way to ensure peace security and international cooperation.

During his recent State visit to the United States of America, President José Sarney referred to Brazil as a factor for stability and peace, for conciliation and equilibrium in all dimensions of world order. "We are a country that contributes", he said, "a country that does not disrupt – a country that brings not problems but solutions".

I have come to the United Nations to convey, with certainty and conviction, the responsible and constructive message of a new Brazil, a Brazil that is celebrating its return to democracy, and, with renewed vigor, with decisiveness and assurance, is undergoing significant changes.

The balance sheet of the 18 months of the new Brazilian Republic is impressive. We have consolidated our political institutions, removing the last traces of authoritarianism and making room for a progressive and irreversible democracy, a full, open, modern and united society.

We have corrected inflationary distortions that for decades have afflicted our people – and did so without a recession, but on the contrary, with rapid and firm resumption of economic growth. We have begun to settle our chief debt – the social debt, the historical debt the country owes to its own people, by actively seeking to reduce disparities in income and to wipe out poverty.

Just like the nation we have set ourselves to build, we want to have a politically democratic international order, economically prosperous and sharing, socially just. We want liberty, development, equity.

It does not appear, however, that these aspirations are even close to being fulfilled. On the contrary, on the political level, the trend towards re-bipolarization undermines the international machinery for collective and democratic understanding. Confrontation is replacing dialogue, power is prevailing over consensus. The threat of force and even the use of force are replacing the tools for negotiation in dealing with disputes – as if power per se were efficient in settling conflicts. Where force is present today impasse is more frequent than victory or defeat. Force, besides being illegal, has proved itself to be non-functional.

The historian who in the last century foretold that the twentieth century would be the century of terrible simplification was right. The vast complexity of international relations is imprisoned in trivial schematizations that divide countries according to the easy logic of dichotomies, separating them into different and necessarily opposed camps, seeking to obliterate the spontaneous multi-polarity of the world of today.

Reality itself is richer and more contradictory, and has resisted the authoritarianism of binary concepts. But Manichean dualism can be perverse and end up imposing itself upon reality. To deal with a local dispute, brought about by local causes, on the basis of preconceptions and interests embodied in the confrontation between exogenous Powers, can unleash forces that will end uptransposing a minor dispute into the major conflict. Although fallacious in their premises, these concepts can be catastrophic in their consequences. What was false as a principle in application becomes painfully true – and all the more serious.

The international economic system is conducted by anachronistic automatisms which are in conflict with the interests of a good portion of the international community – primarily the developing countries. In the field of trade rules prevail which first and foremost reflect the interests of the most powerful industrial nations – and even these rules are frequently violated. In the financial and monetary fields, the world economy is subject to the impact of measures taken unilaterally that can decisively affect the developing countries without their having any rights – neither the right to speak, nor the right to argue, nor the right to compensation.

As regards equity, the hoped-for reduction of the deep gap between rich and countries, we are witnessing the almost total paralysis of international economic cooperation. The initiatives taken by the developing countries run into inertia and even the hostility of the developed countries. On the other hand, there is an accentuation of trade protectionism on the part of these countries, an iniquitous practice made even more so by

being incorrectly compared with the legitimate measures that developing countries need to adopt in order to protect infant national production. There is an unmistakable difference between one kind of behavior and the other: one preserves the concentration of wealth, sustaining non-competitive activities; the other seeks to guarantee the survival of the poorest countries in an unjust and unbalanced international system that even obliges them to accumulate ever larger surpluses for the payment of their foreign financial commitments.

And worse, a new model of protectionism is emerging. The action of barring inconvenient imports is now being complemented by the strategy of creating obstacles to the very installation of production processes in the developing countries; even when primarily intended to meet the demand of the internal market. Such "preventive" protectionism is particularly evident in sectors which involve the use of more advanced technologies.

The climate of international relations does not, therefore, look very favorable for developing countries such as Brazil. However, this does not discourage us from persevering in our quest for the objectives we set for ourselves at home, nor does it lessen our willingness to participate in any endeavor leading to a truly more free, prosperous and just international society – such as the society we firmly propose to establish in our own country.

I cannot fail to mention here the Ministerial Meeting of the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade (GATT), in Punta del Este, in which I have just participated. At that meeting I stressed the firmness of positions and the constructive attitude of the developing countries. Brazil trusts that the consensus eventually reached may serve as a starting-point for fruitful and profitable negotiations for the international community as a whole, leading to a more just end effective economic order.

Latin America is heroically struggling to extricate itself from an economic crisis at the precise moment at which its democratic vocation is solidly reasserting itself.

Despite the progress that some Latin American countries, such as Brazil, have succeeded in making at the economic and social levels, the general picture of our continent still presents serious difficulties – recession, unemployment and heavy foreign indebtedness. I am reminded of the famous words of Simon Bolívar, to whom our continent owes so much: "Slavery is the daughter of darkness; an ignorant population is the blind tool of its own destruction."

The Liberator would agree today that the blind population in the deep night of poverty can just as easily become the tool of revolt and destabilization.

The present juncture calls for statesmanlike vision. Just as was the case after the Second World War, it is now necessary and of the utmost urgency to take concrete action to launch an authentic new international economic order.

We also stand in need of short-term measures. Latin America cannot continue being a net exporter of capital; it cannot continue paying high interest rates and spreds in renegotiating its foreign debts; it can no longer have access to international markets blocked for its products; nor can it continue to suffer from restrictions on the transfer of technology.

Keen awareness of the economic problems of Latin America led to the establishment of the Cartagena consensus, through which we issued an invitation to the creditor nations for dialogue and understanding.

It is essential that the crisis of Latin American indebtedness be examined and understood from its political aspect. It is essential that the Governments of the creditor countries understand that an exceptional situation exists, a situation that cannot be automatically corrected by the simple play of the market forces. It is essential to understand that there is a need to contain and correct patent distortions and inequalities in the international economic system. President Sarney has declared again and again that Brazil will not pay its foreign debt with the hunger and poverty of its people, nor at the cost of democracy or economic growth. In reaffirming this resolute stand of the Government of Brazil, I do so in the name of a country determined to fulfill its international financial commitments but equally determined to secure a better quality of life for its people, who have already made so many sacrifices.

It was with this superior objective in mind that in February of this year Brazil adopted a broad program for economic reform, to crush inflation, stimulate investments, reward production and labor, and penalize speculation. The new program, the highly successful *Plano Cruzado*, or Cruzado Plan, is today the symbol of new hope for Brazilians, embodying a new mentality, a new force to give impetus to our growth.

There is no longer any terra incognita on this planet; but new frontiers are being opened up in areas that are crucial for humanity: those of technology. The developing world cannot be kept as an outsider in this new revolution, lest the already enormous chasm that separates our world from the developed world be consolidated and broadened. The technological revolution must be channeled towards the bridging of these

two worlds, so that it will benefit both. The effects of this revolution are exponential and qualitative in character. If they are misdirected, they can not only cause an irreversible rift between rich and poor also inevitably lead to an abyss separating those who possess and control knowledge from those to whom no access to knowledge is permitted.

We do not wish, nor can we accept, the technological revolution's following the same road as the Industrial Revolution, relegating the majority of countries to the role; of mere providers of inputs of limited aggregate value. Nor do we wish to be reduced to the role of mere buyers of the surplus and the obsolete.

We will not resign ourselves to being the passive spectators of a new international division of labor, bisecting the world into distinct universes, one containing the post-industrial societies, where activities of information and service predominate, true nerve centers that would govern the planet, and the other for backward, subservient societies.

Neither do we fail to see the implications of the accelerated development of technologies for military purposes in the rich countries. We are aware of the impact of the civilian applications of these new technologies, whose research and development are endlessly financed by defense budgets. We are not blind to the repercussions that these subsidies to technology have on the entire economic structure of the developed countries, nor do we fail to perceive their negative effect on the competitive capacity of the economies of the developing countries.

In Latin America, in particular, the economic and technological lag is spurring the conscience of our peoples in Brazil we are firmly, irreversibly committed to the cause of the economic integration of Latin America. For a long time this integration has been called for, but only now do we have adequate conditions for the emergence of an authentic political will to further it.

Integration opens up horizons for the formation of a common Latin American space, conducive to the development of the countries of the region and capable of invigorating them as they confront the adversities of the international economic situation. Brazil, together with Argentina and Uruguay, recently took meaningful steps towards this integration, in agreements that set forth, unequivocally, the mature and intelligent decision of peoples thoroughly convinced of the advantages of their uniting. An ambitious decision, but realistic as well, in which renewed faith in the convergence of our destinies is coupled with complete awareness of the difficulties integration can bring. We, however, do not flinch from taking up this historic challenge, which we know is daunting, but its very

magnitude is the measure of our common willingness to cooperate and to progress – our fraternal aspiration to grow, and to do so together.

The continuing existence of regional crises that threaten peace and security is another important aspect on the international scene. A notable instance is what is happening in southern Africa. I am reminded of the words of President Sarney, in Praia, when he paid a gratifying visit to Cape Verde last May:

> The complex problems of South Africa can never be solved from the perspective of East-West tensions or from any other strategic viewpoint of the great Powers. (...)The solution to the crisis in that region lies first of all in the disappearance of apartheid and, subsequently, in the solid implantation of a structure of peaceful interaction between the States of the region, enabling all of them to dedicate themselves to the struggle for the implementation of their national development plans.

The inconceivable recalcitrance of the Pretoria Government in maintaining the regime of apartheid intact and in blocking the process of the independence of Namibia in persistent violation of the Security Council's decision, continues to cause serious tensions and conflicts in southern Africa.

An illustrious Brazilian statesman of the past century, Joaquim Nabuco, fighting against the slavery that stigmatized us at that time, said all those years ago: "The laws of every country are subject to certain fundamental principles, which are the basis of civilized societies, and the violation of any of those societies amounts to an offence against all the others".

No State can thus place itself outside the civilized community of the world asserted that famous abolitionist. This is exactly the case of the abominable regime of discrimination still in effect in South Africa as we approach the third millennium.

The international community is on the threshold of decisions that can no longer be postponed if Pretoria's attempt to perpetuate its nefarious regime is to be rendered unfeasible. Brazil will continue to strive to create conditions for the settlement of that question – an undeniable priority in the light of the explosive situation in South Africa and the critical situation of the front-line countries, which are subjected to every kind of illegal and unjustifiable aggression. Those valiant and long-suffering nations have our steadfast support. In the Middle East, the cycle of violence continues unabated. Brazil reiterates its consternation at the attacks being carried out in Lebanon, a country with which we have traditional ties and whose full right to self-determination we would wish to see respected.

The bases for a just and lasting peace in the Middle East must, of necessity, include the return of the Arab territories occupied since 1967, respect for the right of the Palestinian people to self-determination and independence in their own territory, and the need for all the States of the region, including Israel, to live in peace within internationally recognized borders. Brazil is also following with concern the development of the conflict between Iran and Iraq. We deeply regret that those two countries have not as yet resolved their differences peacefully and we renew our appeal for an immediate cessation of hostilities.

Chronic crises and conflicts are also to be found in other parts of the world. Such is the case in Afghanistan and Kampuchea, where the right to self-determination and the principle of non-intervention are being violated. Violence in those regions will not cease so long as foreign occupation continues and the free expression of the will of the people is curbed.

Another issue which preoccupies Brazil and the other Latin American countries is that of the Malvinas Islands. Since 1833 we have clearly and unswervingly supported the sovereign rights of the Argentine Republic to that territory and have insisted on the need for a peaceful and negotiated solution to the dispute. It is essential that a dialogue be re-established between the parties involved.

In Central America, exacerbated economic and social problems of a structural nature continue to add to the persistent climate of tension heightened by ideological confrontation. Brazil remains firmly convinced that a lasting solution to the conflict can be achieved only by respecting the principles of non-intervention and of the self-determination of peoples in an atmosphere of dialogue and mutual understanding. As a result of that conviction, my country has sought to cooperate in reaching an understanding through its participation in the Contadora peace process support group.

When we met in San Francisco to draw up the Charter of the United Nations, we were concerned chiefly with finding a definition for the kind of world we would be bequeathing to future generations. Shortly thereafter, an apocalyptic event radically changed the very premises on which the negotiations for a new international order were based.

The explosion of the first atomic bomb at Hiroshima revealed mankind to be in possession of a weapon capable of destroying the human species as well as the whole world in which we live. Since then, the problem of nuclear weapons has only worsened. Each day, the risk of a global – global and final – conflict increases.

The process of action and reaction that has taken the lethal and spiraling arms race to ever higher levels is indeed frightening. The prospect that an arms race is to be unleashed in space also causes us deep apprehension.

Brazil maintains a firm and determined policy of opposition to the proliferation of nuclear arms, whether vertical or horizontal. We have actively participated in all efforts towards disarmament carried out by United Nations forums.

My country signed and ratified the Treaty of Tlatelolco, the purpose of which is to make Latin America the first militarily denuclearized zone in territory inhabited by man.

The Treaty of Tlatelolco has not as yet achieved its objective, for it is not adhered to by all the states of the region, nor by one of the extra-continental Powers which has territories under its administration within the area of the Treaty. Furthermore, recent events indicate that for the Treaty to become a truly effective instrument to guarantee the security of the Latin American nations, an efficient verification system to monitor the introduction of nuclear arms is required. Despite these limitations, Brazil has repeatedly affirmed its unwavering policy of abiding strictly by the terms of the Treaty of Tlatelolco, eschewing any activity involving the acquisition of nuclear arms.

That policy, followed continuously and without vacillation, has enjoyed the broad support of the Brazilian people. The complete military denuclearization of Latin America is among the priority goals of the foreign policy of my Government, which is firmly committed, as are the Governments of other countries of the region, to avoiding the development and introduction of nuclear arms on the continent.

The nuclear arms race is not merely a threat to our future; it arouses terror and has already killed, causing death through insecurity, fear, poverty and hunger. In the words of the great Brazilian poet Carlos Drummond de Andrade:

> By the thought alone that it is coming to kill
> The bomb will kill;
> The bomb is indigence unifying millions of indigences.

Despite numerous protests and numerous warnings, in numerous forums – "The bomb attends all conferences and sits alongside all" – we must ask whether mankind will overcome the threat to its own destruction. A comforting message of optimism may perhaps be found in the final verses of the same expressive poem by the poet Drummond:

The bomb, confused beast, allows man
Time to save himself.
The bomb will not destroy life
Man (I dearly trust) will extinguish the bomb.

Let us be confident. In the polished words of Thomas Jefferson, we are, after all, moved by "the conscientious desire to direct the energies of our nations to the multiplication of the human race, and not to its destruction."

Three other subjects merit special consideration. First, I wish to reiterate the importance that the Brazilian democracy attributes to the rights of the human person – to the absolute and full, unimpeded exercise of those rights. Significant international instruments, such as the international Covenants on human rights and the United Nations Convention against torture, are being incorporated into the Brazilian legal order, adding new guarantees for the perfect protection of those fundamental rights in our country.

I cannot fail to refer also to a momentous theme, the subject of drugs, to express the deep concern with which Brazil regards it. In our view, the problem has three essential aspects: the prevention of the improper use of drugs, the suppression of illicit drug traffic and the rehabilitation of chronic users. The problem will not be definitively resolved if those three facets are not taken equally into account. We also consider international cooperation to be essential in combating drug abuse, provided, naturally, that the sovereign rights of nations are safeguarded. Brazil participated actively in the Special Inter-American Conference on Traffic in Narcotic Drugs, held in Rio de Janeiro in April of this year under the auspices of the Organization of American States. We shall likewise give our most dedicated cooperation in the work of the international conference on drugs to be held in Vienna in 1987.

The third theme is terrorism. From this rostrum I wish to express our most vehement, energetic and indignant rejection at its proliferation. The international community cannot continue to tolerate the practice of acts of terrorism and must unite without delay to eradicate their causes and eliminate their effects.

I repeat, with emphasis, what I affirmed at the beginning of my address: strengthening the United Nations is the best way to guarantee international peace and security. In keeping with this view, my country has actively contributed to stimulating the implementation of measures to revitalize the United Nations. In the opinion of the Brazilian Government,

the recommendations of the so-called Group of 18 are a first and promising step in that direction.

We support an increasingly active role for the Secretary-General in the search of solutions to controversies. We support the Organization's examining all disputes and conflicts. We advocate flexibility in working methods, particularly the Security Council, so that the major issues relating to peace and security are treated substantively and constructively. We believe that it is necessary to counteract the tendency to bypass this forum in dealing with fundamental problems of peace which are of interest to the entire international community. These problems affect all and to all falls the responsibility for their solution.

It was precisely on the basis of this conception of the United Nations that on May 29, I proposed, through the Secretary-General, on behalf of the Brazilian Government, the inclusion of the item "Zone of peace and cooperation of the south Atlantic" in the agenda for this session. This initiative results from the statement of President José Sarney before this General Assembly in September of 1985, when he said:

> Brazil will make every effort within its power to ensure that the south Atlantic is preserved as an area of peace, shielded from the arms race, the presence of nuclear arms and any form of confrontation originating in other regions.

We are appreciative of the acknowledgment by the General Assembly of the pertinence of this item by including it in its current agenda. The initiative on the zone of peace and cooperation of the south Atlantic projects the need for an important collective effort, on behalf of which Brazil seeks to be merely a spokesman.

What is involved is the guaranteeing of peace, security and development in a vast area of the globe, comprising countries of two continents united in their common determination to overcome obstacles standing in the way of the attainment of the progress and well-being of their peoples.

On the one hand, the objective is to avert the serious threats to regional and world security whether represented by the situation in southern Africa or by the transfer to the south Atlantic of East-West tensions and confrontations, accompanied by the geographic proliferation of nuclear arms and the resulting intensification of the nuclear arms race. On the other hand, there is the aim to promote broad possibilities of cooperation to benefit the economic and social development of the peoples of the region.

The declaration of the south Atlantic as a zone of peace and cooperation would be a concrete measure in a vast program which the community of nations has itself defined as being of the highest priority in this forum: the conversion of irrational impulses towards confrontation into constructive work of international peaceful cooperation. It would constitute, moreover, the logical, complementary sequence of previous efforts of the Latin American and African countries, embodied in the Treaty of Tlatelolco, the Declaration on the Denuclearization of Africa and the Lomé Declaration and Program of Action relating to security, disarmament and development in Africa. Such a declaration would be a meaningful contribution to the promotion of universal peace based on equal rights and justice for all, which are supreme objectives of the United Nations.

Brazilian foreign policy is not based on illusions, nor does it engage in rhetorical effusions. On the contrary, it translates permanent and legitimate concepts, aspirations and interests.

We are a new country but not an immature country. We are a country with its own identity, which we value and respect, as we respect and value the identities of other nations. Our statements are clear, frank and direct expressions of the deep-rooted values of Brazilian society. When we speak of peace we do not consider that we are talking for talking's sake. We do not hesitate to be even repetitious. I shall therefore allow myself to reaffirm here words spoken in this very forum by an illustrious predecessor of mine in the post of Foreign Minister, João Augusto de Araújo Castro:

> We live within a system made up of reciprocal causes and effects. Just peace is indivisible – because peace involves an element of independence and its consolidation requires the cooperation of sovereign units – so the economic and social development of mankind, which is the condition and expression of peace, should be indivisible.

From this rostrum, at the last regular session of the General Assembly, President Sarney said: "The instrument that worked our transition from authoritarianism to democracy was our capacity to reconcile and understand, without violence or traumas."

To explain that peaceful transition, certain authors who are not Brazilian, assert that Brazilians are a "cordial" people, averse to violent solutions as though by historical predestination. This is an inaccurate over-simplification the merits of which I do not wish to discuss.

It is true that we are naturally inclined towards conciliation, based on tolerance and a staunch respect for differences. But if in moments of crisis there arises amongst us a favorable consensus towards understanding and negotiation, it is simply because we are keenly aware that the paths of violence, in addition to being ethically condemnable, are irrational and of short duration.

It is sad for the human species that at times it is "more difficult to make peace than to make war" as Clemenceau said. This is the challenge that both sustains and stimulates the arduous work of the United Nations. In the course of its 41 years of existence, this Organization has striven, despite all obstacles, to carry out the essential task of building and preserving world peace, promoting dialogue, understanding, and harmony among peoples.

On behalf of the Brazilian people and Government, I reiterate my country's commitment to this noble cause from which we cannot turn away.

New York, September 22, 1986.

1987

1987

The Brazilian political panorama in 1987 was dominated by the sequels of the progressive exhaustion of the "Plano Cruzado" and by the inauguration of the National Constitutional Assembly.

On the external level, the consequences of the unilateral moratorium decreed in February required special efforts from Brazilian diplomacy. By putting into question the relations of Brazil with its main partners, the decision to suspend debt payments significantly disturbed the pattern of Brazilian foreign relationships. The moratorium was not presented as resulting from any ideological motivation, but rather from a temporary injunction deriving from the circumstances of the conjuncture that Brazil was facing and from the desire to promote a global understanding on the question, based on the Cartagena Consensus. Brazil announced its intention to deal with the debt issue on two separate, yet interconnected levels: the financial one, limited to direct negotiations with the banks, and a political level in which the question would be considered under the lenses of its impact on State to State relations.

In the regional sphere, the process of integration with Argentina assumed a definitive character in 1987 through understandings in the nuclear area. Thus, was avoided the possibility that the mastery of the fuel cycle, obtained initially by Argentina and soon after by Brazil, would cause divergence. Since the visit by President Sarney, in July 1987, to the secret nuclear facilities in Argentina, both countries mutually

disclosed their nuclear programs. Mistrust based on lack of knowledge was replaced by trust based on cooperation.

Addressing the Forty-Second Session of the General Assembly, Minister Sodré chose to use more positive language about the prospects for the international situation. He announced the decision of Brazil to present its candidature for election to a seat in the United Nations Security Council, after an absence of twenty years. The Minister went over the main issues of the moment, reaffirming well-known Brazilian positions and confining his remarks to brief and objective mentions to the external debt, in conformity with the decision to avoid excessive politicization (Brazil was looking for an understanding with the United Sates and the international financial institutions).

XLII Session of the General Assembly of the United Nations
1987

Minister Roberto de Abreu Sodré [*]

Mr. President,

It is with a renewed feeling of confidence in the United Nations and a keen perception of its vital role in the strengthening of peace and cooperation amongst peoples that for the third time I come to this podium. Nearly all the nations of the world are represented here, protagonists in the universal and egalitarian communion that this General Assembly propitiates every year. Here the nations, large and small, raise free and sovereign voices in a discussion of important items on the international agenda.

Brazil has the privilege of opening this debate, which allows me to be the first to compliment you, Sir, upon your election to the presidency of this General Assembly and to convey to you our best wishes for your complete success in that capacity. I would like also to express my appreciation to Mr. Choudhury, the Minister for Foreign Affairs of Bangladesh, for the able way in which he presided over the work of the General Assembly at its Forty-First Session.

I bear responsibility for carrying out the foreign policy of a Brazil reborn into the practice of democracy, strengthened in its commitment to the interests and aspirations of its people and open

[*] **Roberto Costa de Abreu Sodré,** born in São Paulo, SP, June 21, 1918. Bachelor in Law from the Faculty of Law of the University of São Paulo. Governor of the State of São Paulo from January 1967 to October 1970. Minister of State for External Relations from 2/14/1986 to 3/14/1990. † São Paulo, September 14, 1999.

to candid dialogue at the international level. I speak on behalf of a country which is absolutely loyal to its diplomatic traditions, one that is building its future with determination, without being intimidated by the obstacles raised by the reality of the modern world. This reality, unfortunately, is independent of the will and aspirations of most of the peoples of the world and is not always in tune with the lofty purposes of this organization. The so-called crisis of multilateralism undermines the attempt at juridical regulation of international life and saps the foundations of cooperation among States.

The world will no longer tolerate structures based on the supremacy of the few and the submission of the many. Attempts to impose oligarchic schemes on the organization of international society meet with increasing discredit. There is no more place for rigid and exclusive formulas, Manichean dualisms, or theories that arbitrarily divide up world power – theories often inspired by geometrical figures. The world will come upon better days only when the international order is made effectively democratic – and to achieve that goal the United Nations has an essential role to play.

No nation or group of nations has the right to impose its own conceptions and solutions on the increasingly complex picture of international relations. No nation should seek to isolate itself or fail to take into consideration the universal aspirations of the community of nations.

I view with satisfaction the fact that the two superpowers – by means of direct dialogue between their leaders, President Ronald Reagan and General Secretary Mikhail Gorbachev – are seeking more fertile understanding and mutual confidence which, we trust, will result to the benefit of all countries. Along the same optimistic lines, it should also be recorded here that there was a recent important meeting between the leaders of the Federal Republic of Germany and the German Democratic Republic – Chancellor Helmut Kohl and President Erich Honecker – an historic event that may well lead to positive developments for a mature and constructive relationship.

In multilateral diplomacy there are perceptible signs of encouraging vitality. One of those signs was the decision to create a zone of peace and cooperation in the South Atlantic – a decision of undeniable significance for the fulfillment of the principles and purposes of this Organization. There is still hope for a peaceful settlement of the conflict that for over a decade now has been raging in Central America.

The United Nations represents the awareness of mankind that only by dialogue and persuasion can differences between States be resolved amicably. In unanimously adopting its resolution 598 (1987) on the conflict between Iran and Iraq, the Security Council showed its capacity to act in a constructive way to arrive at the peaceful and negotiated settlement of disputes. This action to restore peace, in accordance with the terms of the Charter, leads us to believe that in other cases it will be possible to have recourse to the authority of the Security Council, in the same conciliatory spirit. I am persuaded that the Council's diplomatic potential should be used to the fullest extent.

It was in the light of this conviction that Brazil decided to present its candidature for one of the seats allocated to Latin America on the Security Council. Brazil believes that it is in a position to make a constructive contribution during the coming biennium in reactivating the Council's role and in settling problems that affect or can affect international peace and security. Having been honored with the unanimous endorsement of the Latin American Group, we hope to be equally worthy of a vote of confidence from this General Assembly.

The latest signs of a break in the clouds that darken the international political situation are in direct contrast to the indefinitely prolonged economic crisis. The magnitude of the challenges facing the developing nations and the total lack of progress in restructuring the international economic order are the two sides of the coin of the same deeply disturbing panorama.

There is no raise of consciousness about the drama and concerns of the nations of the third world and their right to a destiny of achievement and progress which is under constant threat. I am from a developing country that will never surrender this right and is not only convinced of the justice and legitimacy of its claims but also of the viability of its objectives in the economic and social fields.

An additional cause for concern in the international community is the persistence of political crises that have been aggravated by the resort to force in violation of the United Nations Charter. Only last year I remarked to this Assembly that, where force is present nowadays, stalemates are more frequent than either victories or defeats. The use of force or the threat of the use of force is not only illegal but is proving itself to be ineffective as well.

This holds true in the Gulf region, where the machinery of violence is out of control. It is also true in southern Africa, with the persistence of the tense climate provoked by the *apartheid* regime, the

unjustifiable delay in bringing about the independence of Namibia and the acts of hostility and aggression perpetrated by South Africa against its neighbors. Only the intolerance, short-sightedness and unreasonableness of the racist policies of South Africa can explain the continuing existence of this situation, which is an offence against human dignity and violates the principles governing relations between States.

On the other hand, it is becoming more and more urgent to give new impetus to attempts to achieve a lasting, comprehensive and just peace in the Middle East. Brazil believes that the need to convene an international peace conference, under the auspices of the United Nations and with the participation of all interested parties, is becoming increasingly pressing. In this context, I reiterate our concern over the suffering inflicted upon the people of Lebanon, a country whose integrity should be respected.

We are hopeful that understandings arrived at between the parties involved, with the participation of the United Nations, will quickly lead to the withdrawal of foreign troops from Afghanistan and the cessation of all forms of outside interference, so that the Afghan people may exercise their sovereign right to self-determination.

We also view with concern the continuing impasse in the case of the Malvinas. Brazil, which recognizes the sovereign rights of Argentina, hopes that the parties involved will heed the appeal repeatedly addressed to them by the General Assembly to attempt to reach through dialogue a negotiated settlement of all aspects of the dispute.

I am pleased to note that the proposals on the subject of the South Atlantic made from this rostrum in 1985 by Mr. José Sarney, the President of my country, were successfully made a reality in the initiative culminating in the General Assembly's approval of resolution 41/11, of October 27, 1986. The establishment of a zone of peace and cooperation of the South Atlantic signified the international community's recognition of the determination of the South American and African countries of the region to maintain their independence, sovereignty and territorial integrity and to promote cooperation for economic and social development in conditions of peace and freedom.

For that decision to be implemented properly, other States must cooperate in good faith. This is indispensable. The militarily more significant States are called upon in particular scrupulously to respect the peaceful statute governing the region, and to avoid extending into the region rivalries and conflicts that are foreign to it. I cannot fail to point out that serious focuses of tension continue to exist there and that they are detrimental to the full realization of the objectives and principles of

the decision adopted by the General Assembly. From the rostrum of this peace forum I wish also to register the satisfaction with which Brazil views the possibility of the conclusion in the near future of the first agreement in history on nuclear disarmament. If, as we all wish, the United States and the Soviet Union come to a successful understanding on medium-range atomic weapons, we shall have the first real disarmament measure, in contrast with previous agreements, which amounted to nothing more than a palliative management of the arms race.

It is obvious that the more heavily armed countries bear the primary responsibility for the disarmament process. But it is equally indisputable that other States have the right to participate in the decision-making process on problems that, although caused by some, affect all, without exception. We therefore consider it indispensable for the negotiations between the superpowers to be linked with the efforts made in multilateral disarmament forums, especially the Conference on Disarmament, which is entrusted with a specific mandate.

As I stressed in my statement at the Seventh United Nations Conference on Trade and Development (UNCTAD), the developing world has been plunged into a deep crisis, and the efforts we are making to resume economic growth are confronted with an adverse international reality, with structures that accentuate the differences instead of reducing them. I also affirmed then that the attempt to shape the new by using the models of the past impeded the resumption of growth and development on a worldwide basis and the formation of a more just and more equitable international system.

The understanding arrived at on the problem of the foreign debt, as set forth in General Assembly resolution 41/202, is an indication of the promising headway which has been made, progress which should now be consolidated. I repeat here the firm and clear position of my country: we acknowledge our international financial obligations; we will settle our foreign debt under fair and reasonable terms and conditions. No one can claim that Brazil has not itself made every effort to overcome its difficulties. Brazil cannot, however, jeopardize its development.

In their efforts to seize increased economic opportunities, the developing countries encounter the severest restrictions imposed by their industrialized partners in the fields of finance, trade in goods and services, and, especially, the absorption of state-of-the-art technologies.

This is a tendency that undermines the heroic struggles of developing countries to assure their peoples a dignified and prosperous future. It is a tendency that dashes those nations' expectations of more just

and equitable participation in the international economy – and more than their expectations: their irrefutable right.

Brazil has no alternative but to grow. We must meet the crucial needs of a vast population which, in many strata, has known nothing but poverty and suffering. Development is not an option for us; it is an imperative.

The efforts undertaken by the developing countries to create a new international economic order will produce results only if they are accompanied by effective action to offset the distortions that exist in the policy of transfer of scientific and technological knowledge. In this regard, a vigorous endeavor can be noted on the part of some developed countries to seek to create a new international division of labor, but a division that would be more inequitable and prejudicial to our interests since it would thwart our legitimate right to have access to the latest scientific advances and mastery of state-of-the-art technologies. As President Sarney stated on September 4, when he announced Brazil's mastery of the technology for enriching uranium, Brazil cannot forgo broad and unrestricted access to the entire range of available scientific knowledge and its practical applications.

In this connection I wish to reiterate my country's commitment to use nuclear energy exclusively for peaceful purposes. This commitment not only is beyond dispute but also is supported by the positive effects which Brazil's technological advances in this field, together with those of its sister nations, are producing, to the enhancement of increased cooperation and mutual trust in Latin America. The initiatives of collaboration which are being implemented between Brazil and Argentina, in particular, will assure the mastering of the nuclear cycle without the development of atomic weapons in our continent. This common purpose was highlighted in the exchange of correspondence between Presidents José Sarney and Raúl Alfonsín when the announcement of Brazil's mastery of the technology for enriching uranium was made public.

The fact that Latin America is showing its ability to find practical and creative answers to its own problems is most encouraging. In this regard, I should like to cite the example of the dynamic action which the Contadora Group has been taking, with the political backing of the Support Group of which Brazil is a member, in its quest for a genuinely Latin American solution to the conflict in Central America.

On behalf of my Government I wish to praise the important understandings arrived at on August 7 last in Guatemala. On that occasion the Heads of State of the five Central American nations gave a

clear and historic demonstration of political will to resolve the conflict. Brazil deems the accord signed then to be one which offers a unique opportunity to guarantee peace in the region. To that end it has lent its active and interested contribution to the understandings which resulted in the decision, adopted on August 22 in Caracas, to set up an international commission for the purposes of verification and surveillance.

In Brazil's judgment the results of the recent steps taken in the quest for a peaceful solution to the Central American crisis indicate that the countries of the region are themselves in a position to find ways to put an end to the conflict which concerns and affects all of Latin America. To accomplish this, it is essential that all other countries with ties or interests in the region avoid displaying any attitude that might render such solutions non-viable.

The same ability of Latin America to find its own solutions to the problems of the continent is corroborated by the creation of the Permanent Mechanism for Consultation and Political Coordination, instituted as a result of the fruitful experience acquired over more than two years of successive contacts among the eight countries which make up the Contadora and Support Groups.

The decision of those countries, arrived at last month in the city of São Paulo, to begin to hold periodic meetings at the presidential level is an indication that the process of regional coordination begun in Rio de Janeiro has rapidly matured. In fact, the Group of Eight is an integral part of a process of broader regional understanding, another of whose multiple facets is to be found in the renewed efforts towards the integration of Latin America, which Brazil, as well as other countries of the region, has been fostering in various forums such as the Latin American Association for Integration, the Latin American Economic System, the Latin American Energy Organization and the Cartagena Consensus.

I wish to reaffirm before this world forum the importance my country attributes to the agreements for integration and economic cooperation concluded with Argentina and Uruguay at the beginning of last year. These are instruments of truly historical significance which attest to our fraternal determination to grow together, to strengthen our democratic institutions and to contribute to the success of the greater undertaking, which is today closer to realization than it was yesterday: the integration of Latin America as a whole.

My words here today have expressed greater optimism and hope than I voiced in this forum last year. This attitude can be explained in the light of some positive aspects of the current international panorama.

(1) The rhetoric of the East-West confrontation is beginning to give way to a dialogue between the superpowers with prospects for understanding on disarmament matters.

(2) The world does not seem willing to accept the permanent worsening of the latest crises that shake the foundation of the edifices of peace. The last diplomatic initiatives related to Central America and the action of the Security Council in the Iran-Iraq question fits in this frame.

(3) With its recent efforts of economic integration and political coordination, Latin America displays a more active and fruitful participation in international affairs, thus reaffirming its identity and its sovereign ideals.

Along with this optimism and hope, however, I cannot disguise my disappointment and even indignation at the imbalances and inequities which persist on the international economic scene. Recent progress in the political field is not being accompanied by advances in the struggle against misery and poverty. On the contrary, the insensitivity and unyielding attitude of the developed countries are increasingly evident on issues of trade, finance and the transfer of technology.

My country is currently experiencing a time of crucial importance for the definition of its political and institutional directions. We are about to approve a new constitution within the framework of perfecting our democratic way of life. Brazil is ready to continue along the road to peace and construction. This is the road that will lead to progress and prosperity for our people, in growing harmony and closer cooperation with all friendly nations.

New York, September 21, 1987.

1988

1988

With the deepening of the reforms introduced by Gorbachev in the Soviet Union, the international strategic panorama in 1988 evolved progressively toward distension. Despite the continuation of the war between Iran and Iraq, the announcement of the withdrawal of Soviet troops from Afghanistan and a ceasefire in Angola contributed to lessen tensions. At the end of the year, the victory of George Bush in the American election showed the satisfaction of the electorate with the successes reached by the Republican administration, especially in what regarded the maintenance of the hegemony of the United States on the international field.

In Brazil, the internal situation was characterized by the interaction of two planes: on the one hand, the politico-institutional reorganization of the country with the final debates of the drafting of the new Constitution, and on the other the worsening of the economic crisis provoked by the persistence of high rates of inflation. At that time the initial movements of the presidential succession process were already felt.

The external financial situation was regularized. In September 1988 the government reached agreement with the creditors and announced the end of the moratorium. Despite its highly positive impact, that measure was not sufficient to recover the smooth flow of relations with the United States, still negatively affected by a series of specific divergences on issues of trade, science and technology, patents and protection to the informatics and environmental industries.

Accordingly, Brazilian diplomacy would seek to develop innovative channels of cooperation with non-traditional partners. During a presidential visit to China, in July 1988, programs of scientific and technological cooperation were established. In a visit to the Soviet Union in October, President Sarney signed with President Gorbachev a memorandum of understanding giving unprecedented format and width to Brazil-USSR relations.

The universalist strategy would be completed with the return of Brazil to the Security Council, a fact that by giving Brazilian diplomacy the opportunity to participate in important international decisions would serve as the basis for the claim, later expressed, of a permanent seat in that central organ of the United Nations.

Addressing the Forty-Third Session of the General Assembly, Minister Abreu Sodré reiterated the positive evaluation of Brazil about developments in the international macrostructure. Despite the persistence of critical situations in the Middle East and Central America, "the world is a little better" than three years ago, said Sodré, noting progress reached in disarmament and the promising possibilities in Southern Africa, in the Gulf and in Afghanistan. This positive picture, warned the Minister, contrasted with the persistence of the lack of progress in international economic relations and the growing distance between the developed and the developing worlds.

Criticism of the United States was still present in the Brazilian discourse: the trend toward unilateralism as a factor of international order was condemned; prospects of "exclusory bilateralism" or "selective multilateralism" were rejected. Brazilian diplomacy, in consonance with its historical discourse, used these terms to characterize the trends to direction by the big powers. In a mention to the dispute between Brazil and the United States on informatics and patents, recent American measures were deemed hostile to international trade and the scientific and technological improvement of developing countries.

XLIII Session of the General Assembly of the United Nations
1988

Minister Roberto de Abreu Sodré [*]

Mr. President,

A tradition dating back to the early days of this Organization confers upon me the privilege of being the first speaker, at the opening of our debate, to convey to you, my colleague and friend Dante Caputo, my warm and friendly congratulations for your election as President of the Forty-Third Session of the General Assembly of the United Nations. I am certain that you will do honor to that high office with the same qualities that have marked your steady leadership of Argentine diplomacy.

I should also like to express my appreciation of and respect for Ambassador Nita Barrow, distinguished representative of Barbados, whose merits enriched our choice for the direction of our work.

I once again pay a tribute to the outstanding diplomatic talent of the Secretary-General, Ambassador Javier Pérez de Cuellar. His untiring efforts in building peace and strengthening the United Nations make him worthy of the appreciation of the whole international community.

When I addressed this Assembly for the first time three years ago there prevailed in international affairs grave forebodings and repeated violations of the purposes and principles of the United Nations Charter. The language of confrontation between the superpowers was becoming

[*] **Roberto Costa de Abreu Sodré**, born in São Paulo, SP, June 21, 1918. Bachelor in Law from the Faculty of Law of the University of São Paulo. Governor of the State of São Paulo from January 1967 to October 1970. Minister of State for External Relations from 2/14/1986 to 3/14/1990. † São Paulo, September 14, 1999.

sharper owing to the use of advanced military technologies capable of spreading the risk of nuclear war to outer space. The persistence of localized tension and disputes frustrated the efforts to attain of the ideals of peace and security.

As I return here today I find that the world situation has improved somewhat. The practice of East-West détente, which seemed condemned to oblivion, has been reborn. The United States and the Soviet Union have finally reached a concrete agreement on disarmament. Their leaders are to be commended for this historic feat.

Some regional conflicts, the protagonists worn out by the tragic toll of death and destruction, now see the dawning of a peaceful solution. In previous speeches I have condemned the recalcitrant attitude of South Africa in blocking the process of independence for Namibia, the violence which seemed to have taken hold for good in the Gulf region and the transgression of the principles of self-determination and non-interference in Afghanistan. Today it is comforting to change my words of warning and criticism to bear witness to the promising outlook for peace efforts aimed at putting an end to those conflicts.

In looking at the clearer skies on the world political horizon, I reaffirm my reverence for the United Nations and my belief in the effectiveness of its instruments. If the world is better today than it was yesterday, we must give credit for that to the decisive contribution of the United Nations. We still have before us, however, unfinished and challenging tasks to accomplish in obedience to the provisions of the Charter. Obstructions remain to eradicating apartheid, solving the Middle East crisis, putting an end to the suffering of the people of Lebanon and bringing peace to Central America. It is my hope that at the next session of the General Assembly we may note further progress in our quest for peace and harmony among peoples.

As the representative of a nation which has always sought the establishment of a just and democratic world order based on the participation of all, I must stress that the task of transforming the world will be complete only after the strengthening and consolidation of cooperation for economic and social development. In this respect, unlike the remarks I have just made on the world political situation, my words today will not differ in substance or in tone from those of my previous statements. Because of the lack of progress in international economic relations, Brazil once again brings to the Assembly a message of apprehension, of disappointment, and renews to the developed world its proposals and claims.

Reaffirming its historical adherence to the highest ideals of international life and faithful to the will and the nature of its people, Brazil has inscribed in its new constitution, which is about to be promulgated, the fundamental principles of its foreign policy: national independence; priority for human rights; the self-determination of peoples; non-interference; equality among States; the peaceful settlement of disputes; the defense of peace; repudiation of terrorism and racism; and cooperation among peoples for the progress of mankind. The representatives of the Brazilian people, when expressing in the Constitution the central demands and concerns of their own society, were perfectly attuned to the aspirations of the international community. They also embodied in their new charter the greatest aspiration of our continent: the integration of Latin America.

The world, unfortunately, has come to realize how absurd is the unilateral ethos underlying the illusion that power – military, political, economic or technological power – could generate a just or even a merely stable international order. Strength cannot give birth to law, much less to peace and justice. This is what the Charter of the United Nations – and in particular its preamble – tells us. Nevertheless, there persists a disturbing tendency on the part of certain countries to place their national law above international law, both in political and in economic matters. To plead internal laws, or alleged national interests, in order to avoid compliance with obligations under international law violates the essential principle of *pacta sunt servanda*, which is a basic rule of civilized coexistence among nations.

The adventure of unilateralism cannot be replaced by self-contained bilateralism or selective multilateralism. Negotiations on matters of interest to the whole world community require the participation of all countries, large or small. Talks on peace and economic development, in particular, cannot be made into an empty exercise whereby power pays homage to law. Regrettably, the atmosphere of dialogue which now brings the superpowers closer together has not resulted in an effective readiness to widen the field of multilateral understanding. The elaboration of power schemes geared to redefining and freezing a vertically structured world order deserves nothing but condemnation.

The difficulties encountered during the Third Special Session of the General Assembly devoted to disarmament illustrate the concern I have just voiced. The impossibility of obtaining a document based on consensus, only a few months after the first treaty on nuclear disarmament in history was signed, clearly indicates the magnitude of obstacle hindering the

participation of the international community as a whole in deliberations concerning its own survival.

The decision made by President José Sarney to take part in that session, along with other Heads of State or Government, attests to the firmness of Brazil's stand in favor of the cause of disarmament and of its open and effective discussion, in the relevant bodies.

So strong is our people's repudiation of weapons of mass destruction and so firm our purpose to develop nuclear technology exclusively for peaceful ends that the following precept is embodied in the new Brazilian Constitution; all nuclear activities in Brazilian territory will be permitted only for peaceful purposes and subject to approval by Congress.

This same spirit, already enshrined in the Treaty of Tlatelolco, prevails in the understandings between Argentina and Brazil in this field. The loyal and fruitful cooperation between the two countries belies the myth of a nuclear race in Latin America.

The constructive purpose inspiring Brazil's foreign policy led to the convening of the first meeting of States of the Zone of Peace and Cooperation of the South Atlantic, which was held in Rio de Janeiro last July. Part of a region which is assuming its own identity, founded on deeply shared interests and perceptions, the South Atlantic countries were able to explore further the many Paths of open dialogue among equals offered by the Declaration of the South Atlantic as a Zone of Peace and Cooperation.

Our views coincided on important issues. We support the efforts for Peace-building in southern Africa. We are concerned that, in spite of repeated appeals from this Assembly, negotiations have not yet begun on all aspects relating to the future of the Malvinas Islands. We believe it necessary that concrete measures be adopted, in particular by the militarily significant States, in order to ensure the non-introduction of nuclear and other weapons of mass destruction and the reduction of foreign military presence in the Zone of Peace and Cooperation.

Ample possibilities exist for joint action in favor of development. We found significant points of common interest in the preservation of the environment, in the need to avoid the dumping of toxic wastes and in the implementation of the provisions of the United Nations Convention on the Law of the Sea. I have no doubt that the conclusions of the Rio de Janeiro meeting will receive widespread support from States Members of the United Nations. The signing of the Geneva agreements and the beginning of the withdrawal of foreign troops from Afghanistan have rekindled hopes for a future of peace and development for that country.

We commend the Secretary-General and his Special Representative, Mr. Diego Cordovez, for the United Nations participation in this process. We would only have wished that the entering into force of the mechanism for verification and control of the agreements, with the good offices of the United Nations, had been implemented only after due process.

The cease-fire between Iran and Iraq, welcomed by Brazil, brought the prospect of peace and economic reconstruction to the Gulf region. May I stress the extraordinary relevance of the United Nations in this initiative, as from the joint action of all members of the Security Council – over which Brazil had the honor to preside at that time – in consultation with the Governments of Iran and Iraq and with the constant, timely and balanced mediation of the Secretary-General. In southern Africa, progress in the negotiations between Angola, South Africa and Cuba, with the mediation of the United States, augurs well for a peaceful and just solution to the question of Namibia under resolution 435 (1978), adopted ten years ago by the Security Council. We hope that this will be the first step towards normalizing the situation in the southern part of the African Continent through the elimination of all sources of tension and conflict. Brazil has underlined the need for strict respect for the territorial integrity of its South Atlantic neighbor, Angola, and for an immediate end to the illegal occupation of Namibia by South Africa.

We regret that the odious practice of Apartheid continues on its absurd course. The people and Government of Brazil long for the day when Namibia joins the community of independent nations. Peace and security can be assured in that region, so close to us, only when the odious institutionalized racism is eradicated.

In the Middle East repeated scenes of violence, which have shocked world public opinion, confirm that the self-determination of the Palestinian people in their own territory is an essential condition for solving the crisis. The Brazilian Government reiterates the need for respect for the rights of the Palestinian people, for Israel's complete withdrawal from the territories occupied since 1967 and for all States of the region to be able to exist in peace within internationally recognized borders. With those goals in mind, we continue to support the holding of an international conference on the situation in the Middle East, with the participation of all interested parties, including the Palestine Liberation Organization, the legitimate representative of the Palestinian people.

The apparent standstill of the peace progress in Central America is viewed with concern by Brazil. It cannot be denied that the Esquipulas Agreement contributed to alleviating tension and that new hopes emerged

with the Sapoa Agreement. But the recurrence of incidents in areas of tension and the paralysis, which we hope is temporary, in the process of dialogue and understanding create a feeling of uncertainty as regards the future of Central America. As a member of the Contadora Support Group, Brazil hopes that a less tense international atmosphere may come to make it easier for the countries of the region to attain their objectives of peace and development.

Although there is progress on the political scene and signs of a future world free from war and truly committed to achieving lasting peace, the international economic situation still troubles our spirits and challenges our minds.

In the great majority of developing countries members of this organization, the dire facts continue to cry out for creative decisions which might break the stalemate that has been keeping those countries on the verge of collapse. We must no longer delude one another with rhetorical phrases and concepts. It is high time we openly admitted that a strong uneasiness is corroding the foundations of international economic cooperation.

Almost half a century has elapsed since we declared ourselves United Nations and, united, undertook to follow a common set of ideals among which was the fight against misery and hunger. One commitment was to halt the degradation of the most cherished values of our civilizations, irrespective of origins or beliefs. What has happened to us? Have we become less united than we were then?

We have only to look at this Assembly, as we meet for the Forty-Third consecutive year, to see that we are nations sharing universal principles and ideals. Whereas the hostilities of the Second World War had plunged us into the most hidden depths of terror and desolation, the seeds sown in San Francisco bore fruit in the Americas, in Asia, in Africa and in the Middle East – throughout the world. They are here, united, the nations which 50 years ago found themselves on opposing sides of the battlefield. They are here in this very place, united, the nations which in the following years achieved their independence, which was to a great extent the fruit of the same seeds of democracy sown in San Francisco.

Are we less united than before? No. We are more united then before, but not as united as we wish to be in the future.

It is therefore sad to note that we American, Asian, African brothers still suffer from the same horrors and the same desolation that so badly afflicted our forbears. While we have done away with wars, we have not yet been able to banish hunger, which is spreading endemically

in pockets throughout the continents. We are all the more ashamed to see that hunger is present in and close to the most plentiful societies man has ever known.

Something is terribly wrong. The real growth of production in developing countries fell from an annual average rate of 5.5 per cent in the 1970s to an average of less than 3 per cent in the 1980s. The share of developing countries in the developed market economies shrank from 28 per cent in 1980 to 19 per cent in 1987, whereas that of the developed countries grew from 63 per cent to 71 per cent in the same period. In real terms, the participation of developing countries in world exports suffered a decrease of approximately 25 per cent between 1963 and 1986. And something is terribly wrong when one notes that, due to the burden of external debt, the developing countries have to transfer abroad a great amount of the resources they so badly need for their economic development.

Brazil has, in the past few months, managed to reach with its private and government creditors a global agreement on the rescheduling of its external debt. We are therefore keenly aware of the burdens weighing down on our economy. That is why we are convinced that only if and when the developed countries adopt appropriate policies shall we be able to reduce interest rates and improve the outlook for trade in debtor nations.

Unfortunately, the erratic policy on international interest rates in recent years has thwarted the economic development of a whole generation. This policy has turned international trade into a complementary source of the reserves needed simply to service the external debt, with obvious adverse effects on expanding or even maintaining our economies capacity to import.

This sad state of affairs has been made all the worse by a battery of constraints imposed vertically – from top to bottom. Proposals clothed in euphemistic language, such as "voluntary export restraints", cannot disguise the old formulas of protectionism and the spoliation of trade partners, formulas which are always at the root of the most serious recessions to shake the international economy this century.

It is our hope that the present multilateral negotiations of the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade will make it possible for international trade to enter into a new cycle of expansion, on a more just and balanced basis. We cannot accept that the concept of trade without frontiers should be invoked to deny third-world countries the special, differentiated treatment they should receive. Nor can we accept that the

developed countries should ignore the commitments they solemnly made when the Uruguay Round was launched and demand concessions from developing countries in exchange for revoking protectionist measures. Moreover, it must also be acknowledged that legislative initiatives in some of the main trading countries are in essence clearly hostile, not only to international trade, but even to the scientific and technological capacity of the developing countries. My country, for example, is now under the threat of trade retaliation, simply because we – in accordance with international law and with the letter and spirit of agreements to which we are parties – have encouraged, within our own territory, the research and development of pharmaceutical products. We were taken aback to see the most stable and predictable rules of international trade and international law being violated unilaterally.

Therefore, conditions seem ripe for the General Assembly, responding to the appeal the President made in his inaugural statement, to relaunch on an effective, realistic and constructive basis, without resorting to rhetoric or recrimination, the North-South dialogue, without forgetting the great frustrations this endeavor has entailed so far.

The General Assembly is meeting at a good moment to change the course of history; to steer it in safer directions; to intensify the progress made in the fields of peace, the settlement of disputes and disarmament; and to reappraise and reinvigorate the already weakened international economic cooperation.

This year we celebrate the fortieth anniversary of the signing of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights. It is tragic that we are still unable to settle together the problems affecting, in vast areas of the world, the most elementary rights of mankind: the rights to life, health, shelter, food and work; in sum, those rights which assure the development and well-being of peoples. Whereas in the task of building peace the day of hope is dawning upon the world, the struggle for development remains in frustrating darkness. It has been said that development is the new name for peace. If that is true, the Assembly cannot fail to measure up to the challenges of our times and to heed the urgent calls for justice and dignity.

New York, 26 September, 1988.

1989

1989

At the close of the Sarney administration, changes in the international conjuncture gained speed. The crisis in Eastern Europe worsened and at the same time reformers in the USSR gained ground over sectors linked to the Gorbachev project of controlled transformation of the system. Ceausescu was deposed in Romania and after a protracted leadership crisis in the German Democratic Republic the Berlin Wall, symbol of the political and ideological divisions that had marked the world since the end of World War II, was demolished.

Brazil was going through the alternatives of the presidential succession as the first direct elections for President since 1959 were being prepared. On account of the divisions resulting from the electoral process it became difficult to garner consensus around measures that could put an end to inflation and the economic stagnation. In spite of the agreement with the creditors, Brazil was faced with a new crisis of payments at the close of the year. The reluctance of international financial agents to assign new resources for Brazil brought serious constraints to the economy of the country. The question of the debt was emphatically dealt with by President Sarney in the summit meeting of the Group of Rio in Ica, Peru, in October.

Strong environmental demands, particularly since 1988, added to the economic and commercial pressures on Brazil. In Western Europe and the United States a veritable mobilization against Brazilian policies in the Amazon region was organized, damaging the image of the country.

International attention focused chiefly on the forest fires. The murder of the leader of rubber gatherers Chico Mendes and images of the devastation of forests by fires and gold digging excited the imagination of world public opinion, especially in developed nations. Despite the initial success of the program "Our Nature" and support from Amazon countries at the summit meeting in Manaus under the aegis of the Treaty on Amazon Cooperation, constraints in the environmental sphere increased throughout the year, compelling the Brazilian government to start wearisome campaigns of explanation. As a sign of its willingness to promote and accept environmental cooperation, Brazil proposed to host the planned United Nations Conference on the Environment and Development, set for 1992. Thanks to this offer, Brazilian diplomacy evolved from a defensive to an open and proactive posture and Brazil acquired credentials of essential interlocutor in the multilateral management of environmental issues.

The African angle of the external policy was attended with the presidential visit to Angola and the creation of the Institute of the Portuguese Language, at a meeting of Heads of State of all Portuguese speaking countries in Maranhão.

At the close of his administration, President Sarney returned to the United Nations podium to deliver the statement of the Brazilian delegation in the general debate of the Forty-Fourth Session of the General Assembly. He made a positive evaluation of the political and institutional situation in Brazil. The President reiterated his favorable view on the evolution of the international conjuncture without neglecting to mention the persistence of serious unresolved problems in the Middle East, South Africa and Timor East. He was particularly emphatic in the dramatization of the Latin-American crisis, contrasting the achievements of the region in matters pertaining to public freedoms an democracy to a severe deterioration in what regarded economic and social development. How can we avoid, he asked rhetorically, that democratic values are contested when it does not respond to legitimate social aspirations?

The international community was also strongly enjoined, in connection with the theme of the debt, to adopt a strategy aiming at the restart of the growth of debtor countries through the reduction of the debt and of the flows of gross and net resources to the outside.

Environmental questions were dealt with in the statement under the double lenses of the protection of national sovereignty and the opening to cooperation, just as had been indicated by the offer to host the Conference in 1992.

The main novelty of the 1989 statement, however, was the return of the issue of United Nations reform which, for many years, had been absent from Brazilian postulations. President Sarney proposed, in particular, changes in the structure and procedures of the Security Council in order to adapt it to the new circumstances of the international macrostructure and put forth the suggestion to create of a new category of permanent members without veto privileges.

XLIV Session of the General Assembly of the United Nations
1989

President José Sarney [*]

Mr. President,

Allow me to congratulate Your Excellency on your election. Your experience assures us that you will lead our work along a firm and constructive path.

I extend my congratulations to your illustrious predecessor.

May I once again express the appreciation of Brazil for the Secretary-General Mr. Pérez de Cuellar.

At the outset of this statement I wish to pay a tribute to and express my respect for the people of Colombia and for President Virgilio Barco for giving the world an example of civic courage and patient heroism, governing as he is a region fraught with turmoil, where lawlessness and fanaticism combine to destroy the country in the hallucinating anti-life of drugs.

In 1985, soon after taking office, I stood at this podium. Brazil was then emerging from a long night. It was recovering from tragedy and facing great uncertainties. On the international scene discord prevailed. Four years later I see a different political landscape: conflicts have been reduced and dialogue reinstated. There is hope. The war between Iran and Iraq has come to an end. Foreign troops have withdrawn from

[*] **José Sarney de Araújo Costa**, Born in Pinheiros, MA, April 24, 1930. Graduated in Law, he is also a journalist and writer. Governor of Maranhão from 1966 to 1970. Senator in 1970, reelected in 1978. Acting President of the Republic from 3/15 to 4/20/1985, assumed the post until 3/15/1990, after the passing of Tancredo Neves on 4/21/1985.

Afghanistan. Positive developments have taken place in Central America and Southern Africa. Namibia is well on the way to independence. There are genuine-prospects for internal reconciliation and understanding in Angola. Direct contact has been resumed between Argentina and the United Kingdom. The interests of peace, security and development have been reinforced in the South Atlantic. The two superpowers have come to agreement on the actual reduction of nuclear arsenals.

But we are still far from a world free from anguish, tension and fear. There still remain problems clamoring for solution. In the Middle East the fury of fanaticism continues to claim the lives of innocent peoples and to tear asunder states such as Lebanon, which was once exemplary for its balance between different religious groups. In South Africa the apartheid regime still persists, an affront to the conscience of civilized peoples. In certain areas, to a greater or lesser degree, human rights are being disregarded. In East Timor appeals go unheeded.

But the spirit of peace has made progress as the supreme value of coexistence among nations. Other great values of modern man – democracy and human rights – have gained strength. As we look back over these last four years there is one thing of which we can be certain: democratization is moving ahead in the contemporary world. The establishment or re-establishment of free institutions is a universal aspiration.

The march is on to reinstating or establishing democratic freedoms. From my own painful experience I boor witness to the struggle in the transition to democracy. It has the significance of life and a bitter fight, mitigated by the fascination of playing a part in great changes. My term of office will soon come to an end. What I can offer as an end result is to have achieved in five years 50 years of progress towards democracy. We are enjoying a period of unprecedented freedom. Our institutions have been restored and a State based on the rule of law has been established. We have built a truly democratic society, with a high degree of organization and participation, in an open system which enables the people to express their will.

We are the third largest democracy in the World, with 82 million voters. We held elections in 1985 and 1986. In 1987 we convened a National Constituent Assembly. We drafted a new Constitution. We held elections in 1988, and on November 15 this year we will elect my successor. All this is taking place in a peaceful and orderly climate, always harmonizing the exuberance of aspirations that have at last been freed. We have had to contend with 10,000 strikes they were settled in a spirit of conciliation. We have been operating within an economic crisis.

It is not only through Brazil that the winds of freedom have swept. In South America, that vast new world, there will not be a single country which is not under democratic rule by the end of this year. Authoritarianism has been definitively discredited.

As I stated in 1985 from this very podium, development can be achieved only through democracy. Democracy and integration: these are objectives in our concept of modernity. I have consistently trod that path. It has been a ruling passion in my life. Democracy and integration are watchwords in Latin America.

The greatest wave of democratization the world has known since the end of the war has swept through Latin America. A burning question, however, haunts the conscience of our peoples: will the democratic values that we have built be capable of dealing with the problems of suffering, misery, poverty, inequality, exploitation and violence that are part of our everyday life? Are the democracies of the wealthy countries joining us in solidarity with our cause, or are they concerned only with their own well-being, relegating us to a marginal existence?

I am convinced that democracy is the road to follow. It was the banner that led our peoples to sweep away authoritarian regimes, strongmen, tyrants and dictators. But it did not do, so merely to replace them with hunger, disease, backwardness, foreign debt, recession and unemployment.

Latin America shows signs of negative growth. It is not that we have grown less than other continents: it is simply that we have moved backwards.

Suffice it to say that in 1988 the region's gross domestic product was at the same level as in 1978. The net transfer of resources abroad in 1988 amounted to $29 billion. Brazil alone, in the past five years, transferred approximately $ 56 billion abroad. This is a Marshall Plan in reverse.

The 1980s have seen a sustained expansion of the industrialized economies. It was to be expected that this expansion would stimulate economic growth in the developing countries. Nevertheless, the rise in international, interest rates for reasons beyond our control, the drastic reduction in the prices of raw materials, commercial protectionism, the volatility of exchange rates, the globalization of financial markets, and the net capital outflows have been responsible for the frustration of that expectation.

The United Nations planned in its development strategy for the 1980s that the gap between the rich and the poor would be reduced.

But what happened? The number of least developed countries increased from 30 to 42.

Once again I ask: if the democracy we have established throughout our continent fails to meet the legitimate aspirations of our societies, how can we prevent its values from being challenged? It will serve no purpose to invoke the imperfect realization of such values.

The greatest enemies of democracy on our continent have been low standards of living and inflation, which corrode our economies. Lacking in resources and oppressed by a perverse international economic situation, the leaders of Latin America have no means available to meet the most legitimate and fundamental aspirations of their societies. Guerrilla movements are proliferating in several countries. Spontaneous manifestations of revolt are springing up. Violence is building up and pent-up forces of rebellion may at any time emerge and spread uncontrollably.

We are no longer dealing with ideological motivations. What is at stake in Latin America is no longer the dichotomy between the capitalist and the socialist systems. In Latin America, the persistence of poverty and the worn-out models of development make ideologies outdated. This climate does not seem to be inspired by any doctrines or fed by revolutionary designs. It is a rebellion growing out of the lack of prospects and the frustration of the deprived and disenchanted masses. Its origins are lost in remote historical times. The choice today is not between militarism and populism, but between recession and growth.

A great many things are being said about the interdependence of today's world. For Latin America, however, interdependence has shown only its negative side. Interdependence is invoked when we are confronted with the perpetuation of an international order that in reality relegates us to a dependency in which the poorest are paradoxically compelled to finance the richest and in which transfers of knowledge take place only on a horizontal plane. That is certainly not the kind of interdependence to which we aspire.

The European Common Market needed the shock of war in order to materialize. In our case, we are determined to take advantage of the shock of democracy in order to advance towards Bolívar's dream of long ago: the building of Latin American political brotherhood.

Latin America, the victim of violent colonial greed, has become the most genuine melting-pot of races and cultures, extending on an unprecedented scale the miscegenation of ethnic groups and the blending of religions and customs. For Brazil, the fate of our neighbors is our own fate.

For us in Latin America and the Caribbean, the option for social progress is an ethical and economic imperative. We cannot continue to waste enormous quantities of human talent because they are denied access to nourishment and education. According to the United Nations Children's Fund, there are in the world today 145 million abandoned minors between the ages of 12 and 16, and perhaps. 100 million of them live in the streets, tempted into larceny, prostitution, drugs and mugging.

Need we point out that these starving and unprotected adolescents in the third world are the present day version of the poverty-stricken youth we encounter in the most biting pages of Dickens, Victor Hugo or Dostoiévski?

There is an urgent need to create conditions through which the developing countries can return to their natural status as recipients of capital, reversing as quickly as possible the trend that has made them exporters of financial resources under the cruel burden of foreign debt.

The discipline and cooperation established by the international monetary and commercial institutions set up in the post-war period have given way to the dominance of the powerful countries' national autonomy in the formulation of their macroeconomic policies. Severe imbalances and asymmetries have developed. The impoverished situation of the developing economies has grown worse. Brazil, for example, is paying more to those institutions than it receives from them.

Another major problem is the trend towards an oligopoly of knowledge. Human knowledge is a cumulative process, anywhere, any time. Knowledge is universal. To restrain its potential for changing the well-being of the world, thereby restricting it to the domain of trade, of economic advantage, of cultural colonization, is to reduce mankind to material objectives that deny man himself. Science and technology, today or tomorrow, must be placed at the service of everyone, not only of a few nations.

Yet another disturbing development is the exploitation of the vulnerability imposed upon us by our foreign dent. The developing countries are being pressured to conform to a model of adjustment which is not often followed by the industrialized countries. Budgets are being balanced at enormous social cost and at the price of State bankruptcy; wages are being depressed below subsistence levels; scant attention is being paid to the legitimate aspirations of infant industries and to balance of payments requirements; the public sector has dwindled even in those areas in which the need for action is greatest, such as education and health; attention is being paid to the fact that the primary need of the

debtor countries is to grow and that only through accelerated growth can they introduce the necessary economic reforms, fulfill their commitments and contribute, as they have in the past, to global progress.

There is an urgent need to understand that growth is impossible when about one third of domestic savings is exported to foreign countries every year. It will be impossible to make any adjustment as long as we are required to solve an insoluble equation. It is time to recognize that up to now the remedy for the problem of foreign debt has contributed chiefly to the financial health of the creditors. For the debtors it has been a prescription for stagnation and impoverishment. I repeat: the time has come to adopt a strategy based on the assumption of renewed growth in the debtor countries. Such a strategy will require a sharp reduction in the stock of the debt and in the gross and net transfers of resources abroad, the only way to retain the savings necessary to finance development.

We view with deep concern the slow pace and the indifference with which this problem is being handled and the way its solution is being postponed.

There are two major questions to which we must also give our priority attention: environmental protection and the fight against drug traffic and drug abuse. These subjects will figure more and more prominently on our global agenda.

The first question relates to the survival of mankind, to the death of life on this planet. The second relates to a life of death, to anti-life, to the destruction of the human person, chiefly in its purest form: youth.

In the question of the environment we have another dimension of the interdependence of nations. As inhabitants of the same small planet, we are all condemned to solidarity.

The environmental question in its planetary aspects – climate change, depletion of the ozone layer – cannot and must not be discussed from a narrow perspective, as if it were a problem between North and South in which the less developed countries, by their irresponsible behavior, were affecting the ecological balance of the world.

The truth is quite different. The industrialized countries bear the greatest responsibility for the pollution of the environment. The developing countries cannot accept as a basis for a new mode of international relations a concept of environmentally sustainable development which assigns to them only the task of ensuring the ecological balance of the planet. If this concept is to be valid, it will be essential to extend it to the industrialized countries so as to make it possible to determine whether the production and consumption patterns they follow can be sustained

from the environmental point of view: it will be essential to establish close cooperation among all countries in efforts aimed at the research and development of new technologies that will be more efficient in the utilization of natural resources and will cause less pollution of the environment; moreover, firm commitments for the transfer of technology at cost will have to be established. The importance we attach to the problem of the environment and the Brazilian readiness to deal with it objectively and openly are clearly reflected in our readiness to host the United Nations conference on environment and development in 1992.

Brazil is more keenly aware than any other country of its exuberant, rich and extraordinary natural world, its forests, its fauna and flora. We will not give up our right to preserve this rich heritage. We preserved it in the past, when the large colonizing companies formed in the rich countries invaded the wild areas of Africa, Asia and America, brutally despoiling them. Brazil rejected them. It forbade them to enter. During the 1960s, the Hudson Institute conceived the idea of a vast lake which would flood Amazonia. Brazil rejected the idea. If the world today is able to turn its attention towards Amazonia, it is only because Brazilians were able to preserve it up to the present day and will continue to preserve it for the future. We are prepared, as we have always been, for cooperation. But we will never be prepared to accept restrictions upon our sovereignty.

With the program known as "Our Nature", we have already been able in a single year to reduce the fire-clearing of forests by about 40 per cent, we have banned the export of timber, we have eliminated the incentives for projects which have proved to be predatory, and we have created the Institute of the Environment; in which dozens of organizations have joined in a broad project for ecological protection. Approximately 8 million hectares of Brazilian territory are now subject to a regime of permanent conservation. Approximately 10 per cent of the national territory is reserved for the total indigenous population of 200,000.

At the same time, Brazil is viewing with great concern the problem of drug trafficking and illicit drug production and consumption. We took an important step forward in 1988 with the adoption of the Vienna Convention. The constantly growing dimensions of the problem make it urgent for the United Nations General Assembly to turn its attention to the adoption of effective measures of cooperation.

Brazil will make every effort to contribute, along with the consumer, producer and transit countries, to the eradication once and for all of this serious threat to our societies. We are pursuing a vigorous preventive policy in this field. With our "Northern Basin" program in the Amazon,

we have been occupying and patrolling our extensive frontiers in order to help the local population and to prevent the entry of drug traffickers escaping from other countries. We are maintaining control over the trade in precursors. We are waging, unremittingly, a war on drugs.

The picture I have painted leads us to contemplate the qualitative transformation of our world.

The ideological confrontation which has governed international events throughout this century is showing clear signs of abating. Irreconcilable opposition is being replaced by understanding. Ideologies are losing their emotional content as the advances of science and technology disclose growing prospects for human well-being. It would be utopian to imagine a world totally free from conflict, but I do not think it nonsensical to think of a rational world in which cooperation and understanding replace confrontation and disharmony, a world in which it will finally be possible to build peace on the solid basis of a universal community of interest; a world in which the democratization of international relations will lead to the overcoming of power politics.

The fundamental difference between the United Nations and its predecessor, the League of Nations, is precisely the awareness of the right to development. That is the ideal that constantly inspires the Economic and Social Council and the Organization as a whole. The League of Nations sought to establish international order, which was no small task; but the United Nations aspires to something more: it seeks also international justice.

Henry Adams declared that so-called practical politics consists in ignoring facts. I am afraid that comment is applicable to the mentality currently prevailing. We need the boldness to advance new concepts, the pioneering spirit to develop new approaches, the courage to carry out new institutional experiments. Let us hope that the decade of the 1990s and the United Nations will be able to think about the problems assailing mankind on the eve of the year 2000.

Our century has not grown old in vain. There are some who attempt to characterize it as an end of history. According to them, the world and the rich world in particular, is destined to live through a long period of historical inertia made up of prosaic pleasures and mediocre satisfactions. The price of eliminating violence would apparently be cultural lethargy and the political laziness of an age without convulsions but also without ideals. That view amounts to a denial of human experience.

New countries such as ours have the feeling of standing on the threshold of an age of great changes. The historical process is now in full bloom. We envisage a mankind free from antagonisms, threats and fear,

opening up frontiers for a new kind of man who can achieve the goal of creation, conceived in the image of God.

Two years ago Brazil had the honor to be elected by this Assembly, after almost two decades of absence, as a membership of the Security Council. These have been for us two years of intensive participation in the Council's wont. That experience prompts some reflections. If the United Nations, acting through the Security Council, is to be able to perform the prominent role expected of it in the field of international peace and security, some changes must be made in the structure and procedures of the Council itself. Now can we solve important problems relating, for example, to the establishment and financing of peace keeping operations without re-examining the very adequacy of the composition of the Council?

That is a problem that deserves to be examined not only from the traditional standpoint of establishing a proper relationship between the number of non-permanent members and the increase that has taken place in the number of States Members of the United Nations, but also – and especially – in the light of the changes in power relationships that have taken place in the world since the Organization was created. The time has come for a reevaluation designed to make it possible to reflect the multi-polarity of today's world in the Security Council so that it may better fulfill its responsibilities. We could consider an additional category of permanent members that would not have the veto privilege.

New circumstances on the international scene – in particular the easing of political and ideological confrontation – unquestionably open up possibilities for a more efficient utilization of the United Nations. But that must not mean a return, pure and simple, to an excessive predominance of the superpowers over the Organization. The United Nations certainly cannot do without consensus between the superpowers as the basis for effective action. In many cases, however, that consensus will not be enough. Contributions by other Member States may be necessary, and even indispensable, if the Organization is to be able to act effectively and responsibly as a truly international institution.

The time has come to make development and justice the foundations of world peace and stability. This organization was created as the result of the struggle against totalitarianism, and represents the most advanced level of achievement in terms of democratic relations among States. We must therefore take advantage of the opportunities afforded by ideological demobilization in order to dedicate ourselves with renewed vigor to the great causes of international cooperation.

We must dare. "Dare, if you dare," said the Portuguese poet Fernando Pessoa.

I propose that the United Nations commit itself to a process of broad and total dialogue on the major problems of these closing years of the century in order that we may enter the twenty-first century with awareness of the challenges that face us and of our potential. From disarmament to the environment, from the banning of chemical weapons to the transfer of technology, from democracy as an instrument of stability and development to civil rights and political freedoms, from economic reforms to international trade, from the regionalization of the world economy to the new faces of interdependence, from the conquest of outer space to the eradication of poverty, we are faced with subjects that invite discussion.

We must go to the source of our problems, understand them in all their complexity, face their consequences without vacillation, take the necessary decisions and eliminate the factors of destabilization and inequality.

Let us act before it is too late, before sacrifices and frustrations crystallize into rebellion, before the satisfied people of the world in their complacency become insensitive to the just demands of those who have little or nothing, before room for negotiation is reduced by mutual fear and intransigent confrontation.

No country or group of countries, no matter how powerful, can claim to be in a position to solve the crisis alone. With an open mind, without mental reservations, resentments or ulterior motives, let us set to work. Perhaps there will never again be a moment in history in which ideological demobilization will offer such favorable conditions. Let us be capable of transforming reality through the creative power of ideas. We call upon everyone, and especially the more powerful, to join in that task. It is not too late to salvage the dream of peace and justice dreamt by past generations.

At the opening of this Forty-Fourth Session of the General Assembly, I wish to leave members with a message of optimism and determination, the same message which inspires Brazilians, who have taken a hand in their own destiny through the democracy they have succeeded in building.

It is Brazil's strength of belief that has enabled it to consolidate a new democracy in our America, triumphing over many challenges.

It is for the same reason that Brazilians express their views here, through the voice of their President, to dream the dream of peace and justice; exorcizing fear and raising altars to hope.

As a politician and an intellectual, I have never regarded poetry as an uninvited guest at the Assembly's plenary meetings. It is with poetry that I take my leave, with the verses of Luís de Camões, the universal poet of the Portuguese language:

> After the storm, tempestuous and drear,
> And shadow of night and shrieking winds that blow
> Comes on the morning hour, serene and clear,
> With hope of harboring safely from the woe.

New York, September 25, 1989.

1990

1990

Upon announcing his candidature to the Presidency, Governor Fernando Collor based his campaign on the renewal and modernization of the country and declared his intention to reach two main objectives: control inflation once and for all, and do away with corruption. This issue and those objectives were deep longings of the society which were skillfully exploited by the image articulation of the Collor campaign.

The developments which led to the impeachment of the President derived to a certain extent of his inability to uphold the social commitment undertaken in his campaign. The promised renewal was foiled by the persistence of traditional political methods, inflation re-emerged violently after the failure of the "Collor Plan" and corruption reached levels unprecedented in Brazil.

At the start of the administration, however, the atmosphere in Brazil was extremely favorable. Society seemed ready to give the new government the benefit of positive expectation, despite some objectionable aspects of the plan to fight inflation.

On the external level, the theme of modernization was used as a tool to introduce a number of changes of course aimed at shifting Brazilian diplomatic action from the side of developing countries to the search for compatibility with developed ones. The intention was to recover a dialogue seen as prejudiced by what was termed "Third World rhetoric". Non-proliferation, human rights and the environment were some of the global issues on which Brazilian external postulations, under that view,

evolved from excessively rigid and protectionist models to more transitive attitudes regarding international cooperation.

By then, the international climate was becoming less predictable in comparison with the rigidity characteristic of previous decades. The reunification of Germany, the liberation of Nelson Mandela, the rise of Boris Yeltsin, the civil war in the former Yugoslavia and the Gulf War were part of a series of facts that made the last decade of the 20th century look like a harbinger of transformations in the international relations.

In his statement before the Forty-Fifth Session of the General Assembly, President Fernando Collor highlighted the changes that were taking place in the world, whose positive direction was compromised by the breaking out of the Gulf War, and also in Brazil, which according to the President was well situated in the path of "absolute and definitive democracy, economic opening and social justice". The tone of the statement was optimistic. The President affirmed that the world marched "toward freedom, democracy and a better dialogue among nations (…) in Latin America we have attained (…) an advanced stage of democratic construction and respect to human rights (...) in Africa the remnants of the colonialist past are crumbling (...) one can no longer imagine a world chronically divided in two hostile halves…"

This voluntaristic and triumphal view of Brazil and of the international reality was accompanied by a prescription for a new international structure, able to supersede the "old-fashioned concept of power".

The fundamental postulations of Brazilian external policy on the issues of economic development, international cooperation, rejection of trade protectionism, external debt and science and technology, however, were kept.

Concretely, the speech presented, side by side with a more positive world view – three innovative elements in Brazilian diplomatic action: 1) change in the posture regarding the Treaty of Tlatelolco; 2) a more transitional stance on international cooperation for the preservation of the environment and 3) a positive attitude vis-à-vis international cooperation on human rights.

XLV Session of the General Assembly of the United Nations
1990

President Fernando Collor [*]

Mr. President,

Please accept my congratulations on your election. Your talent will ensure that the Assembly's work is conducted in a fair and efficient manner.

I wish also to convey to your predecessor our appreciation of the important tasks he accomplished.

May I also assure the Secretary-General, Mr. Javier Pérez de Cuellar, that Brazil has been following, and supports, the diplomatic activity he has undertaken in the discharge of his functions. We recognize in him a dynamic Secretary-General dedicated to the lofty purpose of the United Nations.

A few days ago, Liechtenstein was admitted as a new Member State. On behalf of Brazil I extend my welcome to Liechtenstein and wish it every success at the United Nations.

I am addressing the General Assembly for the first time. I note with emotion that the general debate is opening precisely at a time when many profound changes in Brazil and throughout the world are bringing about a revision of concepts and misconceptions that for decades have asphyxiated the community of nations. I wish to convey to the Assembly the views of the people of Brazil and their new Government on the

[*] **Fernando Affonso Collor de Mello**, Born in Rio de Janeiro, RJ, August 12, 1949. Degree in Economics and Journalism. Governor of the State of Alagoas between 1986 e 1989. President of the Republic from 3/15/1990 to 9/30/1992.

prospects for peace, freedom and progress throughout the world, and on the role to be played by this Organization in the years ahead.

I am convinced that the dawn of the new era we are striving to create will certainly shine forth from this privileged forum of reflection and analysis. The brilliance of that dawn will depend on our individual and collective endeavors towards world peace, the prosperity of nations and the growing solidarity among the peoples of the world.

In the last 12 months a number of events have transformed the outlook of international relations, especially at the East-West level. Peoples who had been subjected to authoritarian regimes resolutely and definitively chase to follow the path of democracy. The end of the cold war represented the liquidation of a bitter legacy of disappointment, confrontation and risk to the very survival of humanity. The relaxation of international tensions has shed light upon the understanding of our common destiny, emphasising the global nature of the relationship among peoples and between mankind and the environment.

New and promising trends have almost led us into euphoria and complacency. But the vulnerability of the international order, the destabilizing effect of certain regional crises and the seriousness of economic problems would warrant caution and reserve.

The crisis that has befallen Kuwait presents an unexpected and serious threat to collective peace. The Brazilian Government deems it essential that the mandatory resolutions adapted by the Security Council be immediately compiled with.

These resolutions were adopted in response to the clamor of international public opinion. Their legal basis is found in the Charter. All parties involved must therefore abide by them, not as a sign of weakness but as an inescapable legal and political obligation. This seems to be the only just and peaceful means to restore tranquility to the region and the world at large. It is our belief that all States are profoundly committed to peace and to the agile and effective use of diplomatic means to avoid conflict.

By immediately and fully complying with the resolutions, Member States have in turn unequivocally indicated that a breach of international legal odor is intolerable in times when even conventional weapons have awesome destructive force and the international panorama presents a network of complementary interests. They have also expressed their firm support for United Motions efforts in the region as a whole, where many a people deserving, as all others, of peace, security and prosperity have for so long been vexed by crises. Brazil is particularly concerned with the

fate of the long-suffering Lebanese people, torn by internal strife, their sovereign capacity to decide their own destiny thwarted by the presence of foreign troops.

I reaffirm the determination of my Government fully to comply with Security Council resolution 5131 (1990) within its domestic jurisdiction. The decisions of the Council affect the economic interests of Member States quite differently; and Brazil, which, as is generally known, had been struggling with difficulties prior to the crisis, ranks among the countries outside the region that have been most adversely affected.

Closely attuned to the more positive treads of contemporary history, Brazil is undergoing a process of deep transformation which sets it irreversibly on the path towards full democracy, economic liberalization and social justice. Elected by my fellow citizens in the freest elections ever held in our history, I have taken upon myself crucial personal and political responsibilities before 150 million Brazilians. The mandate conferred upon me by the people is that of swiftly promoting modernization and fully integrating the country into the world economy in order to render it more competitive and so that its people may reach the levels of well-being to which their talents and industriousness entitle them. It is my commitment to rehabilitate both the State and society, to guarantee fully functioning democratic institutions, to restructure and revitalize the economy, to defeat inflation, to unleash the creative forces of the private sector, and to fight the misery which still torments a portion of my people.

It is also my duty to protect the most vulnerable segments of society. This explains why I have given top priority to children and the young. Children, it has been repeatedly stated, embody the future, and this is particularly true in a country like Brazil, with a predominantly young population, which anxiously seeks modernization.

We are aware that our country faces dramatic problems in this respect. We make no secret of these problems or of our resolve to solve them. The comprehensive initiatives we have launched on behalf of children indicate how seriously committed we are to converting Brazil's potential into a lasting reality.

I therefore welcome with enthusiasm the initiative for convening the World Summit for Children, with which Brazil associated itself and in which I intend to participate personally in an intensive and constructive manner.

As a result of important ongoing changes, deep-seated pessimism is vanishing and opposing views are in the process of being reconciled. Authoritarianism is doomed. Political and psychological attitudes based

upon steady progress towards freedom, democracy and improved dialogue among nations are asserting themselves.

At this point no Government can avoid or be excluded from the debate on the prospects for a future world order. In Latin America we have reached, not without difficulty, an advanced stage of democratic evolution and respect for human rights, which constitute for as a source of pride and renewed encouragement.

In our region, as in others, men, women and above all the young have new energies and hopes. Once again Latin America was proved itself worthy of the dreams of emancipation of its peoples and is reconciled with its true democratic calling.

In Africa remnants of the colonial past are crumbling at the same time that the last bastion of segregation and racism is finally beginning to break apart. Together with my fellow Brazilians I salute the independence of Namibia, a process which my country consistently supported, and we wish the young State the realization of its enormous potential. I also welcome the release of Nelson Mandela which was enthusiastically applauded in Brazil, and I wish him every success in his courageous struggle.

The international community's agenda has become global in scope. The United Nations is faced with the task of establishing a new framework for peace and prosperity. It is no longer possible to conceive of a world chronically split into feuding halves. Neither ideology nor poverty can be allowed to come between human beings.

The trend towards globalization holds true for every quadrant of the world, East and West, North and South. The yearning for freedom, dignity and better living conditions knows no boundaries. New opportunities must not be missed lest we run the risk of replacing the obsolete East-West confrontation with the aggravation of the North-South crisis and of adding new mistakes that may jeopardize the future of international society.

The Brazilian Government is prepared to discuss the basic outline of a new international structure that can ensure peace and further cooperation. It would not suffice merely to preserve the current global political and economic arrangements and even less to repeat the past, recent or remote. The highly outdated concept of power as the capacity for destruction and as an expression of economic hegemony should be finally abandoned. It is necessary to dismantle its practical apparatus. Thus:

I) military alliances must undergo profound transformation in order to reflect the convergent and interdependent world we now live in;

II) partial negotiations on disarmament should be expanded in order to assume a general and complete scope, above all is the fields of nuclear and chemical weapons, in response to the expectations of the international community;

III) regional tensions must be thoroughly addressed in diplomatic and political terms in order that they may be eliminated as hotbeds of global instability.

Above all it is imperative to articulate a new concept of world power as a revolutionary capacity for invention, production and construction for the benefit of all nations and all peoples.

Peace is multifaceted and should translate at the international level the trend towards democracy, participation and representation. Democratization of the world order is a prerequisite for a peace that is both just and sound, free from any kind of threat. Peace must mean more than the abolition of conflicts, of threats and of hegemonic preponderance of the most developed or most powerful. Thus, the major international institutions must reflect the new realities and be capable of accommodating the rapid and fruitful increase in contacts among States and the formation of multiple groupings.

This comprehensive concept of peace is illustrated by the new pace set for the process of dialogue and integration in South America. Day by day the understanding within Amazonian, Andean and Southern Cone groups of nations gains in substance. Outstanding among those efforts is the determination displayed by the governments of Brazil and Argentina in establishing a common market before December 1994. The process of integration under way in the Southern Cone involves, in addition to Brazil and Argentina, the fraternal countries of Paraguay, Uruguay and Chile.

In Latin America a pioneering initiative of diplomatic coordination, the Group of Rio, grows stronger and has now attained political maturity. Our region is thus in a position to engage in dialogue with the centers of the world economy, the United States, Western Europe and Japan, in order to explore new opportunities for economic exchange and cooperation. In that regard the economic initiative recently launched by the United States Government met with a positive reaction on the part of many Latin American countries. It will certainly be consolidated in the next few months.

In the South Atlantic the zone of peace and cooperation – established by a resolution of the General Assembly – gains in substance and with the relaxation of international tensions will encompass new elements of global interest, such as the protection and preservation of the marine environment. In this field our zone of peace and of cooperation may play an innovative role on a global scale, provided more committed financial and technological support is available.

Brazil ratified the Treaty of Tlatelolco and has reiterated in international forums its respect for its purposes and those of related international agreements. Recently, Brazil and Argentina publicly announced that an intense exchange of views is taking place among interested parties on the implementation of the Treaty of Tlatelolco. That pioneering Latin American initiative in the field of non-proliferation of nuclear weapons preceded all other efforts, whether regional or universal in scope, devoted to the same objective. I believe, however, that the time has come to go one step further. Brazil today discards the idea of any experiments that might involve nuclear explosions, even if only for peaceful purposes. We trust other nations will consider the possibility of following the same path.

All changes that seek to consolidate freedom and democracy, to strengthen true peace and international security, to cast away old myths and to reconcile efficiency with justice are of interest to Brazil. Not every development on the international scene, however, is forward looking. The structures of power have, in essence, not yet been altered. In fact one may even fear a reinforcement of the international stratification, both economic and political. This could include a biased discrimination hindering access to scientific and technological knowledge.

Efforts towards disarmament are still incipient and their diplomatic handling has never been so remote from multilateral forums. Military incidents in different parts of the world demonstrate that many regional security problems have not yet been addressed. Racialist and xenophobic outbursts are unfortunately recurring in some quarters.

Nevertheless, we have not abandoned optimism. History shall not be rewritten. We think that faced with the global challenges of modern life, humanity will march – despite present difficulties and obstacles – towards new, peaceful and productive forms of coexistence. The global structure shall allow for new strides in the pursuit of human happiness. We are not condemned to the twin threats of violence and political confrontation.

A promising agenda is being announced which includes, not only the reactivation of economic development and international cooperation,

but also issues involving the observance of all human rights – political, economic and social – as well as concerted efforts to protect the environment on a global scale and the fight against illicit trafficking in narcotic drugs. As East-West tensions disappear, the question of establishing new guidelines for the international economic order asserts itself with renewed vigor.

There persist the perverse practices and mechanisms of protectionism and managed trade. Such partial openings as may occur as based on the rigid observance of the principle of reciprocity, to the detriment of more fragile economies. It is unsettling that efforts on behalf of economic and trade liberalization should share the stage with the present wave of neo-protectionism. As it opens up its economy to the world, and in the understanding that an open world economy will be established, Brazil is participating in the current Uruguay Round and is confident that these negotiations, conducted within the framework of the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade, may correct the persistent disorder and atrophy affecting international trade.

The use of export subsidies and other domestic support measures on the part of developed nations has reached excessive levels, strongly affecting developing nations otherwise capable of increasing the world's supply of agricultural or agro-industrial products. It is deplorable that the protectionist arsenal currently in use by the developed world should hinder the increase in the level of world food production, while hunger still afflicts a large portion of mankind.

We look forward, with great hope, to balanced results in all areas currently under negotiation at the Uruguay Round, which may strengthen multilateralism and nullify trends toward restriction. We do not want the freezing of North-South inequalities or the continued stifling of free competition by artificial means.

In the context of well-known economic difficulties faced by the major economic Powers, both domestically and in their relations with each other, there looms the risk that the mega-blocs will not be guided by global interests, by the logic of economic openness and a sense of the whole. On the contrary, there is a risk that they will degenerate into veritable "trade fortresses". Twin challenges have come to further cloud that outlook. The first concerns the orderly absorption of East European countries into the world market in such a way that this far-reaching and positive development does not disrupt traditional North-South trade and investment flows nor add further cause of disarray to the already precarious state of the economies of the developing countries. The second

challenge derives from the persistent and radical economic inequality among nations, a fact that is in itself one of the major obstacles to the full development of social and economic forces on a world scale. The issue of economic development and international cooperation must be placed at the top of the multilateral agenda.

In Brazil a comprehensive and coherent program of social and economic reform is being developed which, in order to be swiftly implemented, calls for a prompt inflow of foreign funds, granted on favorable and mutually beneficial terms. Such measures as have been adopted are already reversing an economic situation the prospects of which were distressing, and are paving the way for the immediate restoration of international cooperation with our country, Brazil.

We trust this effort will meet with a positive response from our most significant partners in the developed world. We wish to make the best of the present moment, in which the new supersedes the old in so many ways. Brazil wishes to play in full its role in conception of a global framework of peace and cooperation.

In this regard, by adopting the Declaration on International Cooperation last May, this Assembly came to recognize, through the unanimous voice of its Member States, that the economic revitalization of the developing countries is the major challenge of the present decade.

Brazil is seeking economic efficiency and desires that the economy of every developing country become productive. Such a goal may be reached if the world economy is better organised. This is a responsibility shared by all countries. The persistence of hunger, the deprivation of minimum amenities and the extreme economic hardship in many areas ultimately affect the whole by way of environmental devastation, systematic violation of human rights, and the production and illegal trafficking in drugs. The conscience and the way of life of every society are thus disastrously affected.

The last decade, though propitious for public liberties and political pluralism, was at the same time cruel and parsimonious towards economic and social development. Development, however, is crucial for the consolidation of democratic institutions. The titanic efforts of many of the peoples of the developing world came to naught by virtue of the enormous and continuing transfer abroad of assets essential to economic growth and investment.

Finding a permanent solution to the problem of foreign debt is a task of urgent and overriding concern for the future of the developing

countries, and especially in Latin America. The economic recovery of our peoples is an unavoidable imperative that cannot be sacrificed and that will not be sacrificed. Economic stabilization and modernization initiatives in developing countries and, especially, their fuller integration into the world economy, would be threatened if the foreign debt problem were to retain its present features. It seems indispensable that a serious, frank and creative dialogue should bring about solutions at the international level asking for the resumption of the process of economic growth and the development of our peoples.

The second major issue of the international agenda concerns the environment. I wish to extend from this rostrum an invitation to the world to come to Brazil in 1992 for the great United Nations Conference on Environment and Development, perhaps the most important international meeting to be held in this century, by virtue of the issue it addresses, which is of vital interest to mankind, and in the light of the expected number of participants, including some at non-governmental level. I invite all Heads of State and Government to attend that event. Brazil welcomes you with open arms.

That meeting will lead to a more precise definition of the generic concern for the environment, and it will also allow agreements to be concluded on the basis of a sense of shared responsibility on the part of all international actors. For this to occur, it is incumbent upon Governments to take up their responsibilities and to review their objectives. Brazil stands ready to do its part and is already doing its part, confident that other countries will do the same.

We are energetically tackling Brazil's environmental problems. Despite serious economic difficulties, grave social problems and the huge expanse of our territory, the Government and society of Brazil are already making efforts in the realm of the environment that compare favorably to those of other countries. As environmental monitoring develops in Brazil, we are proceeding to establish a zoning system for the country, notably in the Amazon, so as to delimit scientifically the large areas that must be fully preserved, as well as those that will serve economic development in different degrees and under rigorous discipline.

Like all other developing countries, Brazil needs easier access to technologies that will permit the elimination of damages to the environment and that are environmentally safe. Such technologies should be used for the benefit of all countries. There is an urgent need for financial conditions to be established at the international level which will allow such technologies to be applied in competitive terms.

The countries that throughout history have contributed most to the pollution of the environment have the greatest share of responsibility in this respect. By facilitating the availability of technologies and resources, these countries will play a crucial role in reversing the situation of environmental calamity unjustly inherited by the present generation and in offering appropriate solutions. The benefits should not be monopolized or concentrated among the few but should rather be spread out as much as possible. In a spirit of fairness we foresee that the more developed countries will commit greater resources to the correction of environmental problems. Such correction must not, even indirectly, widen the gap between rich and poor countries. A higher level of international solidarity is called for as regards the use of modern, low-cost technologies.

Aware of the fact that access to technology, as well as to its production and in a new and necessary economic paradigm, Brazil cannot but express its strong concern with the barriers that still persist to free exchange in such a decisive domain.

What is at stake is nothing less than our chances for integration into the dynamic core of the world economy. Those countries that are subordinate in the field of technology, will also be subordinate in the new international division of labor arising from technological development. International barriers portray the grim policies that virtually shunt aside countries of late industrialization.

The concern of Brazil is understandable not only on account of its technological capacity – which is among the most advanced in the developing world – but also because we live under democratic normalcy, with truly functioning institutions and a government which is uncompromisingly faithful to the rule of law and to its international commitments.

I could not fail to refer to the importance that the issue of human rights is gaining on our common agenda. In view of the current expansion of democratic ideals, international consideration of this matter will gain in scope and incisiveness. Brazil firmly supports this trend. We believe, in fact, that the world is on the threshold of a qualitative leap in this area. Affronts to human rights must be denounced and fought with the same vigor wherever they may occur. One of my paramount concerns in this field is preserving the life and customs of the indigenous communities of Brazil. To this end, my Government has taken drastic measures during the first six months of its mandate is an attitude of absolute respect for and unyielding protection of the rights of the Brazilian Indian. A great deal remains to be done and will indeed be done.

By its efforts, the international community can be of precious help in creating worldwide conditions which would guarantee the observance of human rights in their broadest sense. It is today incumbent upon all countries to take up new obligations in ensuring the individual greater freedom of movement across borders, in the elimination of every vestige of discrimination and protecting the rights of foreigners. Human rights must be increasingly understood in their entirety, without artificial or specious distinctions among their various modalities.

Every feature of the new world structure points to the growth of the United Nations. Important institutional changes in this Organization may be foreseen, even before its Fiftieth anniversary, to translate into terms of multilateral diplomacy the international realities emerging everywhere.

The world did not stop in 1945, and a new phase in history has been in the making in the past 12 months. The United Nations, in particular, is giving evidence of increased diplomatic energy. Forever, the renewed tendency on the part of the permanent members of the Security Council to act as a bloc in certain instances does not seem to be in itself enough to steer us towards an institutional redefinition of the Organization and of the Council itself.

For the United Nations, as the foremost, if not the only, forum of universal scope, to be able to respond to current challenges, it will prove necessary to return to the original political intentions of the Charter, which have so often been misinterpreted, even in recent times. Those intentions struck a clear balance between the prerogatives of the permanent members of the Security Council and the preservation of the sovereign equality of Member States. The latter is a fundamental principle which should be followed as part of the negotiating process in all organs of the United Nations, including the Security Council.

The new multilateralism must be truly innovative and true to the principle of equitable representation, lest it become a sterile formula or a disguise for a deeper political crisis. The last few weeks have not only clearly, directly and dramatically illustrated the system of international relations, but also exposed its vulnerability. Never before have politics and diplomacy been so necessary on the multilateral scene.

As we build new political and economic structures, increasing claims for justice and participation in the international order are to be added to our quest for efficiency. Our common endeavor in this Hall is, after all, the search for a modernity applicable to all nations, one in which we all identify a human face. What we wish for, from the depth of our

hearts, is a world of peace. cooperation, prosperity, justice; a world built upon the basic principles of international law; a world in which we may discern on the horizon, the better future that our peoples so dearly hope for, deserve and are sure to achieve.

May God be with us.

New York, September 24, 1990.

1991

1991

A year of great transformations on the international level, 1991 started under the impact of the Gulf War and ended with the formal disintegration of the Soviet Union. That was the beginning period that came to be called "post-Cold War", in which the military and strategic preeminence of the United States was tempered by its growing economic and financial fragility and in which the atomization of power at the global level led to regionalization and in certain cases at the worsening of conflicts, such as those faced by Serbs, Bosnians and Croats in the former Yugoslavia and those stemming form the dismemberment of the former Soviet empire. The demobilization of the strategic and ideological confrontation between the U.S. and the USSR provoked, on its part, the delinking of the interests of the big powers in areas such as Africa and paradoxically rendered more serious the situations of deprivation and the regional antagonisms existing in that continent.

On the positive side, the Madrid Conference on the Middle East took place in Madrid. It was the first opportunity in which Arabs, Israelis and Palestinians sat formally around a table to discuss peace. The Madrid Conference was the starting point of the process that culminated in 1994 with the recognition of the Palestine State on the part of Israel.

1991 was also the year when the European Community formulated its final union project by means of the Treaty of Maastricht, concluded in December. In Brazil, developments seemed to take a negative course with the beginning of the process of denunciations of corruption and political

instability that would lead to the impeachment of President Collor in 1992. With the failure of the Plan Collor, the economic situation progressively deteriorated. In spite of the efforts by the government, especially following the appointment of Ambassador Marcílio Marques Moreira as Finance Minister, to restore relations with the international financial community and return to orthodox practices in economic policy, the rebound of inflation added elements of instability to the system.

Notwithstanding all the turbulence during this period, Brazilian diplomatic activity kept at a high level. In 1991 MERCOSUR was formally established by the signature of the Treaty of Asunción. This was also the year in which Brazilian nuclear policy took a new configuration with the constitution of the Brazil-Argentina Agency of Account and Control of Nuclear Materials (ABACC) and the signature of the Brazil-Argentina Safeguards Agreement with the International Atomic Energy Agency. For the purpose of increasing the credibility of the Brazilian policy in disarmament matters, Brazil, Argentina and Chile signed the "Mendoza Commitment", by which the three countries formally repudiated chemical and biological weapons. The Head of the government embarked in an extensive agenda of international travel: Spain, Sweden, Norway, United States, Mexico (Ibero-American Summit), Angola, Zimbabwe, Mozambique, Namibia and Italy were the countries visited by the President. Among others, the Presidents of Argentina, Colombia, the Heads of government of Portugal (in 1991 the problem of recognition of the titles of Brazilian dentists in Portugal would arise) and Germany, as well as Mr. Nelson Mandela, were received in Brazil.

The President returned to the United Nations podium and delivered the statement of the Brazilian delegation before the Forty-Sixth Session of the General Assembly. On that occasion, the hopeful tone of the previous speech gave way to more cautious language, in which some aspects of growing concern joined positive elements arisen with the evolution of the international conjunctures.

The 1991 speech was also the occasion when the President, in explaining his modernization program, extolled the conception of "social liberalism".

It was a predominantly conceptual statement in which the traditional Brazilian themes of development and peace were retrieved.

In view of the preparation of the United Nations Conference on Environment and Development, which would take place in the following year in Rio de Janeiro, the President devoted a large part of his speech to environmental issues. He coined a phrase which synthetized the links

between the questions of the environment and development and would later be widely quoted in the context of the Conference: "We cannot have an environmentally sound planet in a socially unfair world".

Moreover, he stressed the changes that had taken place in the nuclear policy of Brazil with the signature of the agreements with Argentina and the IAEA and the Mendoza Commitment on chemical and biological weapons.

The mention to the establishment of MERCOSUR, by its turn, was significantly accompanied by a signal aiming at its compatibility with the "Initiative for the Americas" proposed by President Bush with a view to the constitution of a free trade area encompassing the three Americas.

XLVI Session of the General Assembly of the United Nations
1991

President Fernando Collor [*]

Mr. President,

May I congratulate you upon your election, which does justice to the tradition of international cooperation supported by Saudi Arabia and is an eloquent acknowledgement of your own talent. I have great pleasure in welcoming the representatives of the new States that have now become Members of this Organization: the Republic of the Marshall Islands and the Federated States of Micronesia. The admission as Members of the two Republics that form the Korean peninsula is emblematic of an auspicious moment for world peace. The presence in these halls of the representatives of the Republic of Estonia, the Republic of Latvia and the Republic of Lithuania, whose tenacious struggle for independence commanded universal recognition, brings a special kind of joy to the community of nations.

I also wish to pay a well-deserved tribute to the Secretary-General, Mr. Javier Pérez de Cuellar, for the balanced and dedicated manner in which he has been exercising, for some 10 years now, the highest-ranking functions of the Secretariat of our Organization.

We are privileged to live at a time of universal affirmation of the rights and freedoms of the individual, of pluralism, of respect for the will of the majority, of protection of minorities, of free enterprise. These

[*] **Fernando Affonso Collor de Mello**, born in Rio de Janeiro, RJ, on August 12, 1949. Degree in Economics e Journalism. Governor of Alagoas between 1986 and 1989. President of the Republic from 3/15/1990 to 9/30/1992.

achievements come in an age that is weary of conflict and arbitrariness. These achievements highlight an essential point, namely that collective interests always prevail, sooner or later, over the wishes of groups that cling to privilege. Our aim is to open up a whole new historical cycle in which there should be no place for totalitarian coercion over peoples or countries, in which democracy, freedom, development and peace can be truly universal values.

I address the General Assembly of the United Nations as the representative of 150 million Brazilians, as the elected leader of one of the largest democracies in the world. I come here to join in the celebration of glad tidings. I come here to share in the celebration of joy, but also to share concerns. I come here to celebrate, but also to draw attention to serious problems.

We face the challenge of reshaping the world, of building a peace that will not be the offspring of the constant threat of war. The ideological and strategic motivations for global confrontation are fortunately on the wane and exhausted. Sources of tension subsist, however, that still have to be extinguished. The roads towards prosperity and the distribution of its fruits are known to all of us. In spite of that, parochial interests widen the gap that makes our objectives fade in the distance and that has to be bridged in our undertaking. It is as though we were simultaneously heading for common rejoicing in freedom and for separation in inequality. Liberal ideas have won. We should now labor to ensure that they will prevail in a consistent, widespread and, above all, innovative manner.

Such observations are made from the viewpoint of a country that has opted for a liberal project clearly oriented towards social concerns, for social liberalism. That is the viewpoint of a society that for 18 months now has been striving to realize those ideas.

Liberalism places the emphasis on the freedoms of the individual, which are invariably more fully exercised once the material conditions that a great majority of our citizens still lack are assured. The time has come for liberalism to take on, at the international level, the sensitivity to social problems that it has already incorporated at the domestic level. Liberalism highly values the freedom inherent in the market, but it cannot turn away from the mechanisms needed to curb distortions and prevent the non-observance of its most elementary rules, as is the case with existing discriminatory and protectionist policies.

This means that the international community will have to devote priority attention, at the political level, to development problems. This means supplementing the functioning of market mechanisms with

measures intended to correct serious imbalances, the persistence of which would put good relations at risk. Just as nobody can feel secure facing the possibility of nuclear war, nobody can consider himself to be secure and at peace in a planet where the poor and forsaken are dramatically spending in number and in extent. I shall not repeat here statistical data and indicators, many of which were drawn up within this Hall and which demonstrate with alarming clarity that developing countries are worse off today than they were 10 years ago.

We are approaching a global consensus on the values of democracy and we must carry through its ethical premises. Concern for the individual lies at the very heart of democratic conscience. Through political participation and responsibility it is individuals who frame the destiny of their collectivity. It is towards individuals that the actions of democratic governments must be oriented, for the aims of such governments are only accomplished if they can ensure each and every citizen the effective means of well-being and justice.

The democratic conscience cannot but be universal in scope, since it is based on the overriding principle of equality of rights and opportunities for all. There cannot be relative democracy, under any pretext whatsoever. Thus, it is incongruous that three-quarters of mankind should live in pitiful and often inhuman situations of poverty. If political oppression affronts our democratic values, so does economic exclusion. This is all the more true as the victims of hunger and misery are often children and adolescents, so that the indignation of the present spills over into a future of hopelessness.

Last year, here in New York, the World Summit for Children revealed a broad consensus that the issue must be addressed at the highest level and with the utmost determination. It is necessary, however, that the international community give concrete shape and follow-up to that commitment.

In my country, the Government seeks to mobilize all levels of society to make children our first national priority. At the same time, various measures have been taken, such as the assignment of a special cabinet-level portfolio for children, to coordinate efforts in that area and to launch an ongoing program to build several hundred integrated facilities, making it possible for destitute children to leave the streets and receive education, food, medical care, and cultural and sports opportunities. With the scarce resources at our disposal, we are earnestly attempting to do our best.

The international community faces three major challenges: the economic challenge of development, the political challenge of peace and the ethical challenge of ensuring a life of dignity for all. These are challenges that cannot be met separately but that must rather be faced jointly and simultaneously. These are challenges that must be met democratically, with the participation of all. These are challenges that, in the end, test our ability to elevate solidarity to the highest plans of international relations.

It is development that ensures the consolidation of democracy and represents the fundamental premise of peace. Where inequality holds sway, quarrels and confrontation are bound to take root. In a world where universality of values is increasingly pursued, little progress is being made on the path to universal patterns and paces of development.

We have a responsibility to build a truly democratic and balanced international society. In a democracy, a citizen abides by the law because he feels legitimately represented in its elaboration. The some principle should hold for norms affecting relations among States: it is participation and not coercion that provides the basic stimulus to lawful behavior. For that reason, the General Assembly, as the world parliament, where citizens of every country are effectively represented, is the forum where we ought to work together for a better, more just, more prosperous and more peaceful world.

The definitive establishment of peace demands decision-making processes that are more open, that ensure wider participation and that are binding on States in a broader and deeper way. The natural course towards meeting the great challenges that lie at the heart of our agenda is cooperation by means of universally applicable rules genuinely agreed upon and followed by States. It is through pluralism born of tolerance, consensus born of understanding, the synthesis born of differing opinions freely expressed that the pillars of genuine cooperation can be built.

The General Assembly cannot accept having its legitimate prerogatives diminished, since it symbolizes to an increasing extent the triumph of democracy the world over, which in turn opens up the prospect of victory for an international system that is also democratic.

The war in the Gulf has shown us, the United Nations, effectively at work. We count on its ability to influence the course of events and to overcome hotbeds of tension in the international scene.

Peace in the world is contingent upon peace in the Middle East. Our friends in Lebanon are already joining together to rebuild the country on the basis of a loftier goal: a united, free, prosperous and peaceful Lebanon. Now the time has come for the Arabs and the Israelis. The grand design

of a region where all may live in peace within internationally recognized boundaries will be realized through respect for the rights of the Palestinian people and a change of attitude towards Israel.

Brazil strongly supports the initiative of convening a peace conference on the Middle East, with the participation of all interested parties, aimed at the full implementation of the relevant resolutions of the United Nations. We hope that all parties will display the necessary flexibility to remove obstacles, both physical and emotional, to the establishment of a just and lasting peace in the region. In this contest, we believe that the application of labels that have exacerbated mistrust among the parties should be reconsidered.

Alongside political and economic challenges, the United Nations cannot avoid facing the ethical challenge to which I have alluded. It is necessary to design new approaches and more creative and consensual instruments for action in priority areas of the environment and development, human rights, world population questions, and the situation of women and children. In the years leading up to the Fiftieth anniversary of the United Nations we must not down guidelines for international relations in the twenty-first century.

The 1992 United Nations Conference on Environment and Development will be the first among the major universal gatherings to take place in the next few years. The Conference has an inescapable obligation to future generations, inasmuch as it is they who will stand to benefit most from our work, the main objective of which is to improve the quality of life for all people.

Lasting solutions to global problems require the commitment of the international community as a whole, each country according to its responsibility relative to the origin of those problems and to their management, as well as to its economic and technological capacity to overcome them. The months leading up to the Conference will require intensive consultations. Brazil intends to explore opportunities for dialogue to the fullest and hopes to find its interlocutors to be open and determined.

Perhaps the most striking characteristic of such a Conference on Environment and Development is that it should allow for as broad a debate as possible, as profound a discussion as the political will of the participants will allow. It is with those objectives in mind, and without constraints or preconceptions, that we believe the issues of the Conference must be tackled and its crowning decisions adopted.

At the Conference we shall discuss the economic policies of developed and developing countries alike that are best suited to eradicating poverty and correcting unsustainable patterns of production and consumption. The transfer of environmentally sound technology requires an innovative approach to intellectual property rights that will allow for a regime that effectively favors access by the developing countries to the progress made by the industrialized world in that field.

The Conference should not set the stage for grievances and recrimination. It should, on the contrary, provide the framework for mature and feasible proposals. In effect, it amounts to finding a proper response to the common interest of ensuring the survival of mankind and of the planet itself.

Just as the question of development has yielded to other issues on the international agenda, I am concerned that the issue of the environment may also yield to other aspects of the day-Today life of the world.

It is understandable that the dramatic developments of the past two years have attracted considerable attention. But it should be pointed out that the political task of peace building does not take place in a vacuum. It depends on economic development, which, in turn, is dependent on environmentally sustainable economic models.

We cannot abide having an environmentally sound planet and a socially unjust world. Hence, the convergence of the political, economic aid ethical dimensions on the question of the environment, which ultimately brings together the challenges of peace, development and the improvement of the quality of life of mankind as a whole. Hence the importance of our commitment to come together at the highest level at the Rio Conference in 1992. I again invite all Heads of State and Government from all regions of the world to be present in Rio de Janeiro. Their participation will ensure that the decisions we adopt enjoy the needed political support. Brazil awaits you all with open arms.

My country is striving to ensure its rightful place on the international scene. We are aware of the fact that to that end we must rely above all on our own efforts. It is our obligation to manage our domestic affairs, to solve our problems among ourselves and to persevere on the right path.

There is no other path to progress, harmony and social well-being. There is no other path to the role to which we aspire in international decision-making processes. We ask nothing of the world that we are not prepared to give. We propose nothing to the world that we are not in a position to do ourselves.

Brazil is a too complex nation to be treated according to standard prescriptions. There are no magic formulas and no economic miracles. We join the concert of nations with an open mind, with a vision of the future and with generosity, and we expect the same attitude in return. We are perfectly aware that respectability is beholden to responsibility. In the course of our national history we have cultivated consistency and responsibility in our international relations, in conformity with the rules and principles of relations among nations. The world is witness to this tradition.

Last year I announced in this very forum my Government's decision to abstain from any nuclear explosions – including for peaceful purposes, as if it were possible to explode atomic bombs for peaceful purposes.

On July 18, 1991, in Guadalajara, Mexico, Brazil and Argentina signed the Agreement on the Exclusively Peaceful Uses of Nuclear Energy. The Agreement has great historic significance for our countries and constitutes proof that it is possible to ensure nuclear security through nuclear cooperation.

The Safeguards Agreement that Brazil and Argentina will sign with the International Atomic Energy Agency will provide all pertinent information for verification of our commitment to the exclusively peaceful uses of nuclear energy and will also preserve the technological advances that we have arduously attained in the realm of the nuclear energy cycle.

Less than one month ago we also signed, together with Argentina and Chile, the Mendoza Commitment, on the basis of which we formally and collectively renounced all chemical and bacteriological weapons. We are aware of the example we have just set for the elimination of weapons of mass destruction, and we hope that a similar agreement at the global level will be finalized in the near future. It is Brazil's understanding that the aforementioned instruments afford renewed and sufficient assurances regarding the exclusively peaceful objectives of our national nuclear energy program and regarding our repudiation of weapons of mass destruction.

International flows of sensitive technology goods, services and know-how are today a vital issue. We should look for formulas that would serve to reconcile two basic interests: avoiding the possibility that such technologies are used in weapons of mass destruction, and ensuring that access to such technologies remains open. This is an essential prerequisite for building and modernizing the technological capacity of countries like Brazil.

It is easy to welcome change and to exult in the prospects for building a new world. It is painful, however, to speak of the many obstacles that still stand in the way of hope. Among these obstacles we find the acute problem of external indebtedness that drains the developing countries of scarce capital, arbitrary constraints on the transfer of technology and disregard for market principles under the protectionist policies pursued, first and foremost, by the industrialized countries.

The paths leading to an international framework that ensures peace and fosters development are complex and have yet to be defined. There is consensus on the objectives and perhaps on the means, but resistance to real change remains enormous. The great strides that have been made in the ideological and strategic realms must be matched by no less courageous strides towards building confidence and cooperation.

In the political sphere, democracy should open up the way for new decision-making procedures in the international field. Security must be an effectively collective endeavor, enforced by law and not by the specter of arms.

If in the economic sphere we have shed the facile and simplistic dreams of radical reform of the international economy, and if we know that great transformations begin with hard work aimed at internal reform, we cannot all the same forgo realistic and sensible proposals for international cooperation. We are committed to fighting for the success of the Uruguay Round in the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade (GATT), as we believe that the philosophy of free and open trade should rest on a solid and balanced foundation.

In the realm of values, there is a consensus that our first duty is to struggle for the full exercise of human rights on the political, economic and social levels. That is the great objective that international solidarity should attain.

Brazil is pursuing no other policy than to warn, to caution, to propose and, above all, to collaborate. The growing imbalance between developed and developing countries poses a tangible threat to international stability and security. This threat will only increase if there is no effective support for the consolidation of democracy and development. There is a need to create, at the world level, a sturdily built, consensual program of action, organized around the question of development, to guide and spur negotiations on specific items pertaining to relations among nations at all stages of economic progress.

On the American continent, the Enterprise for the Americas initiative, currently known as the Bush Plan, is a first indication of

willingness to reach understanding. Along the lines of this same drive towards the actual integration of the continent, Brazil, Argentina. Paraguay and Uruguay have signed the Treaty for the Constitution of the Common Market of the South (MERCOSUR), which already dovetails with the Enterprise for the Americas through the Rose Garden Agreement, signed in Washington earlier this year.

In order to realize the hopes thus raised among the peoples of the region, both initiatives must incorporate as a priority goal the search for a solution to the serious social problems that still confront us. This political, economic and ethical imperative cannot be regarded as constituting a claim-by any particular country or group of countries. It is an ensign to be flown by all States, by all governments.

We are drawing nigh to the universal and ultimate triumph of the revolution of democracy and freedom. What remains is to carry it through with the revolution of social justice and solidarity. May God be with us.

New York, September 23, 1991.

1992

1992

1992 was a year of fundamental importance for the institutional evolution of Brazil. Beset by a crisis that later would take an extremely serious turn and before the depth of the problems and the extreme severity of the accusations became evident, President Fernando Collor decided, in the beginning of 1992, to appoint a Cabinet composed of "prominent personalities". Developments, however, forged ahead rapidly. The credibility of the government was shaken by a devastating series of denunciations. In the terminal phase of the administration, the Ministers even prepared a commitment to governability, assuming the responsibility of ensuring normality in the conduct of the government.

During that year Brazil had three Foreign Ministers: José Francisco Rezek, until April 1; Celso Lafer up to October 5; and Fernando Henrique Cardoso starting from the inauguration of President Itamar Franco, as a result of the process of impeachment against President Collor.

Until October, the national agenda was dominated by the deterioration of the political and institutional situation of the country. Since the assumption of office by President Itamar Franco, the prevailing concern was the restoration of institutional normality and of the administrative capacity of the State, both negatively affected by the lengthy crisis. The external agenda, by its turn, was conditioned by the evolution of the dismantlement of the Soviet Union and the civil war in the former Yugoslavia.

Simultaneously with the crisis that would lead to the removal of the President, Itamaraty had the responsibility of hosting, in June 1992, the biggest diplomatic event of the postwar period, not only due to the complexity and breadth of the issues on its agenda but also because of the size of the logistic problems: the United Nations Conference on Environment and Development. Brazilian diplomacy was entrusted with the task of harmonizing divergent positions on many of the most important questions on the Conference agenda and at the same time organising the final negotiation of the texts that resulted from it. The Brazilian delegation carried out fully the mediating role which made the success of the Conference possible. Possibly, never before a developing country had come to play with such agility a role of equal relevance in a global negotiation of universal reach.

Other important issues of this period were the consequences of the crisis in Peru (the so-called anti-coup by President Alberto Fujimori) and Haiti (the diplomatic negotiation for the return to power of President Jean Bertrand Aristide) the campaign for the election of Brazil to the Security Council, the question of Brazilian dentists in Portugal and the signature of the Third Generation agreement with the European Union.

Participating in the general debate at the Forty-Seventh Session of the General Assembly, Minister Celso Lafer showed special concern with projecting an image of normality and serenity in the face of the developments in Brazil. In his statement, the Minister sketched an analytic picture of the evolution of the international panorama in which solid arguments and the magisterial tone deriving from his academic personality are not missing. Perhaps somewhat influenced by the uncertainties of the moment in Brazil, the Minister used a "labyrinth" metaphor to describe the challenges of the new order that emerged from the rubble of the ideological confrontation and stress the ambivalence of the centrifuge and centripetal forces operating on the international level.

The statement was divided in three main blocs: "Disarmament, Peace and Security", "Democracy and Human Rights" and "Development and Ecology". In the first two sections the traditional postulations of Brazilian diplomacy are objective expounded, with special emphasis on the new situation created in the country since the consolidation of democracy. On human rights, the statement by Minister Celso Lafer innovated by affirming that these are absolute values and by establishing the goal of shortening to the maximum extent the distance between the desirable and the achievable. In the third bloc, the stress was put on the success of the Rio Conference, described by the Minister as having generated a new

paradigm and a new international social contract based on the concept of sustainable development.

The question of United Nations reform is taken up with discreetness. The Minister mentioned the need for readjustments and pointed out the convenience of a prudent conduct of negotiations and vision of future, in order to preserve the institutional balance among the organs provided for in the United Nations Charter.

XLVII Regular Session of the General Assembly of the United Nations 1992

Minister Celso Lafer [*]

Mr. President,

Let me congratulate you, Sir, and the Republic of Bulgaria upon your election as President of the General Assembly at its Forty-Seventh Session. Your experience as a respected political leader and jurist augurs well for the success of our deliberations. I wish to acknowledge the work of Ambassador Samir Shihabi of Saudi Arabia and his inspired and constructive presidency of the General Assembly at its Forty-Sixth Session.

I present my compliments to Secretary-General Boutros Boutros-Ghali, whose election was supported by Brazil from the beginning. His experience and statesmanship, which I had the occasion to witness at the United Nations Conference on Environment and Development, will certainly stand him in good stead in the exercise of his high office.

Brazil welcomes the representatives of the new States Members of the United Nations: Armenia, Azerbaijan, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Croatia, Georgia, Kazakhstan, Kyrgyzstan, Moldova, San Marino, Slovenia, Tajikistan, Turkmenistan and Uzbekistan. My country wishes to explore the possibilities of cooperation with the new Member States.

The opening of the general debate requires that we should call forth national and regional aspirations without losing sight of our

[*] **Celso Lafer**, Born in São Paulo, August 7, 1941. Bachelor in Law from the Faculty of Law of the University of São Paulo and Doctor in Political Science from the University of Cornell, USA. Minister of State for External Relations from 4/13/1992 to 10/5/1992, and from 2001 to 2002.

concern for the universal. It requires that we should seek to fulfill our individual identities in a harmonious whole, that should we be both effective and just.

Historical change should not be viewed as the chaotic workings of nature, which, like a storm, are beyond control. Nor does it bear comparison to a theatrical play whose plot and outcome are known to the author and the performers in advance but which the audience discovers only as the play unfolds. The most pertinent metaphor for understanding the lessons of history would be that of a labyrinth. Conceived of as a labyrinth, history unfolds unpredictably. This, however, does not deny the rational creativity of man and of peoples. Rational creativity lies in identifying by trial and error the blind alleys in the maze of collective experience, while trusting that there are exit points and struggling to reach them. Today the role of reason in the search for a way out lies in resorting to historical experience to promote those values which may ensure better and higher ways of life in an organized society: freedom, democracy, human rights, sustainable development, justice and peace. In times of change it is important to stop and think about the values and concepts that lie at the foundation of international relations.

The process I have described gives rise both to hopes and to concerns. It reflects the interaction of centripetal forces that tend towards the universal and of centrifugal forces that call attention to diversity. On the one hand, societies are embracing standards and practices that are well on the way to becoming universal, as witnessed by the strengthening of democracy and human rights, of sustainable development and of free enterprise and market integration.

On the other hand, we witness the rebirth of nationalism and ethnic strife, religious, fervor taken to extremes and forms of discrimination which multiply tension and threaten world peace. The United Nations, and in particular the General Assembly, should serve as the natural point of convergence for the various trends that shape the complexity of our time. That complexity requires building a new international order based on the democratic participation of all States, as stressed by the Secretary-General in his report on the work of the Organization. In conformity with its commitment to dialogue and cooperation, Brazil wishes to make its contribution to the common task of ensuring the equitable fulfillment of the historical aspirations of mankind. Brazil takes pride in its diplomatic tradition. With 10 neighbors and nearly 17,000 kilometers of borders, all of which were peacefully negotiated, Brazil's destiny is civil and fruitful coexistence with all countries.

The democracy we enjoy today at the domestic level is an assurance of unity and stability. It teaches us to accept the diversity and divergence inherent in a pluralistic society. It permits us to face crises and vicissitudes within the rule of law and the strict boundaries of constitutional order. At the same time, democracy encourages us to uphold its principles and methods in our relations with other nations in a democracy where the rules of the game relate to the sharing and limitation of power. Government must belong to the many, so that it can resist imposition by the few. Power must be constrained by law, so as to avoid the arbitrary discretion of those who wield it.

The acknowledgement of these rules aims at tie qualitative transformation of life in society the passage from the realm of violence to the realm of non-violence achievable by the taming of power through law. This is what confers on the law an irrevocable ethical content. In the realm of public international law, this ethical content finds its expression in the peaceful settlement of disputes, since its procedures for choosing among available options for action seek precisely to dispel the fears that derive from the rule of violence. It is in that spirit of democratic civility that, Brazil intends to participate in the process of reorganizing the international system. The unprecedented historical crossroads at which we find ourselves calls for a new agenda, an agenda embodying an awareness of the present and a vision of the future. The drafting of this agenda must take into account all the dimensions of value. All values have to be susceptible of fulfillment and are inexhaustible. To subsist, they must be translated into normative and social reality. However, the fulfillment of values in history does not exhaust their content. For example, we can and may always obtain more freedom and more justice.

The foreign policy of Brazil stresses these twin dimensions in its response to the new international situation and stresses them through creative adaptation and vision of the future. These concepts, we think, are appropriate as we consider the items on the agenda of the General Assembly.

The starting-point for a rethinking of the international system lies in the acknowledgement that peace, security and disarmament are inseparable. The suggestions put forward by Secretary-General Boutros-Ghali in his document "An Agenda for Peace" lend new contours and an enlarged scope to discussions on the role of the United Nations. All Member States should participate in an in-depth consideration of the provocative and creative suggestions put forward by the Secretary-General. Brazil will contribute actively to their consideration at the

present session of the General Assembly. The "Agenda for Peace" comprises timely issues, such as preventive diplomacy, peacemaking and post-conflict peace-building. Such innovative concepts are, by their very nature, still fluid. They open up new perspectives which remain to be explored, albeit cautiously, as befits an encounter between unknown realities and bold and imaginative ideas.

The dream of a better world cannot, however, be excluded from the debate. Though realism is the starting-point of all political action, it should not be taken as its final objective. Justice is the ultimate value that should, in the final analysis, permeate the concept of order. Peace-building is a continuous task and an evolving process. In addition to the concepts related to the means of tackling conflict situations, we should also seek to define the logical corollary of preventive peace-building, namely the forestalling of crises deriving from economic and social factors. To that end, we must strengthen the role of the United Nations, not only in restoring peace and security, but also in fostering economic and social progress.

Other elements should therefore be added to those put forward in the "Agenda for Peace", such as the promotion of a more just international economic environment, full respect for human rights and the rule of law, general and complete disarmament, and the democratization of international relations based on sovereign equality and the non-use of force.

it is essential to avoid the temptation of a selective application of the provisions of the Charter. The instruments for the maintenance of international peace and security must not serve to consolidate imbalances based on power relations, which are not more legitimate because they are real. The fundamental attribute of legitimacy consists in the all-encompassing perspective of humanity. It is of paramount importance to uphold the provision of the Charter whereby the maintenance of international peace and security is the collective responsibility of all Member States In carrying out its primary responsibility for the maintenance of international peace and security, the Security Council acts on behalf of all Member States of the United Nations. Now that the Council is being called upon to play an increasingly decisive role, there is a clear need for an in-depth discussion of the representative nature of its composition, the scope of its competence and the powers of its members.

We should consider, with prudence no less than with foresight, such readjustments as would permit the Council to discharge its functions in a more representative manner. Brazil is prepared to contribute

constructively to this effort, taking fully into account the institutional balance among the organs of the United Nations provided for in the San Francisco Charter. The contribution of Brazil to United Nations peacekeeping operations reflects our commitment to implementing the principle of collective responsibility.

The issue of disarmament has been momentarily overshadowed by that of security in the wake of the unstable situations which followed the collapse of global confrontation. The progressive reduction of arms stockpiles, especially of weapons of mass destruction, remains, however, fundamental. Much has indeed been accomplished in the field of disarmament, yet much remains to be done.

Brazil and Argentina have jointly entered into an agreement with the International Atomic Energy Agency on the application of safeguards. With Argentina and Chile, we launched an initiative to ensure the full entry into force of the Treaty for the Prohibition of Nuclear Weapons in Latin America the Treaty of Tlatelolco. The entry into force of the Treaty of Tlatelolco will make Latin America the first nuclear-weapon-free zone in the world. This represents a balanced agreement on non-proliferation with equality of rights and obligations. We have banned chemical and biological weapons from our territory through the Mendoza Agreement, which we concluded with our neighboring States. We have thus advanced the application of the convention on chemical weapons, which set down uniform rules of disarmament and verification binding on all signatories. We hope similarly universal and non-discriminatory disarmament conventions will be concluded in the future.

Regarding the zone of peace and cooperation of the South Atlantic, we welcome the opportunity to work with our partners on both sides of the ocean in a process of dialogue and joint endeavor aimed in particular at the protection of the marine environment.

Security and disarmament are only means to achieve the highest goal to which mankind truly aspires the goal of peace. Peace, not as the mere absence of war, but as an affirmative value, peace as a state of satisfaction in which relations among States can be ruled by law and disputes settled by peaceful means. Peace must be linked to cooperation, of which justice is an integral part, for common interests are rooted in a balanced relation among States. It is widely acknowledged that there is a close link between the democratic system of government and the inclination of States towards peace, and conversely, a link between authoritarian regimes and a greater propensity to conflict.

The values inherent in democracy – pluralism, majority rule, tolerance, consensus, the rule of law – extend naturally to the external affairs of the State. The strengthening of democracy on a planetary scale represents therefore a decisive contribution to the building of a more peaceful international system. An unquestionable value in the domestic order, democracy also projects itself as an organizing principle of the international order, through the strengthening of multilateral diplomacy and the search for a broad participation in the international decision-making process.

Brazil is convinced that relations among states must be governed predominantly by incentives to cooperation and not by disincentives. That amounts to promoting a positive and not a negative agenda for international relations, an agenda that must be negotiated in a democratic manner. The improvement of international cooperation to ensure adequate and effective treatment of worldwide issues, such as those of humanitarian, developmental or environmental character, is to be pursued within the basic principles of international law, foremost among which is respect for State sovereignty.

Fortunately, a new perception has evolved in the field of human rights that focuses on the need for special protection for the most vulnerable groups in each country. Cultural, religious and ethnic minorities, women, children, refugees and immigrants are social groups frequently exposed to intolerance and to the abuse of their most basic rights. We must strive to bridge the gap between what is achievable and what is desirable. Respect for human rights must be universal in scope, just as the 1948 Declaration is universal and just as the provisions of the basic covenants and conventions on this matter are universal. In short, human rights must not be violated under any pretext whatsoever.

The full enjoyment of individual rights requires material conditions of social and economic organization grounded in the idea of justice. The holding in 1993 of the World Conference on Human Rights, as well as the proposed world summit on social development, will provide opportunities to strengthen the protection and the promotion of human dignity.

The Government of Brazil is doing everything in its power to protect and promote human rights. We maintain an open dialogue with international organizations, governmental and non-governmental, and we have acceded to the main legal instruments on this matter. To be assured of success in our endeavors, we further need constructive international cooperation to address better the perverse consequences

of extreme poverty and to equip democratic States with conditions to reinforce their preventive and corrective actions in these areas, where serious violations of individual rights still occur. One of the most urgent tasks of the United Nations will be to promote in all countries a strong campaign against all forms of discrimination. It is high time we reaffirmed the classic concept of tolerance as an essential constituent element of life in an enlightened society. Equality can be genuine only when there is respect for diversity, where there is respect for heterogeneity. Policies of racial segregation, by any name, will always be hateful. The idea that a nation or a social group is somehow superior because it is ethnically homogeneous is flatly wrong.

The world has not lived through the horrors of a world war, the anguish of 45 years of the cold war and the hardship of conflicts that have offended the conscience of mankind to witness now the resurgence of the specter of xenophobia, of exclusive nationalism, or of ethnic, cultural or religious intolerance. We cannot allow the concept of nationhood to serve as a cloak for the practices of oppression. Brazil, as a multiracial country proud of its roots, rejects outright attitudes that are inimical to the human race. Just as our societies cannot coexist with the marginalization of parts of their population so the new international society we seek to build cannot coexist with the marginalization of entire peoples.

The interdependence of the world economy paradoxically highlights the shortcomings of global cooperation. The gap between the North and the South is widening before our eyes. This situation cannot persist. We must work together to foster economic growth in all countries. There will be no peace or security so long as such disparities continue to distort the international system. In an increasingly open and interdependent international community, the leverage from international trade is extraordinary. We must therefore prevent protectionist pressures linked to short-term parochial interests from undercutting the negotiating effort of the Uruguay pound, inspired by free competition and the multiplication of benefits. The difficulties and sluggishness inherent in the process of multilateral-trade liberalization should not prompt us to opt indiscriminately for self-contained regional blocks. We see, and would like others to see, regional-trade liberalization as a form of creating additional opportunities for international trade as a whole, without inflicting losses on third parties. This is how we view the Southern Cone Common Market (MERCOSUR), the regional basis for our competitive integration in the international economy.

Brazil is a global trader. We trade with all regions of the world and we are modernizing our economy through trade liberalization and openness towards the world economy. Negotiations with foreign creditors have produced positive results. Science and technology today represent the crucial variable of economic success. Promoting their dissemination and ensuring greater transparency and equity in the access to knowledge is fundamental for development. That is the spirit that guides the Brazilian initiative now under consideration in the United Nations Disarmament Commission, aiming at the definition of non-discriminatory and universally acceptable principles to regulate international transfers of sensitive technologies for peaceful purposes.

Last June Brazil hosted the United Nations Conference on Environment and Development, which was the largest diplomatic event in the history of the Organization and set new patterns of international understanding and cooperation. We worked creatively to face the challenges of the present and boldly in the preparations for the future. The Rio Conference was not aimed at simply reorganizing this or that aspect of economic activity or of life in society. It was aimed, rather, at reshaping the very notion of development, to conceive it on a more rational, more just and more generous foundation that of sustainable development.

The Rio Declaration, Agenda 21, the Declaration on Forests, the Climate Convention and the biodiversity Convention outline a legal framework and a political project of paramount importance for international cooperation. The significance of these instruments will be even more evident over time.

Adherence to the principles that have been agreed upon and prompt ratification of the two Conventions will usher in a new era of international cooperation. The Rio Conference set up a new paradigm, a new social contract, on the basis of the fundamental concept of sustainable development. It established as a primary concern the need to ensure the most rational balance between legitimate development goals, on the one side, and the preservation of the health of our planet and the well-being of future generations, on the other.

Sustainable development is the contemporary expression of progress. It is the basis for a new international environment and development order. In welcoming the Heads of State and Government who honored us with their presence, President Fernando Collor stated that "The world has decided to assemble here to address no more, no less than the life itself on the surface of the planet."

The Conference concluded that we cannot allow the persistence of social imbalances in the current international system marked by inhuman situations of poverty and by the coexistence of want and waste. As stated by the Brazilian Head of State, as President of the Conference, "We cannot have an environmentally sound planet in a socially unjust world". The Rio Conference therefore fostered an awareness of the fact that development must be sustainable. Sustainability requires due attention not only to environmental but also to economic and social factors. That and all the other achievements of the Conference were made possible thanks only to the unprecedented engagement of the community of nations at the highest level, allowing for the consideration of problems of universal interest through the equal participation of all countries.

Let me stress this point: The Rio Conference was exemplary in that it brought to a higher level the practice of democracy in international relations, thus strengthening multilateral diplomacy. At the Conference, all countries, large and small, rich and poor, gave proof that they were and are capable of linking their own specific interests with larger, more general interests. This is the "spirit of Rio", which we hope will guide the United Nations in other areas as well: mutual confidence among States, a willingness to act decisively with a view to achieving common goals, and the grandeur of joint endeavors in devising forms of enhanced cooperation in line with norms defined democratically and on the basis of consensus.

Brazil counts upon the cooperation of the international community in the field of the environment. Nevertheless, I should like to stress that my country, on its own initiative and with regard to its own legitimate interests, has been consistently demonstrating in a concrete way its willingness to contribute to the international efforts in this area. From 1987 to 1981, deforestation in the Amazon region decreased by 85 per cent as a result of internal measures and of a growing mobilization of Brazilian society in defense of the environment.

This session of the General Assembly is called upon to address the task of taking the first steps in implementing the conclusions of the Conference and in honoring the commitments entered into at Rio. We therefore attribute great importance to the establishment of the Commission on Sustainable Development. Sustainable development requires new and additional financial resources on an adequate and predictable basis, as reflected in chapter 33 of Agenda 21. We expect that, at the present session, the developed countries will announce initial plans to give effect to the goals of the Conference.

Equally crucial is the availability of technology to developing countries, so as to ensure the feasibility of established programs. Action or follow-up measures are also necessary in other areas; among these I stress the development of small island States and the convening of a negotiating committee on desertification.

Brazil wishes to make an additional contribution to the accomplishments of the Rio Conference by offering to host an international centre for studies on sustainable development. We count on public and private support for this initiative, which was welcomed in a resolution adopted at the Conference and for the implementation of which we have already laid the groundwork. As an academic institution, the centre will provide an international research and exchange forum for the application of decisions adopted at Rio.

When I spoke about the dichotomy between the real and the ideal necessary for the construction of a new order, I referred to the great opportunities for cooperation among nations to solve problems in the areas of peace and security, democracy, human rights, development and environment. The world expects the work of the Organization to be concentrated on those priority areas. The capacity for joint action by the United Nations must spring from the voice of each and every Member State. That action becomes all the more legitimate as the basic decision-making process grows more representative and more democratic. Brazil views the ongoing work on the restructuring and revitalization of the economic and social sectors of the United Nations as eminently relevant. It should lead to greater efficiency, together with a wider scope for international cooperation for development.

An agenda for peace cannot overlook the agenda for development. Ultimate success in this enterprise requires a realistic willingness to endow the United Nations with the necessary instruments and the prospective vision to make this universal forum the core of collective efforts for the improvement of relations among peoples and countries.

In Brazil, as elsewhere in Latin America and other regions, bold and necessary reforms have been set in motion to eliminate obstacles to development, to economic competitiveness, to technological progress and to the free exercise of innovation and entrepreneurship based on the market.

Brazil joins other nations with an open mind, aware of the need for creative adaptation to new realities and convinced that new challenges require a vision of the future endowed with generosity.

Public freedoms, individual rights, tolerance and pluralism, the rule of law, international cooperation, peace and sustainable development are, and must be, the unsurpassable philosophy of our times.

To transform these principles into tangible reality for all men and women is the best heirloom that we can transmit to the third millennium generations. The time to start already struck.

New York, September 21, 1992.

1993

1993

At the same time that it felt strengthened by the mature and democratic manner in which it had faced the institutional crisis of the removal of President Collor from office, Brazilian society had to cope with recurring episodes of urban violence. The Candelária and Vigário Geral massacres perpetrated by elements of the police force against street kids and outlaws brought to the national and international conscience the impact of the continuing existence in Brazilian society of imbalances and weaknesses that could compromise the development of the country.

Called on to assume new responsibilities, Minister Fernando Henrique Cardoso left Itamaraty to take up the conduct of the economic and financial policy, negatively affected by a new and particularly strong inflationary outburst. He would be replaced at the head of the Foreign Ministry by Ambassador Celso Amorim. From the Finance Ministry, with the conception and enactment of the Plano Real, Minister Fernando Henrique started on the path that led him to victory in the 1995 presidential elections.

The external picture did not change significantly. The international scenery was still marked by a superstructure of understanding between the big powers and a large number of instances of regional conflicts: Bosnia, Georgia, Tajikistan, Azerbaijan and Somalia were the protagonists of bloody local wars. In Egypt, the growing importance of Islamic integrationist movements and, in Algeria, the coup perpetrated to prevent the elected Islamic fundamentalist elites from taking office marked the

deterioration of stability in the Mediterranean basin. As a positive sign, the peace Treaty signed in September under the auspices of American diplomacy between Israel and the Palestine Liberation Organization (PLO), opened solid prospects for the gradual solution of the entangled problems that make up the so-called Middle Eastern conflict.

In his statement before the Forty-Eighth Session of the General Assembly, Minister Celso Amorim again evoked the North-South emphasis and criticized some of the trends that seemed to take shape in the international debate in favor of concepts such as the "duty of intervention", "good governance" and "ecoprotectionism", which represented manifestations of a certain intention of tutelage by the developed countries.

Ambassador Celso Amorim proposed the updating of the so-called "three D's" expounded by Minister Araújo Castro at the 1983 General Assembly. Disarmament and Development would be kept as fundamental goals of the international community. The other "D", however, would be from "Democracy", replacing "Decolonization" as had been originally suggested, and would encompass the questions of human rights, environment and international security. Celso Amorim extolled Brazilian democracy and pointed out the circumstances that had led to the removal of President Collor from office as demonstrating its solidity.

In this same context, the Minister mentioned the need to endow the international system with characteristics and procedures that allowed the transposition of the democratic advancements observed within national societies to the level of the international relations. He used a conceptual frame to reintroduce in the Brazilian discourse, with particular emphasis, the theme of the reform of the Charter and more concretely the updating of the composition of the Security Council. In the light of the debates that were then starting in order to prepare the commemoration in 1995 of the Fiftieth anniversary of the United Nations, Brazilian diplomacy sought to push forth the candidature of Brazil to a permanent seat in the Council. It was assumed that that would be an opportune moment for the updating of the Charter.

In the chapter about development issues, the Minister proposed the elaboration by the Secretary-General of the United Nations, Boutros Boutros-Ghali, of an "Agenda for Development" symmetrical to the one that he had presented in the previous year under the title of "Agenda for Peace". Taking up an important theme in the Brazilian external

postulation, he condemned attempts at introducing qualifications to the concept of sovereignty.

Referring to the questions of disarmament, the Minister reviewed the progress of Brazil in previous years (agreements with Argentina and the IAEA and entry into force of the Treaty of Tlatelolco) and claimed, as a counterweight, wider access to high technology.

XLVIII Regular Session of the General Assembly of the United Nations 1993

Minister Celso Amorim [*]

Mr. President,

It is with great pleasure that I congratulate you, Sir, and the Republic of Guyana, on your election as President of the General Assembly at its Forty-Eighth Session. In so doing, I wish to reaffirm the traditional ties of friendship between Brazil and Guyana. I am certain that you will contribute to making this session of the General Assembly a landmark in the path towards progress and democracy among nations.

I would also like to express to Mr. Stoyan Ganev, respected jurist from the Republic of Bulgaria and President of the General Assembly at its Forty-Seventh Session, our recognition for the work he accomplished.

The strong and innovative leadership provided by Secretary-General Boutros Boutros-Ghali will continue to be a factor in furthering the work of our Organization.

At the opening of the debate at this Forty-Eighth Session of the General Assembly, we are, once again, being swept by the winds of change. A fresh breeze, bringing us the message that understanding and peace may finally prevail over selfish interest, is blowing from the Near East, cradle of some of the most valuable moral lessons on which our planetary civilization is built.

[*] **Celso Luiz Nunes Amorim**, born in Santos, SP, June 3, 1942. Master in International Relations from the Vienna Diplomatic Academy. Doctor in Political Science/International Relations from the London School of Economics and Political Sciences. Third Secretary 1965. First Class Minister on 12/18/1989. Minister of State for External Relations from 8/31/1993 to 1/18/1995 and from 1/1/2003 to 12/31/2010.

Man's adventure on Earth, driven by reason and by dreams, has unfolded within the tension between self-interest and solidarity. In the dialectic interaction between solidarity and self-interest which has shaped and continues to shape the destinies of mankind, solidarity has just attained a great victory, allowing us greater optimism about the future and about the possibility of the materialization of the perpetual peace of which Immanuel Kant spoke. Indeed, following the high hopes ushered in by the end of the cold war, we were forced to postpone any exclamations of joy as we witnessed the much-heralded new order transform itself into growing disorder, marked by the re-emergence of conflicts rooted in particularisms, which were supposed to be among the closed chapters of history.

We have noticed that the inherent preoccupations of the Cold War have shifted from an East-West axis to a North-South orientation. New concepts have been used to justify discriminatory acts with repercussions for the countries of the South. Some of these concepts were presented under the cloak of humanitarian or moral values, such as the so-called "right of intervention" and "good governance"; others are renewed versions of old practices, such as eco-protectionism. At the same time, the countries of the North tightened their controls on the entry of dispossessed people from the South, many of whom came from former colonies. Thus, peace of mind was to be preserved along with the exclusive privileges of post-industrial society. At the same time, just when they were enjoying new heights of freedom, some of the peoples formerly subjected to authoritarian rule were carried away in nationalistic exaltation, the consequences of which continue to parade before spectators who are as shocked as they are powerless.

It was as "glad tidings", in an almost Biblical sense, that the world welcomed the news that peace and understanding were possible in a region marked up to now by pain and conflict. The handshake between Mr. Yitzhak Rabin and Mr. Yasser Arafat is emblematic of the close of this century, a symbol indicating that history is not over, as some have suggested, but rather that it is just beginning, after a long, dark and turbulent pre-history, in which the mark of Cain has always prevailed over the profound desire for lasting peace felt by all peoples.

In this same spirit, I reiterate the solidarity of Brazil with the Russian people, who continue to face the challenges of the process of democratic transition, which we are confident will succeed in their country.

It is therefore with renewed faith in the ability of mankind to find solutions to the problems it continuously creates for itself that we begin our work at this Forty-Eighth Session of the General Assembly.

Exactly thirty years ago, another Minister of External Relations of Brazil, a career diplomat like myself, Ambassador João Augusto de Araújo Castro, pointed out that the task of the United Nations could be summed up in what he called the "3 D's": Disarmament, Development, Decolonization. Today, with the virtual elimination of the last remnants of colonialism, I could paraphrase him by stating that the international agenda is once again structured around three "D's": Democracy, Development, Disarmament, with their ramifications in the areas of human rights, the environment and international security.

The changes we have witnessed have not been limited to the international sphere. Ethical advancements have also been made in the domestic sphere of countries, where ethics have prevailed over the petty interplay of interests which usually makes up day-Today politics and which leads so many young people to disbelief and to turn away from the ideal of citizenship, without which man cannot fully realize his calling as a social being. I believe that I can proudly assert that my country, Brazil, despite the inherent problems of underdevelopment, has placed itself at the forefront of this "ethicalization" of political relations, which goes far beyond the almost bureaucratic concept of "good governance".

We can still hear the echoes – and the world's most important opinion makers did not fail to register them – of the resounding popular campaign which, in perfect harmony with the legislative and judiciary branches of the Brazilian Government, led to the impeachment of a president. Through an exclusively internal process, which emerged and developed within the Brazilian people and their legitimate representatives, a rarely seen lesson in citizenship was given, by the use of a legal instrument which, though present in other countries, had never been implemented to its ultimate consequences as it was in Brazil. In this process the Brazilian people counted on the support of a press which, with courage and boldness, put to good use the freedom it was once again enjoying after two decades of authoritarian rule.

It is with justifiable pride that I am able to state, before this world assembly, that Brazil has etched a mark – and not a minor one – in the evolution of political institutions. I am certain that the peaceful and strictly legal and constitutional manner in which this transition took place in Brazil will be a necessary reference in books that may come to be written about the history of democracy in our time. I would like to stress that the process which led to this feat – and a feat indeed it was – was set in motion and ran its course neither as the product of any form of external pressure, nor in response to any action inspired by standards of governance imposed

from outside, but solely and exclusively as the result of the deepest sense of citizenship shared by Brazilians of every social class.

Since taking office, President Itamar Franco has imposed upon himself and upon the Government he leads absolute respect for the Constitution and for the laws of the country and, above all, for the unchanging principles of law and ethics. Among the constitutional rights of the human being and of the citizen are those laid down in the Universal Declaration of Human Rights, which our Constitution incorporates and expands upon. Ensuring respect for those rights – in protecting indigenous populations, in safeguarding children and families, in guaranteeing political freedom and access to justice – has been the determined policy of the current Government, and is the challenge we face after a long period in which economic growth and social development did not tread convergent paths.

Within an atmosphere of freedom in which the project of building an open democratic and pluralistic society is moving forward, we are seeking to solve our macroeconomic problems while steering clear of the authoritarian temptation of recourse to technocratic formulas based on closed decision-making structures. Although it may seem, on occasion, more efficient, technocracy tends too frequently to impose excessive sacrifices on the poorest and most vulnerable sectors of the population. The road we are following – that the Government of President Itamar Franco is following – is another, perhaps more complex and arduous one, but certainly one that is more democratic and more capable of leading to consensual and sustainable results.

The Brazilian Government and society are both aware that the difficult issues we are confronted with in the area of human rights are deeply intertwined with the social imbalances inherited from decades of insensitivity rooted in authoritarian rule. Democracy, human rights and development make up another indissoluble triad. None of those terms can be brought to complete fruition in the absence of the other two; that is why the Brazilian Government attaches such importance to the resumption of growth and the expansion of employment along with a fairer distribution of income, the only solid and sustainable basis with which to ensure social development and the full realization of human rights. That is also the reason for the importance attached to programs, such as the program to combat hunger, which have emerged in our society and which can count on the full and resolute support of the Government.

We know only too well, however, that problems in the area of human rights – to which recent incidents that shocked Brazilian society and the world bear witness – cannot wait for development to be

consolidated and for welfare to reach all of society. At the same time as we seek to solve them radically – that is, by attacking their social and economic roots – we must also attend to the more immediate aspects. To this end, the Government is determined to act, at different levels, under the inspiration and the guidance of the President, who is personally committed to this task.

Transparency in the decisions and actions of the Government constitutes an important aspect of Brazilian politics. Such transparency manifests itself in, among other actions, the fluid and cooperative dialogue maintained with segments and organizations of society dedicated to the struggle for the observance of human rights in the country. This open and constructive spirit is not restricted, by the way, within our own borders: we seek and maintain cooperation on issues related to human rights with other countries, intergovernmental and non-governmental organizations, with which we are devising new methods of action for safeguarding the rule of law and in favor of the adequate protection of human rights on the basis of mutual respect.

We do not disregard the fact that impunity may turn out to be the Achilles' heel of any policy aimed at the full implementation of human rights and the elimination of violence. For this reason, the President has personally determined measures – whose implementation he has been following – for every case in which the human rights of children, of indigenous populations, of women or of any citizen have been violated. In this endeavor, he has the support of Brazilian society, which will not tolerate impunity as it did not tolerate corruption and the breach of ethical standards in politics.

With specific reference to indigenous populations, we are currently proceeding with the necessary strengthening of the Government's presence in the Amazon region in order to protect simultaneously the population and the environment, both of which are frequently exposed to predatory activities; these result from an encounter of civilizations that began five centuries ago and extends up to today.

Here again, the dialectics of solidarity and self-interest are at work; the increased effectiveness of actions undertaken by the Brazilian Government in the Amazon region, in conformity with the full and irrevocable exercise of our sovereignty, is fundamental if we are to ensure the protection and defense of all the region's inhabitants and, in particular, those of the Brazilian indigenous protected areas, which amount to the impressive total of over 800,000 square kilometers.

The special importance we attach to human rights in the domestic sphere is also reflected in our diplomatic action, as was evidenced at the World Conference held in Vienna last June. The nomination of Brazil to chair the drafting committee of the Conference was both an honor and a challenge; we offered our collaboration with satisfaction with a view to the Vienna consensus being expressed at the highest and most democratic level. The Vienna Declaration and Program of Action constitute a significant advance in the promotion and protection of human rights, including by refining concepts now unquestionably acknowledged as universal. By reaffirming the interdependence of all human rights, all of which require equal protection, the Declaration recognizes that individual rights become little more than legal fiction if the bearers of such rights and the States which must guarantee them lack the material resources with which to ensure them.

The promotion and the defense of the democratic regime inside each country are not sufficient: a vigorous effort of democratization of international relations is essential, in conformity with two notable phenomena of current times: the wide consensus on the advantages of representative democracy and the growing linkage between the domestic and the international spheres. This twofold perception leads us of necessity to the recognition that the democratic ideal is applicable with equal validity to relations between nations.

We note with satisfaction the establishment of a virtual consensus on the need to update the composition of the Security Council. It is our understanding that the growing role of the Council in matters which affect the fundamental interests of Member States corresponds to the need to ensure a more representative composition, and so enhance the Council's legitimacy and its efficiency. The reform of the Council must be achieved in such a way as not to aggravate further the imbalance between developed and developing countries in the decision-making process of the United Nations. The General Assembly, as the definitive democratic organ within the United Nations system, must play a decisive role in shaping that process.

The democratization of relations between nations demands that the international order protect them and guarantee their rights against illicit acts and abuses of power. There can be no democratic society if the rule of law is not strictly observed and if the less powerful are not sheltered from arbitrary acts by those who wield force and power. In today's world, it is no longer admissible to say, in the words of Pascal's well-known aphorism, that "as it was not possible to make the righteous mighty, the mighty were made righteous".

The material progress of peoples is to a large extent the product of their own, irreplaceable efforts. It is beyond doubt, however, that such progress is contingent upon the prevalence of a favorable external environment. It is therefore imperative that international society, acting in solidarity, encourage the creation of conditions for progress, not for the preservation of privilege.

Apart from its intrinsic importance, the development of all nations is the only factor that can genuinely reduce the imbalances that are so patently expressed, for instance, in the growing flow of migrants and refugees. In a global society, social justice becomes an indispensable condition for preventing crises, for alleviating tension, for consolidating democracy and for promoting human rights.

If we are to undertake a wide-ranging exercise of preventive diplomacy we must realize that only socially and environmentally sustainable economic development provides an effective means to accomplish our goals.

In the pursuit of development the United Nations has a fundamental role to play. We must make sure that the Organization will act urgently to impart renewed life to its commitment to development and, therefore, also its capacities in the economic and social field. Imbued with this hope, Brazil has supported and continues to support vigorously the initiative of an agenda for development. We are confident that the Secretary-General will present us with a proposal that will be no less innovative, bold and rich in ideas than was "An Agenda for Peace".

Similarly, great store is set by the work of the Commission on Sustainable Development. Brazil expects the Commission to be an effective tool for putting into effect the commitments undertaken in Rio de Janeiro in 1992.

In the same vein we give our wholehearted support to the holding of the World Summit for Social Development, a most timely initiative of the Government of Chile, a country to which we are linked by close ties of South American brotherhood and partnership in the Rio Group.

We should not however be misguided by illusions.

Only a dynamic insertion in the cross-currents of trade and technology will allow developing countries to reap their fair share of the fruits of progress. To that end we advocate a strengthened multilateral trading system that can guarantee both an adequate reward for our effort at trade liberalization and a normative framework to discourage protectionism and unilateral measures. Today that entails the need for a prompt and balanced conclusion of the Uruguay Round, without

discrimination or impositions. The significance of the Uruguay Round projects far beyond its strictly commercial aspects. Its successful outcome will be instrumental in framing an international order that is open and propitious for cooperation, thus preventing a splintering of economic relations into self-contained blocs.

The vigorous involvement of the community of nations in the pursuit of development must be consonant with the principle of State sovereignty. Brazil views the sovereign nation-State as the basis for the legal and political international order. It must not be weakened lest we undermine the very basis of international representation and of the multilateral system. Attempts to play down the principle of national sovereignty - which incidentally are hardly ever targeted at the more powerful States - would be a step backwards in the effort towards more democratic international relations. At a moment when we are building the future multilateral system we should not allow differences in power among nations to replace the sovereign equality of States. The warning sounded by Ruy Barbosa, the distinguished Brazilian jurist and statesman, at the Second Peace Conference of the Hague in 1907, remains fully valid. In discussing the composition of the Permanent Court of Arbitration he stressed that if certain proposals were to prevail, then:

> The great Powers would no longer be more formidable only as a result of the strength of their armies or of their fleets. They would also enjoy a superior legal status in the international judicial forum, thus claiming a privileged situation in the very institution to which the administration of justice among nations is to be entrusted.

The international order we seek to build rests also on a third pillar, that of disarmament. Brazil, along with its neighbors and partners in Latin America, particularly Argentina, has been making an important contribution to advancing disarmament and international security.

The revision of the Treaty of Tlatelolco, the establishment and work of the Brazil-Argentina Agency for Accounting and Control of Nuclear Material (ABACC) and the Quadripartite Agreement on International Atomic Energy Agency (IAEA) Safeguards, which have just been approved by the Brazilian Chamber of Deputies, thus meeting an important requirement for ratification, provide the international community with the guarantees of our commitment to the peaceful use of nuclear energy.

We reaffirm our support for the non-proliferation, in all its forms, of weapons of mass destruction. In relation to chemical weapons, we, with Chile and Argentina, have already signed the Mendoza Declaration in which we solemnly renounced the possession and production of such weapons. We were equally active participants in the process that led to the adoption of the Convention on the Prohibition of the Development, Production, Stockpiling and Use of Chemical Weapons and on Their Destruction, signed in Paris early this year.

We are gratified by the current observance, although on a somewhat fragile basis, of a moratorium on nuclear tests. We hope that the climate resulting from this moratorium will bring forth the early conclusion, through multilateral negotiations, of a comprehensive nuclear-test-ban treaty.

Brazil, as is well known, has been participating in a clearly positive and transparent way in the process of establishing the United Nations Register of Conventional Arms.

Brazil's experience in the field of peace-building and confidence-building is noteworthy. Brazil shares almost 17,000 kilometers of land borders with 10 different neighboring countries. No other nation has had uninterrupted relations of peace and cooperation for so long and with so many neighboring States. Very few countries spend as little on arms – as a percentage of national product – as Brazil.

At the same time Brazil does not renounce its right to maintain, in good harmony with its neighbors and partners, an adequate and legitimate defense capacity. Nor does it renounce its right to have access to technology necessary for the well-being of the Brazilian people.

By undertaking firm and unambiguous commitments in the field of non-proliferation and disarmament, Brazil believes it is entitled to expect from its more developed partners unimpeded access to high technology, if necessary on a commercial basis.

Recent history gives proof that, despite persistent and serious shortcomings, United Nations peacekeeping operations are important for overcoming situations of conflict, some of which are quite old, complex and delicate. The need for an improved conceptual framework for peace-keeping operations must be kept under constant review by the General Assembly. It is expected that the United Nations will contribute with sober effectiveness to maintaining peace and security wherever they may be threatened. Brazil currently participates with a significant contingent of military observers in United Nations peacekeeping efforts. We intend to expand our presence in this field and we are actively examining ways and means to do this.

Within that context it is essential to rectify the serious political and strategic mistake of envisaging the South as an area of international instability. Quite the contrary, various regions such as Latin America provide examples of stable relations of cooperation based on mutual trust; as illustrated by the vigorous processes of Latin American integration which, far beyond their mercantile aspects, are the material expression of a political project aimed at international cooperation and solidarity. Such processes, including that of the Common Market of the South (MERCOSUR), are in stark contrast with the trends of fragmentation seen in other parts of the world.

Yet another clear demonstration of the potential for cooperation is taking shape in the Community of Portuguese Speaking Countries. Far more than a means of expression, "lusophonia" is the hallmark of a frame of mind, a form of being, a way of life predicated on tolerance and open relations among different peoples.

The Zone of Peace and Cooperation of the South Atlantic reinforces our links to sister nations in Africa. The enhancement of political and economic relations within the Zone of Peace and Cooperation of the South Atlantic is a goal towards which we are determined to work, having regard, among other issues, to the constitution of a vast area free of the nuclear threat. We furthermore expect to have the pleasure of celebrating the full admission to the South Atlantic community of a democratic and united South Africa, free forever from the scourge of racism.

The historic speech delivered by Mr. Nelson Mandela just a few days ago from this same rostrum warrants the expectation and confirms the idea that in spite of remaining obstacles the process of democratization in South Africa is now irreversible.

We are forced to admit that serious areas of tension continue to exist in the world. By virtue of our historical ties of friendship, cooperation and cultural kinship with Angola, the situation in that country is of particular concern to us. The international community, through the United Nations, has a fundamental role to play in the defense of democracy in Angola and in the utter rejection of the use of force as a means of achieving political gains. Peace must prevail in Angola in full compliance with the Bicesse Accords and all the relevant resolutions of the Security Council.

We remain gravely concerned about the situation of human rights and democracy in Haiti. The prospect for a prompt solution to the crisis in that country is high on our agenda. We look forward to the return of President Jean Bertrand Aristide on October 30.

The restoration of peace in the former Yugoslavia is a priority for the international community in order to bring to an end the suffering of the populations involved in that conflict. A willingness to achieve agreements acceptable to all parties must prevail in Geneva, as in the capitals of the former federation. That willingness alone can enable the United Nations to play its irreplaceable role in bringing peace to that region.

Our example, and our response to these challenges, will frame the future order to which we all aspire: an order that is democratic, stable, disarmed and committed to the material and spiritual development of all nations.

The humanistic vision that inspires us was forcefully expressed by a Brazilian poet and diplomat, João Cabral de Melo Neto, in these words: "Learn this: that man is the best measure always. And more: that life, not death, is the measure of man."

NewY ork, September 27,1993.

1994

1994

The Brazilian internal panorama in 1994 was dominated by the electoral campaign and the introduction of Plano Real. The success of the Plan, which responded to a deep yearning of the Brazilian society for monetary stability, would be decisive for the victory of the Fernando Henrique Cardoso in the first round of the October 3 elections.

Externally, positive developments included the election and inauguration of Nelson Mandela at the head of the South African government, officially ending the *apartheid* regime; the signature of a peace agreement between Israel and Jordan; another link in the chain of solutions for the Middle East conflict; the implementation of Palestine autonomy in Gaza and Jericho, with the return of the political leader of PLO Yasser Arafat; arrangements for peace in Algeria; and the return to power in Haiti of President Aristide, after an action directed by the United States. On the negative side, the persistence and in certain cases the worsening of conflicts in Bosnia, Afghanistan, Yemen and Rwanda, as well as the radicalization of fundamentalist movements in Mediterranean Basin countries were noted.

The European Union was again expanded, this time to include Austria, Finland and Sweden and encompass fifteen countries. MERCOSUR, on its part, after protracted negotiations, arrived at an agreement on the question of a common external tariff, which permitted the achievement on schedule of the timetable set for the Customs Union

and for the progression of the organization of the Common Market with Brazil, Argentina, Uruguay and Paraguay.

Speaking once again at the General Assembly in 1994, just before the elections which would be won by President Fernando Henrique Cardoso, Minister Celso Amorim made at the Forty-Ninth Session a statement of an analytic nature which also contained several demands.

The speech opened with a positive evaluation of the evolution of the international conjuncture after the Cold War, counterbalanced by an inventory of new problems that affected peace and stability in several regions: local crises, social inequalities on a global scale, neo-protectionist practices in international trade and hindrances to the access to technology. The Minister made an extensive and forceful mention to the question of Cuba, a country that at the time was being approached through diplomatic action by Itamaraty.

In order to solve the remaining problems in the international macrostructure, Minister Celso Amorim took up another traditional line of the Brazilian discourse by suggesting a "new utopia" based of a pluralistic and democratic perspective, committed to development. He also formally proposed the convening of a United Nations Conference on Development.

Extending the range of the formulations contained in his speech of the previous year, Minister Celso Amorim offered in 1994 an expanded and objective account of Brazilian intentions regarding the reform of the Security Council. He supported the expansion of the Council and the participation of developing countries in all categories of its members. Basing his argument in formulations especially turned toward the Latin-American circumstance of Brazil, made an express claim for a permanent seat for the country: "We have made clear our willingness to assume all responsibilities inherent to countries that qualify for permanent seats".

XLIX Regular Session of the General Assembly of the United Nations
1994

Minister Celso Amorim[*]

Mr. President,

It is with great pleasure that I present my compliments to you, Mr. Amara Essy, Minister of Foreign Affairs of the Republic of Côte d'Ivoire, and congratulate you on your election to the presidency of the General Assembly at its current session.

I would also like to extend my recognition to Ambassador Samuel Insanally, who, as President of the Assembly at its Forty-Eighth Session, dignified not only his own country, Guyana, but all the countries of the Amazon and South American region as well. I also greet the Secretary-General, Mr. Boutros Boutros-Ghali, to whom I convey my gratitude for the tireless efforts he has been undertaking at the head of this Organization.

The close of this century is marked by the force of transformation. In the last few years there has been prodigious change. This has been of such a radical nature that we could, like Hamlet, say that "The time is out of joint" (Shakespeare, Hamlet, Act I, scene v). The process has been so fascinating that some have deluded themselves with the fantasy that the future is already under control. That is not the case. Transformation does not have a fixed, inexorable course. We must not allow ourselves

[*] **Celso Luiz Nunes Amorim**, born in Santos, SP, June 3, 1942. Master in International Relations from the Vienna Diplomatic Academy. Doctor in Political Science/International Relations from the London School of Economics and Political Sciences. Third Secretary 1965. First Class Minister on 12/18/1989. Minister of State for External Relations from 8/31/1993 to 1/18/1995 and from 1/1/2003 to 12/31/2010.

to be enticed by hasty interpretations or by mere appearances. It is our responsibility to give meaning to change and to guide trends in accordance with the greater interests of the world community.

It will be five years next November since the Berlin Wall crumbled. That period is sufficient for evaluating the distances that have been covered and, above all, for charting a course that will lead us to a safe harbor. The cold war took place under the sign of denial, a situation reflected even in the language that marked the period. The expressions that identified and explained almost 40 years of tense relationships denoted confrontation, exclusion or, at best, uncomfortable coexistence of opposites. The catchphrases of the day were "iron curtain", "containment" and "balance of terror".

Today we are in the midst of transition. Taking stock of these last few years, we can say that the results, though tenuous and imperfect, are positive. The cause of peace has made significant headway. Nuclear war has ceased to be an impending threat. Conflicts which many of us judged insoluble either have been or are in the process of being settled through dialogue and negotiation. In southern Africa and in the Middle East, steps of historic significance have been taken toward a more just and a more peaceful world. In Central America and in South-East Asia, progress is tangible. Throughout the greater part of our planet, the logic of confrontation is giving way to the logic of cooperation.

It is that very logic that we wish to see firmly established in our own region. Peace and fraternity are Latin America's vocation. We have been striving to bring the sister Republic of Cuba fully into the inter-American and international fold by means of a policy of outstretched hands, of dialogue and of rapprochement. Political, economic and commercial isolation, apart from being unjustifiable, only contributes to aggravating the hardship endured by the Cuban people at a time when we perceive positive indications of democratic reform and of reconciliation. Here too the stasis of confrontation must give way to the dynamics of dialogue, putting to rest this remnant of the cold war.

Given a set of entirely different characteristics, we are equally interested in promoting a lasting solution to the Haitian crisis, the return to office of President Jean Bertrand Aristide, and national reconciliation. The diplomatic efforts of the international community, which we firmly support, must have as their point of reference the prompt removal of the de facto authorities by peaceful means – the only means to avoid even greater suffering for the Haitian people. We consider it disturbing that the principles of non-intervention and self-determination are the object

of interpretations that are incompatible with the charters of the United Nations and of the Organization of American States. The gravity of the Haitian crisis and the urgency of the need to solve it do not make us unable to see the inherent risks of a situation that evokes traumas and scars that are still very vivid in the memory of Latin America. Once the legitimate Government is re-established, it will be the responsibility of the international community to provide Haiti with assistance in the daunting task of national reconstruction.

We are still far from universal peace. Conflicts of enormous cruelty shock the world and are the cause of unspeakable suffering for millions of human beings. Rwanda and Bosnia and Herzegovina are emblematic tragedies of our times. The scenes of horror shown by the media attest to the difficulty of finding effective solutions to the imbalances which challenge all peoples. The intensification of migratory flows toward developed countries has been accompanied by an exacerbation of xenophobia and racial discrimination.

Critical situations continue to challenge the international community's ability to ensure peace and harmony. In Angola, a country so closely linked to Brazil by historic and cultural ties, we witness with pain and indignation the prolongation of a conflict that is the longest and most devastating civil war today. We are encouraged by the prospects that the negotiations under way in Lusaka between the Government of Angola and UNITA may be promptly concluded. In paying a tribute to President José Eduardo dos Santos for his political conduct, we urge UNITA to demonstrate a real commitment to stability and peace in the country, and we call upon all those with an influence on the Angolan crisis to do likewise.

We welcome the progress achieved in Mozambique. The process of national reconciliation will culminate in the general elections to be held next October, when the people of Mozambique will be able to choose, in free and fair elections, the government that will lead the country in this new era of its history. President Joaquim Chissano has played a central role in this process. Brazil takes pride in the fact that Brazilian troops are participating, through the United Nations Operation in Mozambique (ONUMOZ), in the reconstruction of Mozambique.

In the case of East Timor, we have also noted positive signals in the negotiating process promoted by the Secretary-General, to whom we pay a tribute.

Democracy and the values associated with it are the greatest conquest of our time. We are experiencing an ethical revolution. The

concern with human rights gains universality alongside a growing awareness of the imperative of public probity. The international context has ceased to be the exclusive domain of the *raison d'etat* and has acquired a more human dimension directed to the welfare of the individual.

In the economic and commercial sphere, recent developments are also positive. After eight years of difficult negotiations within the Uruguay Round of the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade (GATT), we adopted the Marrakesh agreements. The World Trade Organization (WTO) will open up new and promising outlooks for the economic relationship among nations. Unilateralism and protectionism, derived from parochial interests, will lose any semblance of legitimacy.

The effective progress achieved cannot obscure the fact that there are challenges that continue to demand firm resolve from the international community.

The fundamental rights of individuals, despite having been incorporated into the realm of universally recognized values, still demand the firm and decided support of all those who believe in them.

The social conditions of the majority of the world's population continue to deteriorate. In the last 20 years, the gap has widened between rich and poor nations, between the millions of people who are adequately fed and educated and have a surplus for leisure and the billions who are struggling for survival. The pressures for migration toward the developed North and the many conflicts of the impoverished South are two sides of the same coin. Youth, in particular, continues to be a victim of deprivation and of a lack of prospects in most of the world.

The globalization of the economy and the strengthening of free trade have yet to demonstrate in practice their undeniable potential as factors of growth and well-being. Lingering protectionism, now draped in new colors, resists the assault of economic rationality. The positive impact of the Marrakesh agreements is under substantial threat from new conditionalities that will have a restrictive effect on the flows of international trade. Issues that are in themselves legitimate such as the protection of the environment and universally accepted labor standards cannot and should not serve as pretexts for even greater barriers to the access of goods produced in poor countries to the markets of wealthier nations. The cost of readjustment of the most prosperous economies cannot be shunted onto the shoulders of those who possess little or nothing.

The mastery of technology is a major watershed between industrialized and developing countries. The difficulties in access to advanced technologies are an obstacle to overcoming the disadvantages of developing countries, reducing their competitiveness and creating barriers

to the transformation of productive processes. The new international division of labor cannot re-enact past formulas that have proved to be inefficient. The competitive integration of developing countries into the world economy must build upon dynamic comparative advantages, not static ones, with an increasing integration of knowledge into the productive process. Alongside the indispensable internal efforts of each country, such a qualitative leap requires an international environment based on cooperation.

In order to consolidate peace and ensure that the progress already achieved shall be irreversible, we must be able to develop a vision for our future, an attainable and forward-looking Utopia. Brazil is convinced that a truly new order must be based on a pluralistic and democratic perspective on international relations.

We do not contend unrealistically that States and other international players will refrain from affirming their specific and often conflicting interests. The fact is that we all stand to gain, and our interests will be better served, once the basic aspirations of the great majority have been reasonably satisfied.

Interdependence must be understood in an integrated way, and not merely as the expression of a market economy phenomenon. It presupposes the political ability to act in coordination with others toward the fulfillment of objectives shared by all mankind. In an interdependent world the improvement of living conditions in a poor country may have an impact on the creation of jobs in a developed nation. The integration of those that are excluded and the promotion of participation by all in world affairs is not only a moral obligation, but, first and foremost, a demonstration of lucid judgment.

The fundamental commitment to development is the cornerstone of the order to which Brazil aspires. This concept has the advantage of encompassing the essential needs of all nations, large and small, rich and poor. Development reinforces freedom, invests the dignity of man with a concrete dimension, stresses efficiency, promotes stability and enhances democracy. Development builds peace.

The promotion of development stands to benefit from the lessons of the past. We must formulate a concept of development that recognizes each country as the main actor in creating its own prosperity, while incorporating the various features of its international dimension in the fields of trade, investment and flows of technology.

A renewed international effort in favor of development will be successful only under an active and mutually advantageous partnership

between the countries of the North and those of the South. Advancement of the interests of the richer nations requires their involvement in efforts to overcome the backwardness of the less prosperous. To hold the opposite view would be tantamount to believing that a fire in our neighbor's house cannot reach over the fence into our own. In short, it is an absurdity the price of which even the wealthiest cannot afford.

The nations of the world have a fundamental role to play in the construction of an open and equitable international system.

We must undertake a profound reformulation of the United Nations performance in promoting development. No other task under the United Nations mandate will more adequately support and promote peace and establish a just and stable order.

We must avoid the crystallization of an undesirable division of labor between the United Nations on the one hand and the Bretton Woods institutions on the other. Peace and development constitute an indivisible whole and must support each other. This great forum cannot be kept outside decisions on matters arising from objectives inscribed in its very Charter.

These concerns have been at the root of the launching of the Agenda for Development, in which Brazilian diplomacy has been deeply involved.

Several United Nations Conferences, some having already taken place, others yet to come, are significantly contributing to shedding light upon the need for a comprehensive and coordinated consideration of the development issue. In one way or another, development was a central concern, or will continue to be so, in Rio de Janeiro at the Conference on Environment and Development, in Vienna at the Conference on Human

Rights, and in Cairo at the Conference on Population and Development, and it will continue to be so in the forthcoming meetings in Copenhagen on Social Development, and in Beijing, on Women. Awareness of the fact that the decisions reached at these encounters will produce effective results only if all these issues are examined in an integrated fashion is becoming increasingly firm and universal.

With a view to fostering a debate on all such issues in a wider conceptual framework, the Brazilian Government proposes the convening of a United Nations conference on development, possibly in 1996, which would seek to synthesize the initiatives and programs designed to promote human dignity and well-being.

Democracy should be the rule for political relations within and among States. To bring democracy into politics and international relations is a goal which can be turned into reality. The strengthening of the role

of the General Assembly and the expansion of the Security Council, with the participation of developing countries in all member categories are important and necessary steps on the road to democratization and greater legitimacy.

Like other Member States, we favor a reform of the Security Council that will increase its effectiveness. We understand that such effectiveness will be ensured only by a composition truly representative of the world community. At the beginning of this month the Heads of State and Government of the 14 nations from Latin America and the Caribbean which form the Group of Rio met in Rio de Janeiro and stated that "in accordance with their legal tradition and their contribution to the cause of peace, the Latin American and Caribbean region must be included in any expansion of the Security Council".

Brazil has participated actively in the debate on the expansion of the Security Council. We have clearly stated our readiness to assume all responsibilities required of countries eligible to occupy permanent seats.

Elected to the Security Council for the current period, Brazil has lived up to its responsibilities. We have based our positions on respect for principles such as non-intervention, as well as on the sovereignty and territorial integrity of States; we have consistently favored peaceful and negotiated solutions to conflicts, as well as consensus; we have stood by the rule of law in safeguarding the international public order; we have risen in defense of human rights and fundamental freedoms; and we have increasingly participated in peacekeeping operations in several regions of the globe.

As part of Latin America, we are proud of sharing its long history of peace. Latin America is the least armed region of the world and the only one to have become, by virtue of the Treaty of Tlatelolco, definitively free from nuclear weapons. Cuba's adherence to the Treaty, announced in a letter from President Fidel Castro to President Itamar Franco – in response to a Brazilian initiative – has brought this process to a conclusion.

Latin America has been a factor of international stability in a turbulent world. Our legal tradition, built through decades of efforts to regulate inter-American relations, represents a relevant contribution to the international community. As pioneers in the promotion of disarmament, we feel entitled to seek equivalent gestures from the entire international community, and in particular from the nuclear-weapon States. In this context, we attribute special significance to the prompt adoption, through multilaterally negotiated commitments, of effective measures to reduce, and not merely control, their arsenals, including

sensitive nuclear material such as plutonium. It is likewise imperative that negotiations on a comprehensive test-ban treaty be successfully concluded, leading to signature.

Brazil is ready to join in the construction of a new international agenda based on universal participation and cooperation for peace and development.

This readiness derives from our own identity. We are a pluralist and open society, having emerged from the meeting of different cultures and ways of life, which in turn produced a new culture and way of life, founded on tolerance and understanding. We enjoy peacefully defined borders with 10 neighboring countries, and an absence of conflicts for more than 120 years.

Forged through dialogue, conciliation and peaceful reform, Brazilian society is experiencing a moment of intense democratic affirmation under the leadership of President Itamar Franco. In a few days we shall be holding the largest elections in our country's history. Nearly 100 mil1ion voters will cast their ballots, in an atmosphere of absolute freedom, to choose their representatives in the executive and legislative branches at the State and federal levels from as many as 35,000 candidates.

Ours is one of the most diversified economies in the southern hemisphere. As we head toward economic stability, with a strong currency, conditions become favorable for the resumption of a sustained process of economic growth which will undoubtedly place Brazil once again among the most dynamic economies in the world.

We have made important advances in increasing the exposure of our economy to world trade. As of next January, we will have brought into force a common external tariff, along with Argentina, Paraguay and Uruguay, and wil1 have consolidated a Customs Union capable of generating growth and prosperity, one of the first customs unions among developing countries. The interest expressed by other South American countries in joining MERCOSUR – Common Market of the South – provides ample proof that the vision of a South American free trade area is gradually materializing. These accomplishments represent a telling example of the enterprising capacity of Latin American nations, and constitute a fundamental step toward a harmonious and integrated South America.

Our efforts in developing political and economic cooperation go well beyond Latin America. In line with the universal inspiration of our diplomacy, we have set out to reinforce the ties that associate us to friendly nations in all regions of the globe, as well as to expand into new and

important political and commercial partnerships. Such actions range from the intensification of traditional relations within our hemisphere and with industrialized countries to new and creative formulas for cooperating with countries in Africa, Asia and the Middle East. In all cases, we have tried to raise the dialogue to increasingly higher levels and, in many instances, have succeeded in establishing dynamic and privileged relationships.

The ties between Brazil and African nations have been strengthened through the action taken to give structure to the community of Portuguese-speaking countries. This new and important forum will unite our brothers and sisters on different continents and lead to even greater understanding and cooperation.

Beginning in the South Atlantic which we share, we intend to expand the horizons of cooperation between America and Africa, with the added strength, in the political and moral spheres, brought about by the election of Nelson Mandela in the new South Africa.

The zone of peace and cooperation of the South Atlantic will transform this area into a zone free of nuclear weapons, constituting an example of solidarity and brotherhood between two continents. With this objective in mind, the 24 countries that make up this forum have just met in Brasília, with very encouraging results for friendship between Africa and South America.

Brazil desires for itself what it desires for each and every other nation. We know that there can be no happiness and prosperity in the midst of strife and misfortune. Together with the family of nations, Brazil, which does not countenance any form of hegemony, seeks to move forward in a spirit of confidence toward the creation of a world order responsive to the aspirations for democracy, stability, disarmament and respect for the sovereignty of States and a world order committed to development.

New York, September 26, 1994.

1995

1995

In 1995 the international conjuncture was dominated by the persistence of serious conflict situations in the former Yugoslavia. After several episodes in which the United Nations peacekeeping forces were seriously threatened, NATO decided to intervene by means of air strikes aiming at reinforcing the Bosnian and Croat positions and bring Serbian forces to the negotiating table. At the opening of the Fiftieth Session of the General Assembly an agreement was taking shape, under American pressure, toward the establishment of a Bosnian State composed of two entities: one representing the Bosnian-Croat majority and another the Serb-Bosnian minority. Meanwhile, despite recurring obstacles due to the persistence of acts of violence coming from radical sectors on both sides, it was possible to progress on the path of pacification between Israel and the Palestine territories, by means of the signature of new instruments designed to improve the Palestinian self-government capacity.

Thus, the international scene remained characterized by a precarious combination of negative and positive factors, which were also reflected in the persistent volatility of the capital and currency markets. The difficulty shown by the chief developed economies to overcome recession and unemployment, the worsening of trade conflicts between the United States and Japan, as well as the consequences of the Mexican crisis on emerging markets became, for their part, additional factors of instability.

The victory of Fernando Henrique Cardoso in the first round of the presidential elections in November 1994 brought positive changes in the internal political dynamics of the country and permitted the restart of the process of competitive insertion of Brazil in the world. On the internal level, the success of the *Plano Real* provoked a sharp and constant fall of the rate of inflation and made possible the creation of conditions for the stability of the economy. At the same time, thanks to the configuration of a wide basis of political support, the administration could kick off the process of Constitutional reform, a fundamental requirement for the consolidation of prospects of stability and long term durability of the *Plano Real* and for the economic and social development of the country.

On the external level, the Cardoso administration devoted itself to the consolidation of the image of renewal and stability. Once the initial obstacles stemming from the Mexican crisis of December 1994 and from the ensuing instability that almost affected the economy of Argentina were surmounted, Brazil was again in a favorable position to attract investments and external resources, thanks to the success of the *Plano Real* and the start of the process of Constitutional revision. An important program of international travel took President Fernando Henrique Cardoso to the United States and Europe with good prospects for the strengthening of political, economic and financial relations of Brazil with its chief developed partners. At the same time, important and consistent steps were taken toward the continuing consolidation of MERCOSUR. In this period Brazilian diplomacy played a distinctive role in the articulation of the successful efforts of the guarantors of the Rio de Janeiro Protocol with a view to overcoming the situation of armed conflict arisen between Peru and Ecuador.

In his statement before the Fiftieth Session of the General Assembly, Minister Luiz Felipe Lampreia highlighted the changes that had taken place in Brazil, stressing the consolidation of democracy and the stabilization of the economy as decisive steps for the projection of Brazil in the world. When referring to the international situation, the Minister compared the progress achieved with the end of the Cold War and the positive events in the Middle East, Africa and Latin America with the persistence of hotbeds of tension in several regions, and described the war in the former Yugoslavia as "a living example of past failures and of the present challenges and mistaken perceptions".

The Minister also stressed, in tune with the main traditional postures of Brazilian diplomacy, the urgent need for the United Nations to be given the appropriate tools to face the set of problems deriving from

the persistence of development conditions that affect the wide majority of mankind. He did not neglect to mention the proposal made by President Cardoso to the effect that the international community should take effective measures to bypass the problems created by the volatility of the international flows of financial capital and to strengthen the World Trade Organization as the mainstay of an open and non-discriminatory system of international trade.

Particularly significant – in the face of the initiative taken by the French a few weeks before – was the condemnation by Minister Lampreia of the resumption of nuclear tests, branded as a risk to the environment and an encouragement to the arms race.

In the context of the observance of the Fiftieth anniversary of the foundation of the United Nations, the Minister assessed the trajectory of the Organization with special emphasis on the question of the reform of the system, in particular the Security Council, a theme to which the Brazilian delegation had ascribed great importance throughout the year. Minister Lampreia made clear in his speech the willingness of Brazil to contribute to a reform that would involve a qualitative increase in the number of permanent members of the Council capable of contemplating developing countries having global projection and that would, at the same time, expand the participation of non-permanent members. Affirming that the reform did not involve the individual prestige of any country, but rather the prestige of the Security Council itself, the Minister insisted on the need to give to that central organ of the United Nations greater authority and effectiveness in the fulfillment of its responsibilities.

L Regular Session of the General Assembly of the United Nations
1995

Minister Luiz Felipe Lampreia [*]

Mr. President,

It gives me great pleasure to make use of our common language to congratulate you, Sir, on your election. We are honored to see a Portuguese statesman, a friend of Brazil, and a representative of our commonwealth of Portuguese-speaking countries presiding over this session of the General Assembly, a session that is bound to become a milestone in the history of the United Nations. My Government is confident that, under your skilled guidance, our deliberations will forge the kind of understanding and commitment capable of asserting the credibility and pre-eminence of our Organization in world affairs.

Let me also express our heartfelt appreciation to another friend of Brazil, Minister Amara Essy of Côte d'Ivoire, for his outstanding work at the helm of the Forty-Ninth Session of the General Assembly.

I wish to congratulate the Secretary-General, Mr. Boutros Boutros-Ghali, and the Secretariat for their continued dedication to the United Nations and for their relentless work in carrying out their duties to the international community.

In opening this debate today, Brazil wishes to renew its unwavering commitment to the principles and purposes embodied in the Charter of the United Nations. These principles and purposes set a mandate for

[*] **Luiz Felipe Palmeira Lampreia**, born in Rio de Janeiro, RJ, October 19, 1941. Third Secretary on 11/7/63. First Class Minister 6/29/84. Minister of State for External Relations from 1/1/95 to 2001.

peace and development, and are as relevant today as they were 50 years ago. They coincide entirely with the aspirations of Brazilian society. Our Constitution reflects them as the supreme values of our political and social life in democracy.

I am proud to address the Assembly as the representative of a country that has widened its commitments to democracy and human rights, to sustainable development with economic stability, to peace and disarmament - a country at peace with itself, constantly striving to extend its presence in the world by strengthening traditional partnerships and fostering new ones. We expect from our partners an attitude of cooperation commensurate with Brazil's growing participation in world markets and with its contribution to international peace and security.

Democracy in Brazil continues to show extraordinary vitality under the leadership of President Fernando Henrique Cardoso. Our institutional framework is being strengthened, and progress in the social sphere is generating a renewed sense of citizenship among Brazilians.

While strictly enforcing existing mechanisms, President Cardoso is proposing legislation that will ensure the full observance of human rights. Both at home and abroad, Brazil's human rights policies are based on transparency and full cooperation with civil society. Together with strong governmental action to tackle the country's social problems, measures to promote and protect human rights will greatly contribute to redress the unjust distribution of wealth that unfortunately still prevails in Brazil.

Long-needed structural reforms and privatization are being carried out, paving the way for the consolidation of economic stability and sustained economic growth.

Brazil has achieved a high degree of economic openness, thus accelerating its integration into the international economy and creating more favourable conditions for increased participation in international trade, technology transfers and productive capital flows. Inflation has been reduced to the lowest level in a quarter of a century, allowing the country to pursue policies that benefit the poor and the underprivileged.

We are also engaged in a broad and dynamic process of open economic integration with our neighbors, adding economic substance to the political harmony that we enjoy in our region. MERCOSUR – a customs union bringing together Brazil, Argentina, Paraguay and Uruguay – is a highly successful political and economic reality, a partner ready for business and cooperation with all countries and regions.

Brazil has taken significant steps to further strengthen its commitments to disarmament and to the non-proliferation of weapons

of mass destruction. President Cardoso publicly stated that Brazil has forgone the development, acquisition and export of long-range military missiles. Congress is about to approve the Chemical Weapons Convention, and comprehensive legislation on export controls of dual-use technology is being finalized. Having decided unilaterally to abide by the Missile Technology Control Regime's guidelines, the Brazilian Government is currently discussing its participation in the regime.

Brazil's commitment to peace and understanding was clearly illustrated by its recent role, alongside the other three Guarantor countries of the Rio de Janeiro Protocol, in bringing together two friendly nations in our region, Ecuador and Peru.

Brazilian forces are actively participating in various United Nations peacekeeping efforts, particularly in Angola, a country that shares with Brazil a common heritage and is finally on the verge of healing the wounds inflicted by years of internal strife. We are also proud of the role played by our Government and our forces in the peaceful transition to an elected government in Mozambique.

After too many years of difficulties, Brazilians have recovered their pride. The country has entered a cycle of long-term growth and greater long-term opportunities, an era of optimism and confidence. It is in this spirit that Brazilian diplomacy is prepared to approach the world and to work within the United Nations.

As I reflect upon the events that have taken place over this past year, I am tempted to say that it has been a time for legitimate hope, but also a time of fear and horror; a time for accomplishments, but also a time of frustration; a time for confidence in a brighter future for mankind, but also a time of regret for the fact that peace, freedom, justice and well-being are still unattained in many places in the world; a time in which risks and opportunities coexist side by side.

Current patterns in international affairs converge on the twin concepts that inspired the revolution of the 1990s: democracy and economic freedom with social justice. This is the main thrust that will shape the coming century and ensure liberty and prosperity for all.

The very concept of power has changed. A country's sovereignty and its capacity to satisfy the needs of its people depend increasingly on good social indicators, political stability, economic competitiveness, and scientific and technological progress, not on military strength. It is now widely understood that the fulfillment of national pride lies in democracy, development, trade and economic wealth, rather than in the quest for hegemony or territorial gains.

A new era of freedom is at hand. Countries are peacefully seeking their place in their regions and in the world, helping in the creation of wealth through trade and cooperation. Emerging economies have become a significant force around the world, benefiting from globalization, greater economic freedom and the continued growth of international trade. Economic integration has led to stronger regional ties.

Reconstruction and enhanced participation in international affairs are seen in many parts of the world, just as others continue to prosper and grow in peace. New or renewed partnerships have emerged in the five continents.

The Middle East is finally following the path of dialogue and understanding, through a peace process that we firmly support and encourage. Angola and Mozambique are the new promises of southern Africa, furthering regional peace and conciliation as the South Africans have done.

Latin America, and in particular the Southern Cone countries, has continued to show vitality both at the political level, with democracy fully at work, and at the economic level, with freedom and openness leading to the resumption of growth and the expansion of trade.

The United Nations has kept its role in the maintenance of international peace and security. A broader agenda for the remainder of this century is under consideration. Positive initiatives are under way to ensure that the Organization is capable of more effectively promoting peace and development. Reform of the system is also due to make it more responsive to the challenges that lie ahead.

The promotion of civil liberties and the quest for equal rights among women and men, minorities and majorities, weak and strong are shaping the debate, guiding action and strengthening citizenship all over the world.

These are indeed times of positive change. But even as one celebrates these positive trends, one is painfully aware of the manifold threats posed by the persistence of poverty and violence in many areas of the world. The images of the former Yugoslavia are living proof of past failures and present challenges and misperceptions. They remind us of how much needs to be done to fulfill the promises embodied in the United Nations Charter.

Extreme poverty and unemployment emerge as perhaps the most pervasive of the international issues, affecting developed and developing countries alike, corroding the social fabric while fostering extremism on the part of individuals and engendering short-sighted solutions on the part of governments.

Terrorism, drug trafficking, organized crime, xenophobia and racism, ethnic cleansing, religious fanaticism and intolerance, and persistent violations of basic human rights continue to afflict millions of human beings. Misguided economic policies, financial speculation and the volatility of capital flows threaten markets on a global scale. Emerging economies, striving to consolidate stability and the resumption of growth while dealing with variables such as interest rates and commodity prices, have become increasingly vulnerable.

Disarmament continues to be an elusive goal. The promises heralded by the end of the cold war seem to have vanished in a cloud of vague excuses. The so-called peace dividends have yet to materialize. The world is theoretically less threatening and dangerous. Competitiveness, technological capability, economic strength and social indicators have become the standards of national power. Yet, more positive moves in disarmament and non-proliferation have been offset by anachronistic economic practices and irresponsible military endeavors.

Some countries continue to seek military strength and strategic power. Even as commitment to non-proliferation and support for nuclear disarmament gain ground in Latin America, Africa and parts of Asia, nuclear tests painfully remind us of the threats and honors that haunted the collective imagination during the Cold War years. Besides endangering the environment they encourage the resumption of a purposeless arms race in various parts of the world.

Nuclear testing undermines efforts towards disarmament and jeopardizes the conclusion of a comprehensive nuclear-test ban. Instead of helping the international community strengthen collective security mechanisms, certain countries persist in testing and improving their nuclear arsenals. We deplore it.

So where does the United Nations stand in the current international scene? How can it deal with the conflicting and ambivalent forces operating in the world today? Where does its responsibility begin and where does it end? What can we do to realize the vision of our founding fathers? These are some of the questions that come to mind as we prepare to celebrate the Fiftieth anniversary of our Organization.

It is certainly true that the Organization may have seemed at times to be overwhelmed by the challenges before it. But it is also true that the shortcomings over these past 50 years would have been greater had it not been for the United Nations, a universal conscience, an instrument for peace and understanding, as no other instrument has ever been, with a moral authority that the peoples of the world have learned to recognize and support.

In 1941, when the United Nations was but a distant dream overcast by war, Franklin Delano Roosevelt defined the four freedoms upon which a true community of nations should be built. They were – and I find it useful to recall Roosevelt's own inspiring words – the freedom of speech and expression; the freedom of every person to worship God in his own way; the freedom from want, which "translated into world terms, means economic understandings which will secure to every nation a healthy peace time life for its inhabitants"; "translated into world terms, means a worldwide reduction of armaments to such a point and in such a thorough fashion that no nation will be in a position to commit an act of physical aggression against any neighbor".

Providing mankind with these four freedoms was the challenge that ultimately gave birth to the United Nations. Yet, these four freedoms are still largely unattained. They remain an inspiration and a goal.

In the past 50 years, the nations of the world have used this podium to voice their hopes and concerns and to express their feelings about a true international partnership based on peace and prosperity. The United Nations has undoubtedly represented a call for consensus, a moral and ethical force, a promoter of political will and action, a substitute for confrontation and dispute.

The time has come for us to carefully assess the achievements and shortcomings of the United Nations in order to set the course for the next half century. The time has come for us to create the conditions for the United Nations of the twenty-first century.

In the aftermath of the Second World War the idea of an international body such as the United Nations may have seemed utopian, especially in the light of the failure of the League of Nations and of the tragedies and crimes that resulted from the pursuit of power politics, the kind of politics that led the world into war and its horrors.

While avoiding utopianism, the United Nations was designed to provide actual instruments of diplomatic interaction capable of replacing power politics by ethical values and of promoting conflict prevention and conflict resolution through negotiation and dialogue.

With a pledge to peace and security on the one hand and to development on the other, the United Nations helped to write important chapters of contemporary history, such as the building of a new pattern of relationship between developed and developing countries, the search for development, disarmament, the protection of human rights and human dignity, decolonization, the struggle against apartheid and the condemnation of tyranny and oppression.

In this process important organizations such as the United Nations Conference on Trade and Development (UNCTAD), and decisive forums such as the United Nations Conference on Environment and Development (UNCED), and the several other United Nations conferences dedicated to global issues, have played a paramount role. In these forums we have enhanced commitments in the areas of cooperation for development, the law of the sea, the rights of children, the environment and sustainable development, human rights, population, social development and the rights of women.

We have certainly accomplished one part of our dreams. So why not set our eyes on further accomplishments? We look at the recent past and find the United Nations at the center of the most important international events. Even when its action has been constrained by circumstances, the United Nations always displayed moral strength. We look at the present and we see a United Nations limited by its structure, struggling very hard to take advantage of its own experience to adapt to changing world realities in order to remain the foremost international force.

And so Brazil confidently looks to the future. Peace and development in the years to come will depend largely on our capacity to renew and reform the United Nations. In institutions, as in human beings, reassessment and reform are a sign of vitality, of maturity, of responsibility. As Brazil has already pointed out a normative gap has opened up between some of the provisions of the Charter and the realities of today's world.

The fact is that most of the structures of the United Nations remain those crafted 50 years ago. Back then, the world was entering a new phase of power politics and confrontation that no longer applies. The membership of the United Nations was less than one third of what it is today. The concept of development was not at the core of an international agenda. Significant players in the developed and in the developing world had yet to achieve the influential role they have today.

New realities demand innovative solutions. Greater expectations require stronger commitments. Nothing is more emblematic of the need to bring the United Nations into line with the realities of the post-Cold War world than the reform of the Security Council. As a catalyst for other much-needed reforms within the United Nations system, reform of the Security Council is an imperative that should no longer be put off.

In order to carry out its mandate in the field of international peace and security on behalf of all Member States, the Security Council must have unquestionable legitimacy. As is well known, legitimacy ultimately rests on representativeness.

Reform cannot entail a wholesale or indiscriminate enlargement of the Security Council, much less an insufficient one predicated on the convenience of a limited number of States. Above all, it will be essential to ensure a more equitable representation of developed and developing countries with both the capacity to act and an effective presence on a global scale.

The emergence of new economic powers and of a number of developing countries with global projection has significantly altered the dynamics of world politics. These players have come to the forefront of the international scene and should be present in the core group of permanent members, so that the Council's composition becomes more balanced and better reflects the diversity of world views.

A qualitative increase in the number of permanent members of the Security Council, together with an enlargement of the non-permanent membership, would correspond to the necessity of making it more authoritative and efficient in carrying out its increased responsibilities in the post-Cold War era.

Reform is not about the individual prestige of any country but about the prestige of the Security Council itself. Brazil, for its part, is ready to assume its responsibilities in this endeavor.

The same attention that is being given to improving the United Nations performance in the area of peace and security must be given to efforts in the area of strengthening international cooperation for development. Poverty and unemployment both in industrialized and in developing nations, economic instability and misguided economic policies affecting individual countries, as well as the persistence or the rise of various forms of protectionism, are factors that adversely affect sustained growth worldwide. These are issues that must be accorded high priority.

Unemployment cannot be used as a pretext that will ultimately lead to protectionism directed mainly against the developing countries. There is no use in trying to alleviate unemployment by accusing other people, by creating new forms of disguised protectionism, by putting a new strain on international relations. We must strengthen the role of the World Trade Organization as the mainstay of an open and non-discriminatory multilateral trade system. We must promote a broader coordination of macroeconomic policies and foster regional economic integration, and provide better and more effective cooperation in the areas of health, sanitation, education, the administration of justice and other areas of great social impact. We must widen the decision-

making circles in order to include countries whose contribution to these objectives can be instrumental.

The United Nations should be able to ensure implementation of the commitments reached at the highest level at the United Nations Conference on the Environment and Development, for much needs to be done to fulfill the promises that were made in Rio de Janeiro regarding international cooperation for sustainable development. The same kind of follow-up should apply to the commitments reached at subsequent international conferences on global issues.

These are the main goals to be achieved by a reform of the United Nations institutions that directly or indirectly deal with the issue of sustainable development. We firmly believe that a broad vision of reform of the United Nations institutions will lead to an improved, more efficient and revitalized Organization. For, as once stated in this very forum by a distinguished Brazilian statesman, Oswaldo Aranha, who presided over the first Special Session of the General Assembly in 1947:

> Above all, it is within our power to make the United Nations the sum total of justice, security and peace, or through our lack of wisdom to allow it to be transformed into one more sword to be wielded blindly by force and instinct.

The United Nations will stand as the greatest symbol of the twentieth century as long as it is able to keep its vitality and effectively promote peace and development. Brazil is also committed to peace and democracy and believes that if all peoples of the world are free to express their ideas and to build their own destinies, democracy will be strengthened and will continue to serve the purpose of development and social justice. Brazil is also committed to, and knows that development depends on, an international environment of peace, cooperation and economic freedom.

As our Heads of State and Government prepare to gather in New York in October to celebrate the accomplishments of our Organization, let us hasten to create the necessary conditions for them to build for the future with the same impetus and boldness that inspired the international community 50 years ago. Let us make sure that through our unfaltering commitment and our timely action the United Nations will emerge stronger from the Fiftieth Session of the General Assembly.

New York, September 25, 1995.

1996

1996

The year 1996 was marked by a certain political instability in Europe as well as by important changes in other regions. The conservatives were losing ground in the United Kingdom, the Spanish Socialist Party was removed from power, putting an end to the lengthy presidency of Felipe Gonzalez, and the left returned to power in Italy, in a coalition led by Romano Prodi. Boris Yeltsin was re-elected President of Russia after having led his country to a seat in the Council of Europe. Under the leadership of Benjamin Netanyahu the conservatives from Likud assumed control of the government in Israel, foreshadowing a worsening of tensions in the Middle East. In the United States, Bill Clinton was re-elected in November.

Having prevailed over the Russian forces, the Taliban occupied Kabul with the support of Pakistan and imposed a fundamentalist regime in Afghanistan. This was the origin of a process that years later would be intertwined with the September 11 attacks and lead to the intervention of American forces in Afghanistan.

In Central America, the panorama cleared up to a certain extent with the end of the civil war in Guatemala after thirty-six years of conflict. The activity of the FARC in Colombia, however, became more intense and reached the border with Brazil, where Brazilian citizens were kidnapped.

In Brazil, the Fernando Henrique Cardoso administration strove to deal with the economic and financial stability of Brazil in a context of pronounced international stability. The process of privatization

entered its most intense stage. New foreign investment was sought. The government worked hard in Congress to garner the support needed for the Constitutional reforms and the general legislation necessary for the implementation of its program, which would culminate with the end of the monopoly in the fields of oil, telecommunications, pipeline gas and coastal navigation. The objective of the government was to promote a controlled opening of the economy, capable of generating confidence among investors, recovering the rate of growth without stirring up inflationary pressures and protecting the economy of Brazil from the excessive fluctuation that was then taking shape in capital markets.

At the start of his speech, Minister Luiz Felipe Lampreia made specific reference to the fact that the Portuguese-speaking countries participated for the first time of a General Assembly organized as members of the Community of Portuguese-speaking countries (CPLP). He also mentioned the increased sentiment of cohesion of MERCOSUR, "one of the creative forces of the American hemisphere". He spoke several times of the pride with which Brazil presented itself to the international community bringing a "new projection" based on the consolidation of democracy, stability and opening of its economy, as well as on the resumption of growth "on a foundation of social justice". Moreover, he emphasized the positive evolution of Brazil from a closed economy and an authoritarian society to a country attuned with political and economic freedom and cooperation through integration and trade.

Following a distinctive characteristic of Brazilian speeches, Minister Lampreia displayed the credentials of Brazil to play a broader role in the international scene: Brazil is one of the largest democracies in the world; a diversified and dynamic developing economy; a beacon of attraction for productive investment; a market with huge potential; a country that can serve as a bridge among the many world existing in its internal reality; a force in favor of peace and integration.

After sketching a positive appraisal of the United Nations and recalling the commemoration of the Fiftieth anniversary in the past year, Minister Lampreia expressed the sentiment of insecurity and concern with which Brazil perceived the future of the United Nations. Summarizing the confrontations in different parts of the world, the financial crisis and the "motivation" of the United Nations, the Minister reaffirmed the commitment of Brazil with the Organization.

Referring implicitly to the theme of Brazilian insertion in the post-Cold War world, the Minister called attention to the changes that had taken place at the level of international relations: "the world today organizes

itself according to factors that are much more concrete and dramatic (than the politico-ideological factor of the Cold War) such as international trade, investment flows and the transfer of technology". Following the same line of reasoning, the Minister stressed the evolution of the international order ("the emphasis on politico-ideological coalitions was replaced by the emphasis on economic coalitions") toward "great regional economic agreements". At the same time, however, he called attention to the need for the United Nations to avoid the risk that the bipolarity of the Cold War era finds new expression in the "welfare bipolarity", an original formulation for a concept that until then had not appeared in the Brazilian discourse and that apparently was not used again.

For that, the Minister went on, it is important to set forth a reform of the United Nations that makes the Organization "a viable and logic alternative to unilateralism or politics of power". Indeed, the theme of the reform is recurrent in the Brazilian discourse with remarkable coherence since the Charter left us frustrated by failing to appoint Brazil to a permanent seat in the Security Council. The Minister mentioned in general terms the question of the reform of that central organ, which "should be expanded to allow for a wider participation of countries capable of global action and willing to shoulder the ensuing responsibilities". The Minister did not make specific prescriptions and concluded with a generic exhortation: "It is now upon us to define the direction of this process".

Regarding the questions of disarmament, Minister Lampreia brought forth some important developments for Brazil: current diplomatic efforts for the formal recognition of the Southern Hemisphere as a space free of nuclear weapons; the Brazilian decision to declare (from that date on) a moratorium on the export of anti-personal land mines to all countries; the Brazilian decision to sign the Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty (CTBT) forthwith.

LI Regular Session of the General Assembly of the United Nations
1996

Minister Luiz Felipe Lampreia [*]

Mr. President,

Please accept my congratulations, Sir, on your election as President of the General Assembly at its Fifty-First Session. The Brazilian delegation is confident that, under your leadership, this body will find new strength in the pursuit of the principles and purposes of our Charter.

I also wish to pay tribute to my dear friend Mr. Diogo Freitas do Amaral, for the dedication with which he conducted the historic Fiftieth Session. We are grateful for his steadfast commitment to ensuring that our work was consistent with the high expectations of the Fiftieth anniversary celebrations.

My delegation extends a word of gratitude and recognition to the Secretary-General, Mr. Boutros-Ghali, for the perseverance he has shown in carrying out his tasks.

For the first time, Angola, Brazil, Cape Verde, Guinea-Bissau, Mozambique, Portugal and São Tomé and Príncipe come to the General Assembly as members of the Community of Portuguese-speaking Countries, a body dedicated to cooperation and political coordination. The member States of the Community intend to consult and to work closely together at the United Nations with a view to better promoting their common interests and fostering their linguistic, cultural and historical identity.

[*] **Luiz Felipe Palmeira Lampreia**, born in Rio de Janeiro, RJ, on October 19, 1941. Third Secretary on 11/7/1963. First Class Minister, 6/29/1984. Minister of State for External Relations from 1/1/1995 to 2001.

The countries of the Southern Cone Common Market (MERCOSUR) – Argentina, Brazil, Paraguay and Uruguay – have also come to the General Assembly with an enhanced sense of unity. MERCOSUR gives living and concrete expression to economic integration and open regionalism and represents one of the creative forces at work in the Americas. It is a new and striking feature of our continent's identity and a reflection of democracy and the commitment to economic reform in our region.

With the customs union firmly in place, Chile has now joined MERCOSUR as an associated State by means of a free-trade agreement with far-reaching political and diplomatic implications. Bolivia will also shortly associate itself with MERCOSUR. We look forward to other countries of the region joining as well to further bolster the dynamic and open nature of MERCOSUR.

Now firmly rooted in the process of expanding and acting as an important partner of a growing number of countries and regional groups, MERCOSUR is a positive response by South American countries to the challenges and opportunities of today's world. Such achievements as MERCOSUR and the Community of Portuguese-speaking Countries enhance their credentials and help to make the presence of those countries in the world an instrument for economic development and social progress.

My country comes to this General Assembly proud to present itself before the international community with a stronger presence in the world. Brazil owes this to the consolidation of its democracy, to economic stabilization and liberalization and to the resumption of economic growth with a deeper sense of social justice. It owes this as well to its participation in regional integration and in the globalization of the world economy. We are in tune with the two main forces that are shaping the world today: political and economic freedom, on the one hand, and cooperation through integration and trade on the other.

I am pleased to say that, through decisive action rather than words, we have made genuine strides in enlarging our dialogue and cooperation with friendly nations worldwide, developed and developing alike. We have strengthened traditional partnerships and established new ones, especially in Africa, Asia and the Middle East. We are aware that, if the Brazilian people are to consolidate these achievements, we will need to persevere in the policies that have brought us this far. We know that these policies have yet to meet many challenges Brazil faces in the social, economic and cultural fields. But they are an important beginning.

We are convinced that Brazil's growing interaction with its region and the world, the consolidation of its international partnerships and a

fruitful dialogue and cooperation with its many friends are necessary conditions for our country to continue to pursue its policies at the domestic level.

Brazil is one of the world's largest democracies, a dynamic and diversified developing economy, an attractive opportunity for productive foreign investment and a market of huge potential - in a word, a country capable of enjoying fruitful ties with all nations on the basis of mutual respect and reciprocity. By its very nature, Brazil can act as a bridge between the many different worlds that make up its own internal reality.

Our aspirations to enlarging the scope of our participation in the international decision-making bodies will always reflect a careful assessment of our own merits, of our specific weight and of the contribution that we can make to the community of Nations. We seek to be a force for peace and integration.

The Fiftieth anniversary of the United Nations understandably raised the expectations of the international community – expectations that we would not dwell only on the past and on the many achievements of the Organization, but also look to the future in search of ways for it to come to grips with new realities and problems.

We can confidently say that the celebration of the Fiftieth anniversary produced good results. As world public opinion was focused on the United Nations, leaders and Governments were compelled to reflect on the Organization and to make room for it in their political agendas.

The historic meaning of the San Francisco Charter was recalled, as was the importance of the United Nations as a forum for political debate and as a sounding board for conflicting interests in the post-Cold War era.

Our collective reflection clearly revealed that, without the United Nations, the world would only have been more violent, more unstable and insecure, more unjust and cruel – especially to the weak – who are prey to power politics and arbitrary decisions.

We celebrated great advances in international law and in the political and ethical commitments to the issues that concern humanity – issues such as sustainable development, protection of the environment, respect for human rights, disarmament, non-proliferation and the fight against poverty, terrorism, organized crime and drug trafficking. We have thus given a positive account in the first 50 years of the United Nations.

We cannot say with the same confidence that the Fiftieth anniversary has ushered in a renewed commitment to the United Nations and its future. Our efforts have fallen well short of the expectations of the international community. They have been disappointing even in the

light of the predictions of some of the most cautious analysts. A stalemate persists – an uncomfortable stalemate that leads to a feeling of uncertainty and frustration, of insecurity about the future of the United Nations, and thus of apprehension.

In the wake of momentous changes on the international scene, the United Nations has embarked upon a new phase in its history without the means and the effectiveness to act as the highest political forum of mankind and to fulfill the mandate conferred upon it by the international community – a mandate that remains as valid today as it was half a century ago.

Back in 1961, President John F. Kennedy referred to the United Nations as "our last, best hope". In the face of the threat of nuclear war and in the midst of various conflicts, those words expressed the confidence of the international community in an Organization founded on the universal principles of peace, understanding and prosperity for all peoples.

At that time President Kennedy renewed a pledge to the United Nations, offering "our pledge of support to prevent it from becoming merely a forum for invective, to strengthen its shield of the new and the weak and to enlarge the area in which its writ may run."

Twenty-five years after these inspired words, the United Nations finds itself at a crossroads. The world has changed, the correlation of forces has changed, and so have the hopes and expectations of countries with regard to the United Nations and its capacity to manage, prevent and settle conflicts. Yet various confrontations still cause suffering, instability and misery throughout the world.

This is happening just as the Organization faces the worst financial and motivational crisis in its history. There is a widespread feeling of dissatisfaction – sometimes veiled and sometimes explicit – with an Organization that still embodies the loftiest ideals ever conceived by the human spirit in the search for peace and understanding among peoples.

Brazil is committed to the United Nations Charter and to the Organization's political, legal and diplomatic legacy of the past 50 years. That commitment is part of the diplomatic history of my country and of the principles that have always governed our actions in this body and in our relations with all peoples, particularly with our 10 neighbors, with whom we have lived in peace for well over a century.

Compelled by that commitment, we sound a word of caution to those who, like ourselves, wish to see the United Nations as a source of leadership in international relations, as an instrument for promoting

an international society based on freedom, the rule of law and the rights of the citizen.

With the political and ideological constraints of the Cold War behind us, the world is now organized around much more concrete and pragmatic variables, such as international trade, investment flows and the transfer of technology. The emphasis on political and ideological coalitions has given way to an emphasis on economic coalitions. Pressured by public opinion, Governments are today concerned with social well-being, the quality of life, economic and social indicators and unemployment.

The focal point of the political debate is shifting irrevocably from strategy and ideology to economics and integration. That is why the world is following the path of large-scale regional economic agreements. North-South and East-West – the main axes of international politics in the last 50 years – have given way to groups of countries dedicated to the goals of economic integration and the coordination of macroeconomic, financial and trade policies.

North, South, East and West are no longer the cardinal points on the international political compass. The World Trade Organization and its body of universal rules and regulations for fostering free trade, the European Union, the Asia-Pacific Economic Cooperation Council (APEC), the North American Free Trade Agreement (NAFTA), the Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development (OECD), the Group of 7, the Association of South-East Asian Nations (ASEAN), the South African Development Community (SADC), and the Southern Cone Common Market (MERCOSUR) have become, in their respective areas of action, the catalysts for development, cooperation, understanding and, indeed, for peace.

The peace that the founders of the United Nations envisioned may come about as a result of the response by the various regions and groups of countries to the challenges, opportunities and risks of a new world, which today is called the world of globalization. It is a world that generates prosperity and a healthy competition among countries and regions; but it is also a world that swells the ranks of the destitute and the outcast among and within countries, a world that breeds conflict and increases inequality, a world that demands reason, reflection and constructive action.

Through peace, cooperation, respect for human rights and development, the United Nations has a major role to play in preventing the divisions of the Cold War from finding new expression in a widening gap in well-being.

The Organization must evolve in order to successfully play that role as it has so often done in the past. It must adapt its structure and methods of work in order to optimize its human, material and financial resources. It must make use of the great political, strategic, and moral power it is able to muster. It must implement and follow up on its decisions, on the rules with which it updates and consolidates international law and on the commitments it has won from the international community.

Much remains to be done in the wake of the great conferences that have shaped the international agenda in the present decade. The conferences on the rights of the child, the environment and development, human rights, population and development, social development, women and human settlements have sealed commitments that must be honored, decisions that must be implemented and follow-up work that must be carried out.

The United Nations must ensure that its agenda becomes more appealing and results-oriented, in order to earn the esteem of the public and to retain its primacy in international relations. We must correct the tendency to convene meetings whose only purpose is to produce other meetings or to adopt resolutions of a rhetorical nature. We must rid the United Nations of its image as a lethargic body incapable of rising to the challenges of our times.

Brazil is convinced that United Nations reform remains within reach, that it is still possible to ensure that the United Nations will play a paramount role in this new phase of its existence. We believe in reform as a means to ensure that the United Nations becomes a viable and logical alternative to multilateralism and power politics. We believe in reform as a means to empower the United Nations to act in a radically changed world. We believe in reform as a means to restore the United Nations as a unique forum for political and diplomatic action and debate.

One year after our Heads of State and Government drew attention to the seriousness of the financial situation of the United Nations, a solution to the problem remains elusive.

To stifle the United Nations little by little by depriving it of the means to perform its functions is no way to secure greater administrative efficiency. Should this scenario persist, then the capacity of the United Nations to adapt to the dynamics of the contemporary world could be seriously jeopardized. We could very well witness a situation where other bodies come to occupy the space left by the United Nations, bodies with their own goals and agendas, which may or may not reflect the prevailing sentiments of the international community and the interests of world

peace, security and stability. That is why we need perseverance, courage and, above all, the political will to advance the discussion on issues which reflect a true commitment to the United Nations, issues which relate to the very relevance of the Organization in international relations on the eve in the twenty-first century.

One of these issues is the reform of the Security Council. There is a virtual consensus that the Security Council should be enlarged to allow for greater participation by countries with the capacity to act on a global scale and the willingness to bear the responsibilities that would entail. We must now set a course for this process. Its outcome is essential for strengthening the United Nations.

Brazil has made several commitments in the field of nuclear disarmament and non-proliferation of weapons of mass destruction and their delivery systems. We are now committed to having the southern hemisphere recognized as an area free of nuclear weapons. It is our firm belief that this is a right to which the peoples of the southern hemisphere are entitled, and an obligation on the part of those throughout the world who possess nuclear weapons or the means to develop them.

A further commitment to disarmament in all fields that I now wish to convey to the General Assembly is the decision by the Brazilian Government to declare a moratorium on the export of anti-personnel land-mines. The experience of the Brazilian contingent serving in the United Nations Angola Verification Mission has underlined for us the importance of a universal moratorium of this kind and the need to rid the world of the scourge of land mines, which pose a threat to the daily lives of millions of human beings. We would like to see all countries that export landmines or that possess the capability to do so join in this decision.

The international community has placed its hopes in a Comprehensive Nuclear-Test-Ban Treaty (CTBT). These hopes are fully justified. We have a historic opportunity to put an end to an outdated practice which has increasingly drawn repudiation and condemnation from international public opinion. We are taking an important step towards general and complete nuclear disarmament and stating unequivocally that there is no room in today's world for nuclear weapons or regional arms races.

Brazil is committed to the non-proliferation of weapons of mass destruction and to the elimination of nuclear arsenals. It has consistently expressed its disapproval of nuclear tests. Brazil strove for approval of the CTBT at the Conference on Disarmament and considered the blocking of consensus in Geneva a grave setback. It was inconceivable to Brazil that

we could have let the moment pass, that we could have run the risk of seeing the CTBT meet the same fate as so many other initiatives which were allowed to lapse into oblivion.

This is why Brazil was one of the first sponsors of the Australian initiative to seize the historic opportunity of submitting the CTBT for approval by the General Assembly. This decision reflected the commitment to bequeath to present and future generations a safer and nuclear-weapons-free world. This is why Brazil will immediately sign the Comprehensive Nuclear-Test-Ban Treaty. We call upon all nuclear and non-nuclear weapon States to do the same.

The peoples of the world expect action and leadership from the United Nations. They expect that the United Nations will continue to be an essential benchmark of international politics over the next 50 years and that it will always be not the last, but our best hope.

New York, September 23, 1996.

1997

1997

In the Middle East, in Africa and in Western Europe the year 1997 foreshadowed the panorama of growing instability that would worsen in the following years. There was a visible escalation of the Palestine-Israeli conflict with the collapse of the Hebron agreements. Saddam Hussein expelled IAEA inspectors from Iraq, increasing the suspicion about the existence of weapons of mass destruction in that country. A state of civil war engulfed Rwanda, culminating in a veritable genocide of ethnic minorities. General Kabila assumed power in Zaire (the present Democratic Republic of Congo) in a context of violent internal war which would go on without solution in subsequent years under one form or another. Albania suffered a serious internal crisis that ended with the fall of President Sali Beisha. In Latin America, the violence of the Shining Path in Peru would gain notoriety with the occupation of the Japanese Embassy in Lima and the taking of several hostages that were attending the National Day reception.

At the same time, positive expectations were opened in the field of science and technology with the cloning of the first animal, the ewe Dolly, and the landing of the Pathfinder probe in Mars. A United Nations Conference adopted the Protocol of Kyoto which amended the United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change aiming at reducing toxic emissions by States Parties, whose entry into force, however, would only happen in 2005, after extensive controversy that culminated in the non-participation of the United States.

The left won the elections in France and Lionel Jospin became Prime Minister. In the United Kingdom, the return of the Labor Party to power with Prime Minister Tony Blair, after a long conservative interval, foreshadowed important changes of direction.

In Brazil, the government of President Fernando Henrique Cardoso started its third year in power. Its political capital was then invested mainly on the approval of the amendment that would permit the re-election of the holders of federal, state and municipal functions.

An event that would come to deeply affect Brazil was taking shape. In the second semester of 1997 the international financial markets began experience strong turbulence. Known as the "Asian crisis", the instability in world markets started with the fluctuation of the Thai currency and rapidly spread to the emerging markets in the region: South Korea, Indonesia, Malaysia, Hong Kong, among others. The Russian financial system collapsed and the consequences of the crisis were soon felt in Latin America. The Real suffered strong pressures and Brazilian international reserves were severely affected. The Bovespa index fell almost 15 per cent and interest rates topped the 40 per cent a year mark.

The most serious repercussions for Brazil, however, would happen in the next year. For the time being, the Brazilian discourse could still concentrate primarily on political and security issues.

The Fifty-Second Session of the General Assembly was the first in which Secretary-General Kofi Annan participated. Upon presenting his congratulations, Minister Lampreia stressed the satisfaction of Brazil in receiving the proposals of the Secretary-General for the reform and the institutional strengthening of the Organization.

The speech assumed more optimistic tones: "a new atmosphere of hope surrounds the United Nations". In concrete terms, the Minister highlighted: the modernization and political and economic opening projects going on in many countries; economic integration in several regional levels; and the phenomenon of economic internationalization at the global level.

In this positive context, the Minister emphasized the evolution of South America toward the consolidation of democracy, integration, stability and development, calling attention at the same time to the primacy of MERCOSUR in this process.

Special attention was paid to the issues of disarmament and arms control. The Minister announced the decision of President Fernando Henrique Cardoso to submit the Treaty on the Non-proliferation of Nuclear Weapons (NPT) to the approval of the Congress.

Without prejudice to these political aspects, the Minister recalled the continuing presence of factors of disintegration, such as marginalization, transnational crime, current conflict and terrorism in the Middle East and in Latin America.

When mentioning conflicts taking place at the time at the international level, the Minister singularized the case of Angola.

On the question of United Nations reform and the proposals of the Secretary-General, Minister Lampreia was keen to express the "pleasure and enthusiasm" with which the Brazilian government had received the Annan report, as well as his commitment to work toward the realization of the promises contained in the report.

Next, the Minister devoted a significant section of the speech (perhaps the most explicit among Brazilian pronouncements at the Assembly) to summarizing and expound the views of the Brazilian government on the question of the reform of the Security Council: "we want the Council to be more representative of the contemporary international realities, as was the case at its inception"; expansion of the number of permanent members "to contemplate the industrialized world and the developing one", and of non-permanent members "to provide more frequent participation by interested countries"; rejection of discrimination – it is not possible to create a third and fourth category of members; new permanent members must be identified by exercising realism and pragmatism, stemming from a democratic process which, "without eschewing regional support, leads to a legitimate end universally recognized representation".

At the close, the Minister reaffirmed the willingness of Brazil to accept the responsibilities deriving from the status as permanent member of the Council "representing Latin America and the Caribbean" and exhorted the Assembly to "define the ideal format of an extended Security Council".

In his 1996 statement, Minister Lampreia had quoted Kennedy to define the United Nations as "our last, our best hope". In 1997, the Minister resorted to Martin Luther King to stress the need for the reform of the Organization as a task to be carried out with the sense of the "fierce urgency of now" without engaging "in the luxury of cooling off or taking the tranquillizing drug of gradualism."

LII Regular Session of the General Assembly of the United Nations 1997

Minister Luiz Felipe Lampreia [*]

Mr. President,

On behalf of the Brazilian delegation, I would like to congratulate you, my dear colleague, Hennadiy Udovenko, the Foreign Minister of Ukraine, on your election as President of the General Assembly at its Fifty-Second Session. Brazil has a significant and active community of Ukrainian origin. We Brazilians are thus very glad to see this session headed by a distinguished son of the Ukraine, a country that is close to us.

I want to express my recognition to the Permanent Representative of Malaysia, Ambassador Razali Ismail, for the way he conducted the work of the Fifty-First Session. Ambassador Razali's dynamic presidency paved the way, through extensive consultation, for an imaginative and comprehensive proposal to advance Security Council reform.

I also pay tribute to our new Secretary-General, Mr. Kofi Annan, chosen to oversee the political and administrative challenges of modernization. He has been the focus of justifiable expectation on the part of the international community at a difficult moment in the life of our Organization.

We welcome the Secretary-General's proposals for reform and institutional strengthening as a sign of renewed vitality within the United Nations. These proposals and Ambassador Razali's contribution will

[*] **Luiz Felipe Palmeira Lampreia**, born in Rio de Janeiro, RJ, on October 19, 1941. Third Secretary on 11/7/1963. First Class Minister, 6/29/1984. Minister of State for External Relations from 1/1/1995 to 2001.

certainly warrant close attention in the General Assembly and in parallel consultation. We will help to consolidate a new spirit that should inspire our Organization. This new spirit is called leadership – that driving force of history altering the course of events within countries and in the international scenario, opening new horizons, giving hope to the peoples of the world, seeing movement where some can only stand still.

Ambassador Razali and Secretary-General Kofi Annan have, in a way, revived the leadership of the creators of the United Nations. They have shown the same idealism in establishing goals and pragmatism in carrying them out. It was also the leadership of men such as Dag Hammarskjöld and Brazilian statesman Oswaldo Aranha, twice President of this Assembly, which often led the United Nations to a decisive role as a factor of change in international relations.

This kind of leadership has given the world a forum without parallel in history, a stage for negotiation and a political force in favor of international peace and security. Although the United Nations has not always been able to prevent or to deter conflict, it has certainly reduced its occurrence and avoided some of its more serious consequences. For this reason, the United Nations has been a mandatory reference, a sign of hope and a moral force for world public opinion.

We are witnessing today the rebirth of this leadership, feeling its effects through a remarkable change in the heart and soul of our Organization. There is greater optimism. There is greater motivation among delegates and staff. There is greater expectation on the part of many Governments. A new atmosphere of hope embraces the United Nations. This is something we must nurture and promote - something we must filter to the public in order to renew the trust of the international community in our Organization.

The agenda of the Fifty-Second Session is vast and reveals the continuing complexity and the numerous conflicts of interests that animate international relations in our times. A new international dynamic combines three positive impulses: first, modernization and political and economic opening in most countries; secondly, economic integration in regional contexts, with multiple political and security benefits; and thirdly, the internationalization of the economy on a global scale.

These impulses tend to generate, foster and consolidate international peace and security. They are based on confidence and understanding and should allow us to prosper and achieve the desired material and spiritual results. Economic integration is increasingly the great bulwark of international peace and cooperation. It must be given emphasis and further promoted.

Precisely because of its many political and economic benefits, integration is a defining trait of South America's reality, a direct consequence of democracy and economic freedom. The Southern Cone Common Market (MERCOSUR), a new and powerful impetus for development in the region, is an example of the importance of integration. With democracy firmly rooted and a dynamic process of integration, South America has a reduced potential for conflict. It has the lowest rates of military spending in the world and is following an economic course based on strict government budget controls. Our priorities are stability and development. Arms purchases are compatible with the defense needs of Latin American countries. They are aimed at replacing obsolete or exhausted equipment. Recently announced measures in the strategic-military domain will not affect these fundamental parameters.

The concrete interests that bring together the countries of South America – trade, investment and the reinforcement of our international standing through MERCOSUR – are an unyielding factor of unity and cohesion. There is no threat of military destabilization in Latin America. There is no danger of an arms race in the absence of political, economic and strategic conditions for such. A regional initiative towards self-imposed limitations on conventional arms purchases is therefore unjustified. It would be tantamount to disarming those already disarmed.

Our preoccupation, on the other hand, should be the fight against the arms trade that sustains organized crime and drug trafficking. This is the real and grave problem perpetuating a major source of instability that has, unfortunately, also affected our region severely. Only determined and coordinated action on the part of the international community, especially through tighter controls on the production and selling of weapons in private hands, can curb or even suppress this trade; which feeds crime cartels and leads to violence, fear and desperation. Brazil strongly urges all countries, and particularly those in the Western Hemisphere, to intensify cooperation in the fight against arms trafficking.

We have taken great strides in areas of concern and growing visibility. Disarmament and, most specifically, efforts towards the elimination of anti-personnel landmines have increasingly held the attention of the international community. Today, we can speak of significant accomplishments, such as the signing of the Comprehensive Nuclear-Test-Ban Treaty and the willingness of an overwhelming majority to make firm commitments, expressed at the Oslo Conference on anti-personnel landmines.

In these two instances, Brazil has sought to add its own efforts to those of the international community. This was the main thrust of President Fernando Henrique Cardoso's decision to submit the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons (NPT) to congressional approval. Brazil can and should make an additional contribution to nuclear disarmament. We want to take a constructive part in discussions within the framework created by the indefinite extension of the NPT, the most universal of disarmament treaties. This is also the guideline for our participation in the Oslo Conference and in the Ottawa process. Brazil stands firmly behind the interdiction of landmines in all types of conflict.

The international community should do everything in its power to help poor countries devastated by war. They suffer the perverse and prolonged effects of landmines irresponsibly planted in their territories. The interdiction of anti-personnel landmines and their removal must become an effective commitment on the part of the international community. This is a question of ethics, a question of observing the most elementary principles of humanitarian law. We hope that the international convention agreed upon in Oslo and the important commitments it enshrines find universal acceptance.

These positive tendencies might lead to the impression that the United Nations is less in demand today than 10, 20 or 50 years ago. This is a false impression. We are still subject to the effects of disintegrating factors. Some are, unfortunately, by-products of new global trends, such as marginalization within and among nations, transnational crime and conflicts of interest that find expression through violence and the threat or use of force.

The persistent and overbearing nature of terrorism continues to be one of the most serious threats to international peace and development. It breeds despair and suffering. In the Middle East, terrorism and intolerance jeopardize a peace process that was once full of promise for the peoples of the region. In other countries, some of them in Latin America, terrorist acts reveal the existence of groups that still insist on employing tactics incompatible with the values of civilization and human dignity. We must not falter in condemning those who, in disregard of all moral values, resort to cowardly violence in seeking to advance their own obscure purposes. Brazil is emphatic in repelling these practices and exhorts the international community to spare no effort in the fight against terrorism, whatever its form or the alleged reasoning behind it.

In addition, conflicts that had apparently been surmounted by a spirit of understanding and constructive action on the part of the United Nations still show signs of resistance that demand a strong reaction

from the international community. Angola is a case in point. Hope and promise cannot be constantly undermined by the factors that have wrought so much destruction and suffering upon a valiant people to whom we Brazilians feel so closely linked. Angola is now a decisive test for the United Nations. We cannot accept even the slightest possibility of regression. Brazil, currently holding the presidency of the Community of Portuguese-Speaking Countries, calls upon the international community, and in particular the members of the Security Council, to exercise close scrutiny over the Angolan peace process. We must do everything to ensure that the people of Angola once again find the road of development in a context of democracy and pluralism.

The United Nations has an irreplaceable role in a world that still combines forces of integration and cooperation with forces of disintegration and aggression. But we have allowed the United Nations to lose its strength as an instrument of universal peace and understanding and as a promoter of cooperation and development. We have done this through inaction, through a lack of consensus, through obstructionism and through excessive politicization of issues. We must react to this situation. We must once again find the cardinal notion on leadership.

The past few years have shown that reform of the United Nations can no longer be put off. We cannot lose sight of major institutional issues or waste further precious energy. The report of the Secretary-General entitled "Renewing the United Nations: A Program for Reform" is thus timely and opportune. The Brazilian Government welcomes it with satisfaction and enthusiasm. The strength of our Organization derives from its universality and from the all-encompassing nature of its mandate. The United Nations must not be held to the performance of tasks better suited to other international organizations or specialized agencies.

We cannot be made prisoners of inertia, nor must we condemn our debates to irrelevancy. The General Assembly must urgently move towards an agenda focused on what is essential to ensuring a relevant role for the United Nations in international affairs. For the United Nations to make a difference and provide leadership in today's complex world, it must recover the original meaning of the Charter by concentrating on its essential mission: maintaining international peace and security, promoting justice and international law, strengthening cooperation for development, protecting human rights and providing humanitarian assistance.

Member States must create political conditions for effective action by the United Nations and make the commitment to setting priorities and eliminating the superfluous. Only then will our Organization as a whole

– not just the Secretariat - be able to devote itself to those fundamental tasks. The Secretary-General has assumed a leadership role by putting forth ideas that must be objectively discussed by all Member States. Brazil is committed to working constructively with Mr. Kofi Annan on his proposals to strengthen our Organization.

Brazil has taken an active part in the debate on reform of the Security Council. We have adopted an open-minded and constructive approach because we believe this to be a central element in the reform of the Organization. Brazil has upheld a concept of reform that would strengthen the Council and the United Nations as a whole. It is not geared to the individual interests of any one country. We want the Council to be representative of contemporary international realities, as it was in its early years.

The Council must be enlarged both in its permanent membership, to take account of the industrialized and the developing worlds, and in its non-permanent membership, to allow for more frequent participation by interested States. We repudiate all discrimination in the conception or assignment of new seats. We must not create a third or fourth category of member. This would weaken and depreciate the participation of the developing world and of Latin America in particular in the reform process and in an enlarged Council.

We have always said that in identifying new permanent members we must exercise realism and pragmatism by means of a democratic selection process that leads to universally recognized representation without renouncing regional support. Brazil has expressed, through President Fernando Henrique Cardoso, its willingness to accept the responsibilities of permanent membership in the Security Council, if called upon by the international community to do so. In such a case, Brazil would be determined to carry out the role of permanent member as the representative of Latin America and the international community to spare no effort in the fight against tenorism, whatever its form or the alleged reasoning behind it.

The Brazilian Government notes with satisfaction that we are moving, if not towards consensus, at least in the direction of a significant majority in favor of certain basic notions about how to reform the Security Council, particularly enlargement of its permanent membership to take account of the developing world. The proposal by Ambassador Razali, presently under discussion in the Working Group, constitutes a firm basis for a negotiating process leading to a decision by the General Assembly. Ambassador Razali has helped us regain the ideal of Council reform as

a means of strengthening the entire Organization. Our priority is now to define the most suitable format for an enlarged Security Council. This must be the prime focus of attention.

The international community needs a strong, efficient and ever-present United Nations. We will continue to rely on the political body with the universality and moral strength that, in the history of humankind, only the United Nations has been able to muster. We must display in this session the determination to create the conditions for the United Nations to be an effective instrument for promoting international peace and security. The same spirit of leadership that we have seen in the Secretary-General and in Ambassador Razali has driven many delegations. A new willingness to make a constructive contribution to the Security Council reform process and to other reforms is clearly felt by Member States. There is a new thrust to negotiations. There is leadership, as well as carefully crafted proposals. We must take advantage of this unique opportunity in the history of the United Nations. We must not let the moment pass. Reform has become more than a key concept; it has become the order of the day for the United Nations in 1997.

Let us do it with that "fierce urgency of now" felt by Martin Luther King, a symbol of political leadership and of the forces of change in our century. "This is no time", said King in his most famous speech, "to engage in the luxury of cooling off or to take the tranquillizing drug of gradualism. Now is the time..." Let us do it, then.

New York, September 22, 1997.

1998

1998

During the year 1998 the trend in favor of Social-democrat governments grew in Europe. After the long Helmut Kohl years, Gerhard Schroeder assumed power in Germany and turned the views of his country toward the consolidation of reunification and the stability of Eastern Europe, which was shaken at that time by the Serbian repression in Kosovo against Albanese majorities and by the instability prevailing in Russia.

Some progress could then be seen in the Middle East: under the mediation of President Clinton, Yasser Arafat and Prime Minister Benjamin Netanyahu approved an agreement of "land in exchange for peace". The situation, however, would be complicated by the attacks attributed to Osama Bin Laden against the American embassies in Kenya and Tanzania. North American forces bombed Sudan and Afghanistan on account of those attacks. Non acceptance by Iraq of IAEA inspections brought retaliation by the United States and Britain. In Asia, nuclear tests by India and immediately after by Pakistan, as well as the refusal of both countries to sing the Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty (CTBT) resulted in American sanctions and contributed to increase international tensions.

In South America, the diplomatic attention of Brazil turned primarily toward the crisis between Peru and Ecuador due to the old territorial dispute between both countries. Equally worrisome were the recurring crises with the Menem government in Argentina resulting from the asymmetries between the economic and financial policies of the two

largest partners in MERCOSUR. Hugo Chávez won his first presidential election in Venezuela. The Summit of the Americas in Santiago followed up on the decisions taken by the Miami Summit and negotiations on the creation of ALCA began.

In Brazil, the Fernando Henrique Cardoso administration concluded in 1998 its program of reforms and privatizations and prepared for the election which – once the corresponding constitutional amendment was adopted – would lead to the reelection of the President. The international financial panorama, however, became considerably more serious. The negative effect of the Asian crisis continued to be felt. Stock exchanges tumbled and Asian currencies slid into devaluation as a result of sudden movements of capital and speculative attacks. The situation of Russia deteriorated with the devaluation of the ruble and the halt in external payments. In December, Brazil concluded an agreement with the IMF.

The language used by Minister Lampreia in his statement before the Fifty-Third Session of the General Assembly was certainly strongly influenced by the instability prevailing in international financial markets and by the volatility of the movements of capital which then harmed Brazil with particular intensity. The Minister devoted the first part of his speech to describing the impact of the crisis on Brazil, explaining the action taken by the government to make the functioning of the world financial system more stable and predictable and to recapitulating the proposals taken to the G7 since 1995 by the Brazilian authorities with a view, in particular, to widen the coordination of macroeconomic policies and expand the mechanisms of stabilization of the currencies under speculative attack. The need for concerted measures at the international level could not be delayed under penalty of returning to "closed economy models in an illusory search for self-sufficiency." It was urgent, Minister Lampreia concluded, to make the resources of interdependence work and implement effective forms of governance on the international level.

Linking economic instability and international security, the Minister expounded the desire of a democratic and modern Brazil to play a more active role in the construction of the world order. He recalled our action as a non-permanent member of the Security Council, the ratification of CTBT, the approval by the Congress of Brazil's accession to the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons (NPT) and the deposit of the corresponding instruments of ratification.

He stressed the performance by Brazil as coordinator of the guarantors of the Rio de Janeiro Protocol to resolve the crisis between

Peru and Ecuador as well as the decision to recognize the compulsory jurisdiction of the Inter-American Human Rights Court.

He also emphasized once again the participation of Brazilian soldiers and policemen in United Nations forces. He mentioned the ongoing conflict in Angola, the crisis in Guinea Bissau and the process in Timor East which was then intensifying.

At the final section of the statement, Minister Lampreia (1) made a positive mention to the improvement in the Brazilian human development indexes, (2) called for more coherence from developed nations between their free-trade discourse and their commercial defense policies (a reference to the constant problems caused by anti-dumping measures imposed by the United States) and (3) again took up the question of the reform of the United Nations, with a view to supporting the legitimacy and effectiveness of multilateral procedures and particularly updating the workings and the composition of the Security Council: "we will continue to advocate for the expansion of the two categories of members, with the presence of developing countries in both".

LIII Regular Session of the General Assembly of the United Nations 1998

Minister Luiz Felipe Lampreia [*]

Mr. President, your election to preside over the Fifty-Third Session of the United Nations General Assembly is especially gratifying for us Brazilians. Brazil and Uruguay came into being as sister nations, and our bonds are becoming ever stronger. With each passing day, our destinies are more and more linked together. The opportunity I have of working closely with my friend, Didier Opertti, allows me to say with conviction that at this session the Assembly will have a formidable President. In the exercise of this important task, you will benefit from the example set by your predecessor. At the helm of the Fifty-Second Session, Mr. Hennadiy Udovenko was able to guide and motivate delegations and to provide valuable impulse to the proposals for reform put forward by the Secretary-General.

Because of his dedication to the task of modernizing our Organization and, above all, because of his decisive role in situations that pose a real threat to international peace and security, the Secretary-General deserves our applause. The diplomatic talent and serene daring revealed by Mr. Kofi Annan confirm that we have in him a leader who is up to the challenges and opportunities before us. It was an honour for us to have welcomed him in Brazil this past July.

The defining trait of this particular moment is the troubling instability that besets global financial markets. Since the last quarter

[*] **Luiz Felipe Palmeira Lampreia**, born in Rio de Janeiro, RJ, on October 19, 1941. Third Secretary on 11/7/1963. First Class Minister, 6/29/1984. Minister of State for External Relations from 1/1/1995 to 2001.

of 1997, when we first felt the shock waves of what was then called the "Asian crisis", the world economy has been suffering the effects of a phenomenon whose reach, depth and permanence are still not clear. But the international community cannot wait, with arms crossed, for the course of events to shed light on our quandary.

It is both legitimate and necessary that Governments act to try to prevent problems that may arise. In an era marked by the rapid integration of national economies, such action by Governments will increasingly have to be made through coordination in the international sphere.

Although there is still no consensus as to the dimension of the crisis we face, nor on the prognosis for its duration, there seems to be a growing convergence of points of view regarding the impact of the high volatility of capital movements. The events of the past few months have revealed a serious lag between growing financial interdependence and the modest effectiveness of existing international mechanisms for dialogue and coordination.

Since the beginning of his Administration, President Fernando Henrique Cardoso of Brazil has been calling the attention of other world leaders to the task of making the global financial system more stable and predictable. In repeated messages to G7 members, beginning in 1995, he offered concrete proposals: to increase cooperation among monetary authorities; to expand coordination of macroeconomic policies among countries that can have considerable impact on world finance; to upgrade international monitoring capacity over domestic macroeconomic policy; and to expand mechanisms aimed at stabilizing currencies under speculative attack. There have been, of course, considerable advances along some of these lines, but the measures adopted still fall far short of what is needed. Until now, political will has not corresponded to the magnitude and gravity of the situation. The crisis will not resolve itself. We must join together to face it.

In this, as in other fields of international life, we must avoid at all costs an attitude that, back in the seventies, Brazilian Foreign Minister Azeredo da Silveira described as "the postponement syndrome".

Experience teaches us that inaction can have a high cost. It also teaches that answers given by various countries to crisis situations, if guided by irrational or spur-of-the-moment reactions, can turn these situations into even greater problems, prolonging their effects over time and aggravating people's suffering.

One can imagine extreme scenarios of a return to closed economic models, to the search for elusive self-sufficiency and isolation, to notions

of national security based on distrust of others and on the insecurity of others. Such scenarios must not become reality. We cannot allow it.

Progress in international relations depends fundamentally on the perception of the international arena not as a source of potential threat, but as an environment in which risks can be reduced and difficulties overcome by a pooling of wills and resources.

Ours is not a world in which nations should be left to their own devices. The cost of such a course is invariably higher than the energy or resources saved by attempts to distance one from the problems of others. The willingness to deal collectively with problems will motivate individual countries to believe in the benefit of seeking international consideration of matters in their direct interest. The world cannot depend only on the willingness, capacity and interest of a select number of countries to mobilize and lead international efforts in this or that direction.

We can no longer accept situations, such as the present financial crisis, in which, despite the undeniably international nature of the phenomenon, Governments and societies simply do not fully trust any of the existing organizations or mechanisms as a source of support, guidance or even interpretation of the problem at hand. We must give serious consideration to the fact that growing interdependence renders indispensable effective governance at the international level.

We have before us an essentially political challenge.

This does not mean simply modernizing decision-making procedures or administrative structures, but also giving to multilateral treatment of issues the priority it so often receives in our speeches and statements.

A large gap still remains between the recognition that the central problems facing humanity must be dealt with at the international level and the resistance of Governments and societies to act in accordance with that recognition. This is most evident in the allocation of resources and in the adoption of policies capable of generating external repercussions.

In that same vein, if the link between the national and the international is ever greater, peace and development are also increasingly related. A world racked by economic instability or despair cannot be a safe environment, free of the threat of war, conflict and violence. But the reverse is also true: material and social progress presupposes minimal conditions of security and peaceful coexistence among and within countries. We must advance on both fronts by working to establish a climate of confidence in the political-strategic realm and in the essential context of the global economy.

Brazil's relative weight and the history of our international behavior are some of our country's most important credentials. These credentials are strengthened today by the maturity of our democracy and by the vigorous modernization of the Brazilian economy.

Under the leadership of President Cardoso, we have renewed our permanent willingness to play a more active role in building a world order conducive to peace and development. This spirit guides Brazil's international action, particularly within the United Nations.

I wish to point out that, in the Security Council and other United Nations bodies, our delegation, led by Ambassador Celso Amorim, has faithfully reflected this central guideline of Brazilian foreign policy.

In 1998, we have completed our participation in the international non-proliferation regime. We have ratified the Comprehensive Nuclear Test-Ban Treaty (CTBT) and acceded to the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons (NPT), which was approved by Brazil's National Congress this past July. Three days ago in Washington, I had the satisfaction of personally depositing the instrument of accession to the NPT, in tandem with our Ambassadors in London and Moscow.

These decisions lend formal and symbolic support to the commitment to use nuclear energy for exclusively peaceful purposes. This commitment is enshrined in the Brazilian Constitution and is strengthened by the bilateral and regional pacts we have signed. The existing agreements and the cooperation between Brazil and Argentina, as well as the Treaty of Tlatelolco, are exemplary achievements in this field.

Brazil thus feels particularly motivated to call upon nuclear-armed States, and upon those with the capability of producing such weapons, to take decisive steps towards disarmament. We also expect that Governments which have still not become party to the NPT, the CTBT and other relevant instruments and mechanisms will do so at an early date.

As an expression of the determination which motivates us to work for this cause, Brazil, together with seven other friendly countries, signed the "Declaration on a Nuclear Weapon Free World: the Need for a New Agenda" on June 9 of this year. During the current session of the General Assembly, together with our partners in the Declaration, we intend to present a draft resolution aimed at boosting and guiding efforts towards the complete and definitive elimination of nuclear weapons.

There is no longer room or justification for postponing action in the nuclear field or in the broader fight to eliminate all weapons of mass destruction. The cost of a failure to do so could be truly catastrophic, and the risks are evident to all.

The Brazilian Government, as the coordinator of the guarantor countries of the Rio de Janeiro Protocol, has been making a sustained effort to assist Ecuador and Peru in reaching at the earliest possible date a solid and final agreement on the border differences that have kept them apart for decades. Our diplomatic services - together with those of Argentina, Chile and the United States stand ready to continue making the best possible contribution.

Recent developments confirm the prognosis that the peace process is on its way to a conclusion and reflect the political will and the high level of engagement with which Ecuador and Peru have been working towards that end.

The fact that South America is a region in which countries essentially live in a harmonious, peaceful and increasingly integrated manner is for Brazil a vital and defining trait that our peoples are determined to preserve.

The same applies to the permanence of democratic regimes as a common thread of the nations in our continent. It is a higher value to which we are collectively committed in the Southern Cone Common Market (MERCOSUR), the Rio Group and the Organization of American States (OAS).

The advent and consolidation of democracy was the determining factor in the extraordinary work of integration in which South American nations are engaged. This is an accomplishment of our societies that the Governments of the region must always be prepared to defend as one. This is a basic tenet of Brazilian foreign policy.

Brazil attaches the utmost importance to the advancement of human rights. As we celebrate the Fiftieth anniversary of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights, we should recognize the persistent gap between principles and generally accepted rules of international law, on the one hand, and the prevalent realities of the world, on the other.

The Brazilian Government is engaged in the fight to overcome the distance between norms and facts in our country. We are prepared to draw from the international environment elements that may help us realize an aspiration shared by all Brazilians. This was the main thrust of President Cardoso's submission to the National Congress of the decision to recognize the mandatory jurisdiction of the Inter-American Court of Human Rights.

President Cardoso is also committed to the fight against the drug trade. His presence at the Special Session of the General Assembly this past June was clear proof of this commitment.

Our participation in the effort to build a lasting peace extends beyond the Americas. The Brazilian military and police have taken part in United Nations forces in many parts of the world, particularly in Portuguese-speaking countries in Africa, to which we are bound by history and culture.

Brazil has followed developments in Angola with concern. The United Nations must firmly insist that UNITA fulfill the commitments undertaken in the Lusaka Protocol. An unraveling of the situation could jeopardize the progress achieved in the peace process and would be tragic indeed. Angolans have been subjected to untold suffering for decades. The international community must do everything within its reach so that Angola may finally dedicate itself to reconstruction and development.

The Brazilian Government, along with the other members of the Community of Portuguese-Speaking Countries, is engaged in seeking a peaceful solution to the grave internal crisis faced by Guinea-Bissau. The Community, in close coordination with countries in the region, has contributed to spurring significant progress. We will continue to pursue favorable conditions for the urgent and complete normalization of life in that sister nation.

As for East Timor – to which we are also bound by history and a common language – Brazil welcomes the new spirit that presides over this delicate and complex issue, especially in the context of the tripartite negotiations between the Portuguese and Indonesian Governments, under the auspices of the Secretary-General.

The Brazilian Government has maintained a positive dialogue with the parties involved and is determined to assist, to the limit of its possibilities, in finding an adequate equation for all concerned, with progressive participation by the Timorese themselves.

Since the advent of economic stability in 1994, Brazil has shown renewed dynamism with the strengthening of our domestic market and the outlook for development with social justice.

But present day Brazil does not see its development as isolated or self-contained. We realize that the destiny of our economy is increasingly linked to that of the economies of our neighbors and partners, in the framework of an integration process that has decidedly contributed to progress in the region and to the well-being of our societies, particularly within MERCOSUR.

The limits of this process serve not only the goal of economic development but also, and most importantly, the cause of social justice, which remains the foremost task of our region.

We welcome the results of the most recent edition of the United Nations *Human Development Report.* The numbers show that, in spite of all that remains to be done, our country has made extraordinary social progress over the past two decades in the areas of health, education, the fight against poverty and the reduction of disparities among the various regions of the country. Even though we still face daunting challenges, Brazilians are leading a better life, as our presence among those nations of greater human development indicates.

Consistent with its domestic policies and its regional role, Brazil will continue to fight for a more balanced allocation of the benefits of economic interdependence, without distortions such as those resulting from protectionist policies of developed countries.

Such policies affect in a particularly cruel manner the developing countries and serve to reinforce the arguments of those who preach domestically a return to closed economic models. In the current context of global economic turbulence, we must demand that the developed countries establish greater coherence between free-trade rhetoric and their unfair trade practices.

President Cardoso has stated that we must abandon the path of globalization with exclusion – in the decision-making process as well as in the distribution of benefits – and seek globalization with solidarity in both of those dimensions.

Reforming and strengthening the United Nations is an essential part of building a world of greater solidarity.

The Brazilian Government recognizes the significant progress that has already been made in terms of structural and functional modernization of the Organization. We agree with the Secretary-General when he says that reform must not be seen as an event, but as a process; but we cannot but stress that an important part of that process has yet to be undertaken.

For Brazil, reforming the United Nations necessarily implies updating the functioning and composition of the Security Council, which still mirrors a period of history that is now long gone. That does not mean – and I have stated this before in this forum – that the particular interests of this or that country should be taken into account. What it does mean is that fundamental deficiencies in terms of legitimacy, representativeness and effectiveness must be redressed. We will continue to defend expansion in both categories of members, with the presence, in both, of developing countries.

It is inconceivable that, on the eve of the new millennium, reform of the Organization could exclude the restructuring of the Security Council.

The basis of global solidarity is the establishment of trust between societies. There is no other way if we are to establish a peaceful, stable and constructive international environment. Our so-called global village is still far from becoming a truly integrated community, in which people can consider themselves as participants in the same historical process.

Of the many merits of international organizations, one of the most important is that they offer a framework of interaction that favors the development of a true sense of universal communion. In dealing with common problems, Governments learn in practice just how much they need to work more and more closely together. In international forums, we are constantly weaving a web of relations based on a stronger identity and trust between our nations and their leaders. Countries must trust one another, but they must also have a reason to trust in the legitimacy and efficiency of multilateral organizations and procedures in order to tackle their most important problems.

The dynamics of international life demand a constant updating of the instruments at the disposal of the community of nations to allow it to act collectively in the face of its greatest challenges.

We must have the courage to recognize that never before have the risks and the cost of procrastination been so high. We must, above all, have the will to make the decisions that can ultimately restore our faith in ourselves, in our capacity to state that history does goes on, and that we are pointing it in the direction of a more just and better world.

New York, September 21, 1998.

1999

1999

Upon his reelection in 1998, President Fernando Henrique Cardoso started his second four-year term on January 1, 1999. He soon had to face a speculative attack against the Real, which seriously depleted Brazilian international reserves and finally led to a devaluation of the currency. The liquidity crisis gradually receded on the international level, but in Brazil its reverberations were still intense.

The panorama in the Middle East was of relative stability throughout the year. Ehud Barak assumed the post of Prime Minister in Israel. Security in Eastern Europe continued to be precarious: as the possibilities of agreement in the United Nations were frustrated, NATO finally intervened in the former Yugoslavia against the Milosevic regime in order to protect the Albanian minorities in Kosovo. Russia started a full military offensive against Chechenya. Unable to ensure political and economic instability in Russia, President Yeltsin resigned, opening the way for the rise of Vladimir Putin. The Czech Republic, Poland and Hungary joined NATO and started to prepare for accession to the European Union. In fulfillment of the Torrijos-Carter Agreement, the United States transferred to the Panamanian government the control of the Panama Canal on December 31.

At the end of the year, the expectations of the launching of the so-called "Millennium Round" within the WTO were thwarted. The Seattle General Conference failed, marked by a large attendance by

demonstrators under the coordination of "anti-globalization" non-governmental organizations.

The speech by Minister Lampreia before the Fifty-Fourth Session of the General Assembly in 1999 was marked mainly by the worsening of the crises in Kosovo, in East Timor and in Angola, as well as the shortcomings shown by the United Nations in dealing with those situations. There were very expressive references to Angola and, in particular, to the willingness of Brazil to participate in the multinational force approved by the Security Council to intervene in East Timor, where a referendum had decided in favor of independence from Indonesia.

The speech also contains an evaluation of the crises experienced by Latin America as a reflex of the volatility of international financial markets. In spite of the crisis, the Minister stated, Brazil had arrived at the end of the century with inflation below 8 per cent and with the prospect of starting a sustained development cycle at a rate above 4 per cent yearly.

The Minister once again emphasized the importance of MERCOSUR and the democratic and peaceful tradition of our region, as had been shown, once more, by the solution of the border dispute between Peru and Ecuador.

Many Latin American countries were experiencing leadership changes. In 1999, elections would be held in Argentina, Chile and Uruguay. In 2000, there would be elections in Mexico. The Minister predicted before the General Assembly that such a process would reinforce the democratic mark" of Latin America.

Next, he made specific mention to the situation of the countries in the region: Bolivia; Peru (successes in the economic field and in the fight against terrorism and drug traffic); Ecuador; Paraguay (support extended by Brazil to overcome the crisis that would culminate in the removal of President Raul Cubas); Guyana; Surinam; Venezuela (need to respect the renovation process that was then starting with the assumption of power by President Hugo Chávez: "the expression of this will through institutional channels is the best guarantee that the changes will be kept in the path of respect to the norms, rights and duties that define democracy"); and Colombia.

At the end of this country by country journey, unheard of in Brazilian speeches, the Minister reaffirmed the full incorporation of Brazil in the regional process: "The success of the people and government of Brazil to solve their own problems, to overcome their challenges that are neither few nor small, depends on the success of our neighbors".

After characterizing organized crime and drug trafficking as one of the greatest challenges to democratic societies, the Minister then summed up the progress made by Brazil in the internalization of international commitments to govern the acquisition of conventional weapons, illicit traffic of arms and international organized crime.

The statement ended with a reference to words by President Fernando Henrique at the opening of his second term and an exhortation to the renovation and change of the United Nations. This time, however, there was no mention to the reform of the Security Council.

LIV Regular Session of the General Assembly of the United Nations 1999

Minister Luiz Felipe Lampreia [*]

Mr. President,

Brazil congratulates you, Sir, on your election as President of the General Assembly at its Fifty-Fourth Session. Your personal record in defense of democracy and human rights, which was forged in the struggle of the people of Namibia for liberty and self-determination, offers an inspiring example for our work.

As a sister nation of Uruguay, we take pride in the work done by your predecessor, my friend, Minister Didier Opertti. I would like to express the appreciation and gratitude of the Brazilian Government for his decisive role in presiding over the Fifty-Third Session.

Secretary-General Kofi Annan is equally deserving of special recognition. In these times of far-reaching and uncharted challenges before the international community, his sense of proportion and the strength of his serene leadership have been valuable aids in the search for realistic and innovative solutions. We appreciate and support his endeavors in the cause of peace, development and justice.

The Brazilian Government warmly greets the admission of Kiribati, Nauru and Tonga, which have just joined the United Nations family.

Year after year, for over half a century, we have gathered here to discuss and debate the issues of our time. Year after year, the

[*] **Luiz Felipe Palmeira Lampreia**, born in Rio de Janeiro, RJ, on October 19, 1941. Third Secretary on 11/7/1963. First Class Minister, 6/29/1984. Minister of State for External Relations from 1/1/1995 to 2001.

representatives of the Member countries of the United Nations have come to this rostrum to set forth their vision of global affairs and to provide analysis and to propose solutions.

As the requirements of our societies become ever greater over time, there grows a sense of an ever-widening gulf between our words and our deeds, a distance that serves only to feed the skepticism of some and the pessimism of others.

Whenever an unfolding crisis and its human tragedy break through international indifference and become newsworthy, it is to the United Nations that the public opinion of our countries looks for meaningful answers.

Unfortunately, however, the international community feels compelled to act in a coordinated fashion, mobilizing the necessary resources and political will, only when long festering problems threaten to get out of hand, making a satisfactory solution all the more difficult.

The upshot is a sense of frustration and impatience towards the United Nations. This may be because the necessary initiatives are in the end adopted outside the United Nations framework, as was the case in Kosovo. Or it may be because the measures agreed are not up to the concrete needs, as we have seen in East Timor. Or it may even be because the United Nations finds itself once again confronted, as in Angola, with well-known conflicts of catastrophic proportions that the international community has failed to address in a timely manner.

Why is it that certain predicaments generate intense mobilization of ways and means, but not others? Why does human suffering in some parts of the globe fuel greater indignation than when it takes place elsewhere? The plight of Angola and that of East Timor offer two glaring examples of what amounts to a clear pattern of one-sided and unequal attention.

In Angola, UNITA's refusal to abide by the Lusaka Protocol and hardened positions threaten to rekindle in all its intensity the same civil war that over a quarter of a century has caused incalculable suffering to millions in that country, particularly the defenseless and the deprived.

In Angola, which has special bonds with Brazil, the international community is squarely faced – despite the limited international press coverage – with an immense political challenge and a humanitarian disaster of shocking proportions. Urgent and priority action is called for. The Security Council can no longer allow its resolutions to be blatantly ignored, as has been the case.

No less urgent – and in this case the United Nations is now actively engaged – is the task of helping guarantee the right of the East Timorese people to decide their own future as an independent nation, a decision unmistakably voiced in a free ballot. Brazilian society, which shares linguistic, cultural and historic ties with the Timorese, joined in their rejoicing when the vote returned a resounding verdict for independence. There was consternation in Brazil at the violence against our brothers in East Timor and at the loss of innocent lives that followed.

Brazil cannot accept, nor can Brazilian citizens understand, that the self-determination of the Timorese people is not fully assured. We therefore believe that the multinational force authorized by the Security Council a force in which Brazil was determined to participate from the very outset – will put a stop to the atrocities committed since the popular ballot and will be able to re-establish the necessary conditions for a peaceful transition to independence.

Over the past decade, Latin America, long viewed as a land of backwardness and dictatorships, has fashioned a new international image for itself through the transformations it has undergone. The return to democracy in our countries has had a decisive role in this, as did our important achievements in fostering respect for human rights – although much remains to be done. The adoption of consistent economic policies, in turn, has made it possible to overcome the endless dilemmas that had ensnared us, and to put an end to the inflationary spiral that had brought so much uncertainty and injustice to our citizens.

Let there be no doubt that the difficulties that we experienced, on and off, throughout 1999 will not cause us to lose faith and relinquish our achievements: For a few days, or maybe weeks, at the beginning of the year, Brazil was dubbed by some "the sick man of Latin America". It was thought that we might slip back into the trap of high inflation, that we would experience deep recession or that we would once again resort to the panacea of stoking short-term growth and return to the old boom-and-bust cycles of the past.

Yet we have arrived at the end of the century with an inflation rate under 8 per cent. We fully expect to embark on a course of sustained annual growth of more than 4 per cent and are set to bring to completion a large-scale modernization program by means of important reforms in tax, fiscal and social security matters. President Fernando Henrique Cardoso will not flinch in his determination to lay the groundwork for our country to become modern, economically fit and dynamic, as well as socially more just and politically mature.

With the advent of democracy, Brazil and Argentina have developed the solid friendship that binds our peoples, and have over a short space of time built a lasting monument to integration. Our bilateral agreements in the field of nuclear cooperation are exemplary and a stabilizing force in the region and worldwide. The Southern Cone Common Market (MERCOSUR) – which our two countries joined Paraguay and Uruguay in establishing and with which the democracies of Bolivia and Chile have associated themselves – has fundamentally altered the economic face of the hemisphere and indeed of the world. Our integration process is not directed against anyone, but, on the contrary, seeks to strengthen our historical ties both within and beyond the Americas. Both individually and within the framework of MERCOSUR our countries have become a powerful force in the drive to set the international trade system on a more open, balanced course, one that no longer aids and abets protectionist privileges at the expense, more often than not, of developing countries.

Democracy has made it possible for the countries of Latin America to provide mutual assistance – without undue and unsolicited foreign interference and in a spirit of collaboration – whenever there is a jointly perceived threat to the institutional stability of one of them. Thanks to democracy, the countries of our region have successfully solved disputes that for long disturbed the harmony of the more peaceful and stable of continents. At the end of last year, Ecuador and Peru, with the diplomatic support of Brazil, Argentina, Chile and the United States, signed in Brasília the agreements that put an end to their long running boundary dispute. Thus, despite all manner of difficulties, Latin America is transforming itself into a tightly knit entity that is politically, economically and socially integrated.

It is in this spirit of integration, and in the abiding awareness that we belong to one family, that Brazil feels closely attuned to the various efforts at renewal under way in the region. The elections scheduled for next October in Argentina will no doubt confirm the political vitality of this great neighbor of ours and guarantee the necessary economic conditions for stability and reinvigorated growth. These same favorable expectations, we are sure, will be fulfilled at the elections to be held in Chile and in Uruguay this year, and in Mexico next year. Their outcome will most certainly underline the democratic character of Latin America.

The political and economic achievements of Bolivia since the 1980s in overcoming obstacles that 20 years ago seemed insurmountable are a further indication of how much our region has changed for the better. Peru as well has gained international recognition through its resounding

successes in reversing the adverse economic trends of past decades and in the war against terrorism and drug trafficking. This capacity to overcome obstacles is equally noticeable in Ecuador, where, with the support of international financial institutions, political forces will – through democratic and constitutional channels – undertake the needed reforms to overcome the present crisis. Paraguay, in turn, successfully dealt with a delicate political crisis at the beginning of this year and is moving steadily along the road of democratic institution-building and economic development. Brazil, as always, will continue to decisively support Paraguay in that endeavor.

Guyana provides a further demonstration, not only of our commitment to upholding and fostering democratic values, but equally of the integrationist spirit that inspires us. It is our hope that Suriname will join in the efforts and achievements of the region in bringing about these positive changes. The transformations that Venezuela is undergoing have drawn great international attention. This process of change must be respected, for it clearly and legitimately reflects the Venezuelan people's desire for renewal. The expression of this aspiration through institutional channels is the best guarantee that the changes under way will stay on the track of respect for the norms, rights and duties that define democracy.

Brazil is also confident that the Government of President Andres Pastrana, in Colombia, will persevere in its endeavors to bring peace to this kindred nation. Undue foreign interference would only aggravate an already complex situation, which it is up to the Colombians themselves to overcome.

It is on the success of our neighbors, in which we trust, that hinges the success of the Brazilian people and its Government in solving their own problems and in overcoming their own challenges, which are neither few nor small.

Organized crime and drug trafficking today pose a major challenge to democratic societies. They clearly represent a serious threat to the security of national institutions and to citizens directly, who pay with their own lives the intolerable price for this scourge of our times. The spiraling stockpile of and trade in small arms is closely linked to organized crime and drug trafficking. As its citizens find their lives daily at risk because of contraband firearms, Brazil gives the utmost priority to tackling this question. At the regional level we approved the important Inter-American Convention on Transparency in Conventional Weapons Acquisitions. We would like this Assembly to endorse the proposal to hold an international conference on illicit arms trafficking in all its aspects.

Similarly, Brazil attaches considerable importance to the work being done on a draft convention against transnational organized crime.

In turn, the continued existence of weapons of mass destruction remains a threat to the security and even the survival of humankind.

All actions contrary to the aims of the non-proliferation regime should be firmly condemned by the international community. At the same time, it behooves the nuclear-armed States, as well as the threshold States, to move towards the complete and irreversible elimination of nuclear armaments. For this reason, Brazil, Egypt, Ireland, Mexico, New Zealand, South Africa and Sweden will once again submit, at this session, a draft resolution on a new agenda for nuclear disarmament. The draft resolution, which seeks to pave the way for a constructive dialogue on this issue, is grounded on a realistic and balanced appraisal of the nature of the nuclear disarmament process.

Our countries' democratic institutions and the international organizations, particularly the United Nations, face fundamental challenges today. Our countries are confronted daily with economic difficulties and acute social grievances, such as poverty and extremes of inequality, which heighten impatience: impatience with economies unable to grow at a rate compatible with faster improvement of the well-being of societies; impatience in the face of vulnerability to crises and to turbulence in international markets; and impatience with political processes that sometimes appear slow to respond to the legitimate and pressing demands of citizens. It is vital, however, that this collective impatience be voiced and guided through democratic channels.

Brazil's commitment to democratic institutions and to the primacy of law also applies to international relations. At the outset of his second term of office, to which he was elected last October by an absolute majority of Brazilian voters, President Fernando Henrique Cardoso made it clear that:

> The rule of law is the only admissible foundation for the international order. Should unilateralism and the use of force come to be accepted as organizing principles of international relations, in the long term it will be more rational to side with the instruments of power politics rather than to strive for order and to abide by law. If we are to see a truly new world order emerge, one of its cornerstones must be the acceptance that multilateral institutions – not least the Security Council – are the source of legality and legitimacy for those actions that guarantee peace and the peaceful resolution of disputes.

Our societies await, again with increasing impatience, seeing multilateral organizations, and in particular the United Nations, show themselves to be up to the challenge of playing a meaningful – in fact, crucial – role in establishing an international order attuned to the shared aspirations and values of humankind as a whole.

The road ahead calls for renewal and change. If the Governments of the world desire a strong and effective United Nations, they must not only change how they think and act with respect to this Organization, but they must also think and act to bring about change in the Organization. This is what is at stake. This is the challenge before us.

New York, September 20, 1999.

2000

2000

The statement delivered by Minister Lampreia at the Fifty-Fifth Session of the General Assembly – the last one of his tenure at the head of Itamaraty – had a markedly analytic character. The new millennium was dawning. It was a moment for evaluation and renewal of expectations. A high level meeting, the "Millennium Summit", took place in New York before the start of the General Assembly of the United Nations, at which the 191 Member States of the Organization established eight fundamental goals, the "Millennium Development Goals", aiming at eliminating poverty and inequalities on a global scale.

In the year of the celebration of the Fifth Centennial of the Discovery, Brazil had recovered the trust of the capital markets and showed reasonable rates of growth.

The international panorama, however, was still uncertain. A new Intifada broke out in Palestine after the visit of General Ariel Sharon to a sacred temple in Jerusalem. Barak and Arafat looked for ways toward dialogue. Israel would leave Southern Lebanon. But the death of Hafez Al-Assad opened uncertainties about the direction Syria would take.

The leadership of the United States and Russia were to change with the election of Vladimir Putin and at the end of the year, in precarious circumstances (defeat in the popular vote and victory in the Electoral College), the election of George W. Bush.

In Latin America, a renovation cycle was opened: President Vicente Fox was to be elected in Mexico, putting an end to several decades

(71 years) of hegemony of the PRI over the political and institutional life of the country. Fujimori abandoned power in Peru and after the detention of Pinochet in London, where he had gone for health reasons, the process that would gradually lead to his indictment in Chile for crimes committed during his government was initiated.

Brazil took forward its commitment with regional integration by convening and hosting the First Meeting of South American Presidents, in Brasília.

In Europe, the surge of Social Democracy suffered a setback with the victory of the Popular Party of José Maria Aznar in Spain. In Austria, the conservatives joined the extreme right in order to be able to form a government. Milosevic was removed from power in Serbia after bombardments by NATO.

In the Asian continent, a brief positive expectation was opened with the first meeting of the rulers of South and North Korea.

Minister Lampreia sought to analyze the ambivalences in the international system as characterized, on the one hand, by the growing wealth of intellectual and material resources and on the other by the inability to mobilize the political will needed to articulate convergences between the asymmetrical realities prevailing at the international level and within national societies. Next, he formulated an evaluation of the need for the progress in widening freedoms worldwide to be accompanied by advancements also in regard to "the core values of equality and fraternity".

He concluded with a denunciation of the situation obtaining in the field of international trade: "It is unacceptable that major global issues and campaigns for transnational solidarity be manipulated and exploited in order to disguise what amounts to the protection of narrow interests." The Minister's concern was certainly linked to the collapse of the General Conference of the WTO in Seattle, which was unable to launch the negotiation of what was then called the Millennium Round. With this objective in mind, Minister Lampreia dwelt particularly on the lack of coherence between the rhetoric of free trade and the maintenance of protectionist policies on the part of developed countries. And he criticized the restrictions imposed on the exchange of agricultural products and the improper use of the so called "labor and environmental clauses" to the detriment of developing countries.

He also returned to an analysis of the situation in South America, calling attention to the positive evolution of the integration process in the region and especially to the recent I Meeting of South American Presidents in Brasília.

The statement closed with a brief mention to the series of positive events that had occurred within the United Nations, such as the review of the world conferences on women (Beijing + 5), the NPT review Conference and the constitution of the World Criminal Court. There was also a special mention to the start of the mission of Sérgio Vieira de Mello in East Timor.

Finally, the Minister mentioned the expectation created with the decisions of the "Millennium Assembly" that met a few weeks before and reaffirmed Brazil's belief in multilateralism as a factor capable of warranting a "progressive and just governance in this integrated world".

The Brazilian statement at the plenary session of the Millennium Summit was entrusted to Vice-President Marco Maciel. Its text appears in the following pages. The occasion was used to reiterate the historic commitment of Brazil with multilateralism, both in its political and security dimensions and in what regards the international economic and social order. Demanding a greater presence of the values of the United Nations in the fields of economic, social and cultural development, Vice-President Marco Maciel formulated a series of requests to developed countries in particular and to the United Nations system in general. Regarding Latin America, he also stressed the positive results of the Meeting of South American Presidents.

Statement by the Vice-President of the Republic, Marco Maciel*, on the occasion of the Plenary Session of the Millennium Summit 2000

Mr. President,

At the outset, let me express our strongest condemnation of the attack by Timorese militia against the UNHCR Office in Atambua, West Timor.

We express the sentiments of our deepest sympathy and condolences to the bereaved families, and our sincere wishes that the injured may recover promptly.

It gives me great satisfaction to bring to this historic summit the greetings of the President of Brazil, Fernando Henrique Cardoso, and of the entire Brazilian Nation. I am confident that the President of Finland, Tarja Halonen, and President Sam Nujoma, of Namibia, the co-presidents of the Millennium Summit, will provide inspired and firm guidance in the conduct of our deliberations.

I also salute Secretary General Kofi Annan, whose experience and breadth of vision of world affairs have been crucial to the strengthening of the United Nations.

The Millennium Summit offers a propitious opportunity to reaffirm our collective commitment to international peace and security, the observance of human rights, the respect for international law, the protection of the environment, the eradication of poverty and the well-

* **Marco Maciel**, Vice-President of the Republic from 1/1/1995 to 12/31/1998, and from 1/1/1999 to 12/31/2002 (2nd term).

being of all. These are goals that can only be achieved in the wake of economic and social development.

The United Nations has a key role to play in bringing about these objectives. There is no alternative to the path laid out by the Organization if we are to foster the ideals of liberty, equality, solidarity and tolerance between peoples. The United Nations has increasingly become an indispensable tool in our collective endeavors to overcome the challenges of the modern world.

The establishment of the United Nations is one of the great legacies of the 20th century. The time has come to revitalize it, to ensure that it mirrors the contemporary state of global affairs and the trend towards greater democracy in international relations. We must reform the Security Council to make it more representative, effective and legitimate. No longer can we tolerate anachronistic decision-making structures that are not only selective but fail to reflect the dynamics of worldwide transformations in the last few decades.

It is imperative to prevent the creation of an environment conducive to unilateral actions falling outside the framework of the United Nations Charter and International Law.

It is also imperative to renew within the United Nations the debate on the crucial issue of economic, social and cultural development.

Brazil shares the view of Secretary General Kofi Annan that extreme poverty is an affront to humanity. Poverty eradication, access to education, the supply of basic health services and sustainable development require a concerted effort on the part of the entire international community. Globalization should be a means for creating a world of greater solidarity and, therefore, with less asymmetry. We appeal to the developed countries to move ahead with debt reduction initiatives benefiting the poorest countries. Such a measure will undoubtedly help to bring on stream educational programs geared to the requirements of the needy, in particular by widening access of poor children to fundamental schooling.

By the same token, the United Nations cannot remain aloof from the need to ensure that access to science and technology is more democratic, so as to enable all the peoples of the world to share in the information age. The UN must help in efforts to remove restrictions to a more active role of developing countries in the world economy.

As we the leaders from all parts of the world gather to reaffirm collective commitments, let us bear in mind the significant efforts being made to enhance coordination at the regional level. In this respect, allow me to refer to the holding, last week, for the first time in our history, of a

meeting gathering the Presidents of all countries in South America. The success of this "Meeting of the Presidents of South America", in Brasília, reinforces the prospects for the consolidation of a regional zone of prosperity where our countries will be able to address common challenges and opportunities. I am convinced that the outcome of the gathering in Brasília constitutes a meaningful contribution, from our perspective, to the dynamics of regional integration, which is crucial in times of globalization.

The Brasília Meeting highlighted priorities of the region. Our commitment to democracy was enhanced. Our conviction was underscored that improvement of infrastructure geared to regional integration, the strengthening of our trade ties, closer technical and scientific cooperation, and the fight against drug trafficking and related crimes are decisive measures foster comprehensive regional development. Finally, as a reaffirmation of the peaceful aspirations of the countries of the region, we agreed to establish a South American Peace Zone.

Let us make the Millennium Summit a watershed in our endeavors to build a better world. If we are to achieve this goal as we enter the 21st century, it is essential that we bring new vigor to the United Nations.

New York, September 6, 2000.

LV Regular Session of the General Assembly of the United Nations 2000

Minister Luiz Felipe Lampreia [*]

Mr. President,

Brazil applauds your election, Sir, to preside over the Fifty-Fifth Session of the General Assembly of the United Nations. Your personal political experience and Finland's historic contribution to the promotion of peace, human rights and social development are valuable credentials that you bring to the honored task of chairing our work.

On behalf of the Brazilian Government, I pay tribute to your predecessor, Foreign Minister Theo-Ben Gurirab. His diplomatic skills and commitments to the highest ideals of the United Nations insured him a decisive role at the helm of the Fifty-Fourth Session.

I wish to make a very special reference to our Secretary-General, Kofi Annan. His moral authority has served as a beacon as we strive to fulfill the principles and goals of the United Nations. His report, "We, the peoples: the role of the United Nations in the twenty-first century", is a contribution of fundamental importance to the cause of peace and justice, and to a stronger United Nations. It will serve as a permanent source of inspiration as we ponder the crucial decisions the Organization is called upon to make.

Brazil had the satisfaction to co-sponsor the resolution bringing Tuvalu into the United Nations family. We salute Tuvalu as our newest member.

[*] **Luiz Felipe Palmeira Lampreia**, born in Rio de Janeiro, RJ, on October 19, 1941. Third Secretary on 11/7/1963. First Class Minister, 6/29/1984. Minister of State for External Relations from 1/1/1995 to 2001.

For the sixth consecutive time it is my honor to take part in the opening of the general debate. On all previous occasions, I took stock both of the positive and negative aspects of the current state of world affairs, the facts that afford us satisfaction and those that are cause for frustration and even indignation. This is our daily challenge and the motivating force behind our work.

We meet here for the last time this century. We all know that the twentieth century has been marred by a fundamental contradiction. We have seen a growing abundance of intellectual and material resources that should have brought about a greater convergence of opportunities and expectations as well as of living standards throughout the world. Yet, what we also saw was a failure to harness the necessary political will to translate those extraordinary possibilities into a reality of progress shared by all. This applies not only to the international community as a whole but is equally valid for the great majority of nations represented here, among which is Brazil itself.

No doubt, we have much to gain in identifying those aspects of our relations with the international environment that are a hindrance to national development. Yet it is equally illuminating to seek within our own countries examples of success and failure that help explain the world we live in. Globalization is asymmetrical in part because it flows from national societies that are themselves socially unbalanced and seem to have lost some of their urge to bring about social justice.

Freedom – the greatest of values – continues to advance on all fronts and in all continents. That is a crucial development. There is cause for concern, however, that the core values of equality and fraternity are dangerously being put aside. It is imperative that these two other essential elements return to the top of our agenda. They must retake their rightful place at the center of our policy decisions before it is too late; before some are misled into believing that the inevitable price for preserving freedom is the perpetuation of the divide between the rich and the poor, between those who are included and those who suffer exclusion, between the "globalized" and those left behind.

If democracy and freedom are to put down firm roots within our countries, we must foster a genuine sense of solidarity that translates into effective action. Only thus will we build an international order that is conducive to the preservation of peace and can function as an engine of sustained growth. It is unacceptable that major global issues and campaigns for transnational solidarity be manipulated and exploited in order to disguise what amounts to the protection of narrow interests. Unfortunately, this is what is happening in the field of international trade.

First, the inconsistency between free trade rhetoric and the continued use of protectionist policies of various types by developed countries. As I stated at the World Trade Organization conference in Seattle, the name of this game is discrimination. And discrimination, especially when waged against the weakest, is the absolute negation of solidarity. We must reverse these grave distortions in international trade, and especially as concerns agricultural products.

It is inadmissible that the most prosperous nations, whose economies are strongly based in the manufacturing and service industries, should be legally entitled to restrict access to their markets for agricultural goods, while they call for the free flow of those goods in which they benefit from an enormous competitive advantage. It is even more intolerable that these countries be allowed, as is presently the case, to subsidize the production and export of agricultural commodities to the tune of dozens of billions of dollars. These policies cause enormous harm to exporting nations that are more efficient and competitive in this field, but lack the financial means to offer equally generous fiscal incentives to their farmers.

Secondly, not satisfied with the persistence of this highly discriminatory situation – where what is said often deviates from what is done – there are those in the developed countries who give voice to sectional interests and defend a new offensive against the exports of developing nations. This is what the new language of protectionism, camouflaged as humanitarian internationalism, would seem to suggest. It unfurls the seductive banner of labor and environmental standards, which, if adopted, would further restrict the access of products from developing countries to the markets of rich countries.

This rhetoric and its appeal to certain segments of public opinion might suggest that the exports of developing countries pose a threat to the economic well-being and the way of life of the more developed societies. We all know this is not true. After all, these exports represent less than a third of world trade and are made up mostly of raw materials.

The main objective of those who wish to introduce labor conditionalities into trade rules has little to do with improving the quality of life of workers in poor countries. Their fundamental aim is to protect backward sectors of their own economies that, strictly speaking, are no longer capable of competing effectively in a free trade environment.

Sanctions and commercial barriers are inadequate tools to enhance labor standards and to protect the environment in developing countries. Our countries and our own societies, more than any other, are interested in achieving those very same objectives, which is why we need more – not less – exports and economic growth.

This is a message that developing countries must make ring out in a clear and powerful voice. We must instill in developed societies an understanding that they are not alone in the world. Above all, they must not presume to unilaterally write the rules of international trade solely according to their interests and points of view, as if the other 5 billion human beings did not have equally legitimate aspirations to progress, justice and well-being.

Nations must come increasingly to comprehend and respect differing realities and objectives among themselves. At the same time, they must recognize their commonalties and affinities; explore and enlarge areas of convergence and opportunities for cooperation; and overcome suspicions, rivalries and disputes.

Nowadays, it is above all through regional integration that this learning process takes place. For most countries, it opens the door to a more intensive and meaningful participation in global affairs.

In the Americas, and more specifically in Latin America, we have set ourselves firmly on this course. The countries of the region are increasingly integrated among themselves and into the world. These are the two inseparable faces of the same forward movement.

A few days ago in Brasília, on the initiative of President Fernando Henrique Cardoso, a meeting of Presidents of South America took place for the first time in our history. This gathering sought to bring together the leaders of South America around the common challenges that grow out of our shared geography and physical proximity. It is only natural that this first meeting should have occurred in Brazil, which shares borders with nine of its 11 South American neighbors, and has lived in harmony with all for over a century in a spirit of peace, friendship and growing determination to move ahead on the road to full integration.

The Presidents took important and concrete steps in this direction that will bear lasting fruit. In the political realm, they agreed to underscore the commitment of the countries of South America to democracy and decided that participation in future South American gatherings would hinge on the preservation of the rule of law and full respect for democratic values and procedures. They also agreed to hold consultations among their Governments in the event of a threat to democracy in our region.

In trade matters, they resolved to begin negotiations on a free-trade zone between MERCOSUR and the Andean Community, to be established before January 2002 and to be expanded into an economic zone covering all of South America, including Chile, Guyana and Suriname. To this end the Presidents decided to coordinate the planning and funding

of projects for integrating the region's infrastructure, in particular in the priority areas of energy, transport and telecommunications. By working together in this way we will more quickly set up the physical links that will enhance South American unity.

Drug trafficking and organized crime affect, in different forms, all regions of the world. The Presidents highlighted the role of the Organization of American States in the fight against drugs in the hemisphere and the setting up last year of the multilateral evaluation mechanism to assess the performance of our countries in this effort. They also decided to establish systematic consultations among national agencies and to set up a South American anti laundering task force.

The meeting of Presidents of South America was an event unique in the almost two centuries of independent nationhood for most of the subcontinent. As well as having historic significance and long-term impact, this summit will also generate results in the immediate future.

None is more significant than the commitment to democratic values. President Fernando Henrique Cardoso was very much to the point when he said: "the South America of today is synonymous with democracy (...). In this dawning of democracy, we will not tolerate abuses. And we will increasingly demand the right not only to vote, but to defend freedom, access to information and the judicial guarantees that make elections an effective exercise in democracy".

The United Nations has seen important achievements over this last year. Let me recall a few. The goal of creating a more just, tolerant society was reaffirmed during the follow-up world conferences on women – Beijing + 5 – and on social development – Copenhagen + 5. At the Non-Proliferation Treaty review conference, modest but nevertheless significant progress was made towards freeing the world from the scourge of nuclear arms. As one of the New Agenda countries, Brazil is proud of its contribution to the success of the conference, whose results will be a litmus test for future advances in the nuclear disarmament field.

Efforts to establish an International Criminal Court have moved ahead, and Brazil signed the Rome Statute. Those that commit crimes against humanity must not, under any circumstances, go unpunished.

In the Brahimi report (A/55/305), a valuable framework has been laid out on how to strengthen the work of United Nations peacekeeping operations and, as a result, on how to overcome recent failures. The courageous Rwanda and Srebrenica reports offer us a precise diagnosis of what needs to be done.

In Timor, under the leadership of a model international official, Sérgio Vieira de Mello, a new State is taking form and coming to life. We express our strongest condemnation of the attack on innocent workers at the United Nations office in Atambua, West Timor, who were helping to achieve this very goal.

In contrast with these achievements, the frustrations are well known. Peacekeeping operations in Sierra Leone and in the Democratic Republic of the Congo have still to show results; the conflict in Angola goes relentlessly on as a result of UNITA's inexcusable failure to comply with international directives and law; and there is growing awareness of the devastating dimensions of the AIDS epidemic in Africa and in the rest of the world.

Less than a week ago, in a historic meeting in this very Hall, world leaders took stock of the work and achievements of multilateralism. The outcome was a clearer reaffirmation of our determined and unequivocal commitment to reinvigorate the United Nations. We reinforced our convictions about the crucial role of this Organization in ensuring that justice is done and that international peace takes root.

Brazil has always been convinced of this.

In the absence of the United Nations, human rights would be more vulnerable; the distance between antagonists would be wider; the difficulties in eradicating poverty would be greater; the growth of tolerance would be slower and democratic practices would face even stronger opposition.

It may be that the Millennium Summit only gave expression to what we already knew. The historic legacy of this Summit should, then, be our renewed willingness to act.

We all know that it is by mobilizing political will that we can make a difference. The United Nations is the model political forum of the international community and its central goal is to provide the ways and means to bring to life our dearest ideals, values and aspirations.

In this hall there has often been a divorce between words and deeds, between objectives and the tools to achieve them, as if they hailed from different universes, distant and isolated from each other.

It is only through political dialogue, and consultation among States made possible by multilateralism that a degree of rationality and predictability can be brought to the workings of global forces.

To foster multilateralism is to strengthen the United Nations and the modern understanding of the individual as the central beneficiary of

international action. Only thus can we look forward to progressive and just governance in this integrated world.

It is our obligation to fulfill our common commitments, so vigorously underscored during the Millennium Summit. We must do so with determination and a sense of urgency.

New York, September 12, 2000.

2001

2001

The Brazilian statement before the Fifty-Sixth Session of the General Assembly was delivered by President Fernando Henrique Cardoso. This was the only occasion, during the eight years of his mandate, when the President opened the Assembly debate on behalf of Brazil.

It was an exceptional moment. On September 11 the attack against the Twin Towers in New York had occurred, whose authorship was quickly claimed by the Islamic radical movement Al Qaida, led by Osama Bin Laden. Two thousand seven hundred people of several nationalities perished as a result of the attack, which also targeted the Pentagon, in Washington. A simultaneous attempt against the White House was foiled by the passengers on board the flight that had been diverted from its course by the terrorists.

Pronounced losses at Wall Street and the NASDAQ index foreshadowed the danger of a widespread recession. There were huge uncertainties.

The start of the general debate had been postponed. The presidential speech was delivered on November 10. Obviously, the main emphasis was on terrorism.

President Bush's administration had mustered a nationwide consensus for the fight against terrorism. The United States had been struck in their own territory. A sense of extreme vulnerability prevailed, reinforced by a series of attempts to spread Anthrax by means of contaminated letters sent to the American Congress and other institutions.

Several leadership changes occurred in that year, among which Ariel Sharon in Israel, Koizumi in Japan and Berlusconi in Italy.

In Argentina, beset by an uncontrollable economic crisis, President de la Rua resigned, opening the way to a period of great instability that would lead to the accession of Eduardo Duhalde to the head of the Executive. MERCOSUR became extremely exposed to the Argentine vulnerabilities.

Within the hemisphere, the Summit of the Americas was held in Canada in April. The general objectives of the negotiations aiming at the formation of ALCA were reaffirmed.

Leading a hastily gathered coalition of 40 countries, the United States intervened in Afghanistan to topple the Taliban regime and dismantle the leadership of Al Qaida.

In his statement, President Fernando Henrique recalled Brazil's reaction, the solidarity that he had immediately conveyed to President George Bush, our vehement condemnation of terrorism and our proposal to convene the consultation organ of the TIAR. He said, however, in very clear terms, that "the fight against terrorism is not, and cannot be, a clash between civilizations, much less between religions". He was equally clear when establishing connections between terrorism, drug trafficking, arms smuggling and money laundering.

The President also dwelt on the issue of development. While not necessarily linking terrorism to poverty conditions, he insisted on the importance of correcting the shortcomings of the globalization process and eliminating the governance and democracy deficits prevailing in the world.

A few days before the General Conference of the WTO, scheduled to meet at Doha, in which the negotiations of what would come to be improperly named "development round", the President deemed opportune to make an exhortation for the opening of the markets of developed countries and for a solution to the question of the access to Médicines, a vital issue for the program of the fight against AIDS in Brazil.

He devoted, on the other hand, an important section of his speech, in the same line as the statements made by Minister Lampreia, to the need to renew the Bretton Woods institutions and reduce the volatility of the capital flows.

On the political level, the presidential pronouncement stressed the demand for concrete steps toward the constitution of a democratic, cohesive and economically viable Palestine State.

The President also insisted on the question of the reform of the United Nations and the expansion of the Security Council in order to make it more representative. He did not explicitly asked for a permanent seat for Brazil. Our aspiration, however, was implicit (1) in the mention to the fact that "Brazilian soldiers gave their blood in the glorious campaigns in Italy", and (2) in the proposal of inclusion in the category of permanent members of "developing countries with credentials to take up the responsibilities imposed on them by today's world".

The President also made for the first time a demand for the expansion of the G7/G8 to include "emerging countries".

LVI Regular Session of the General Assembly of the United Nations 2001

President Fernando Henrique Cardoso [*]

I greet you, Mr. President, and pay tribute to the Republic of Korea, which offers the world an example of dedication to the cause of peace and development.

I reaffirm my admiration for Secretary-General Kofi Annan, who, together with the United Nations, was rightfully honored with the Nobel Peace Prize. More than ever, we need his clear vision and courage in seeking to build a peaceful and democratic international order that is based on solidarity. Only fanatics fail to acknowledge the great mission undertaken by the United Nations and by Kofi Annan.

In a tradition that extends back to the beginnings of this Organization, the month of September in New York is dedicated to a celebration of dialogue: the opening of the general debate of this General Assembly. It was not so this year. In New York as well as in Washington, the month of September was marked by the very denial of this dialogue and understanding between peoples: the senseless violence resulting from an odious and treacherous attack against the United States of America and against all peace and freedom loving peoples.

It was an infamous act of aggression against a city that, perhaps more than any other, is a symbol of cosmopolitanism; a city that has welcomed immigrants from all parts, such as the Dutch Jews of Portuguese ancestry who, in the seventeenth century, left Brazil for what was then New Amsterdam.

[*] **Fernando Henrique Cardoso**, President of the Republic from 1/1/1995 to 12/31/1998, and from de 1/1/1999 to 12/31/2002 (2nd term).

New York has grown, prospered and reached maturity guided by pluralistic values. It became great, and was admired, not only because of its Jewish and Anglo-Saxon heritage, but also because of its Arab, Latin, African, Caribbean and Asian presence. The attacks of September 11, 2001 were an act of aggression against all of those traditions – an act of aggression against humanity.

As the first head of State to speak in the general debate at this session of the General Assembly, I wish to be very clear. As I had occasion to say on the very morning of those horrendous attacks, and as I have said during my conversations with President George W. Bush, Brazil extends its full solidarity and support to the people of the United States in its response to terrorism.

To our understanding, the American hemisphere as a whole was attacked. That is why we suggested convening the consultative organ of the Inter-American Treaty of Reciprocal Assistance. Terrorism negates all that the United Nations stands for. It destroys the very principles of civilized behavior. It fosters fear, and threatens the security and peace of all countries.

The victims of any act of terrorism will not be forgotten; nor will the perpetrators of such acts go unpunished, whether they are individuals, groups or the States that give them support. The march of folly will be vigorously resisted by the solid alliance of all free peoples.

The Charter of the United Nations acknowledges the right of Member States to act in self-defense. That is not in doubt. But let us keep in mind that the struggle against terrorism cannot rely exclusively on the effectiveness of self-defense measures or on the use of military force by individual countries.

In 1945, the United Nations committed itself to the task of laying the foundations for peace and the protection of future generations against the scourge of war. War always takes a heavy human toll – a cost in lives cut short and lives overtaken by fear and flight. That underscores the responsibility of terrorists for what is happening today. Brazil hopes that, notwithstanding these circumstances, humanitarian assistance efforts in Afghanistan will not be frustrated. Furthermore, we will, to the best of our abilities, welcome refugees wishing to settle in our country.

Certain things may be obvious, but they warrant repeating. As Secretary-General Kofi Annan said, the struggle against terrorism is not, and must never become, a clash between civilizations, much less between religions. Not one of the civilizations that have enriched and humanized our planet has not known within its own historical experience episodes of violence and terror.

Around the world, problems related to crime, drug abuse, drug trafficking and money laundering are evils related to terrorism that must be eradicated. From this rostrum, I would like to call for a worldwide public awareness campaign to make drug users in all countries realize that they are helping – even if inadvertently to finance terrorism.

If we are to stem the flow of resources to the terrorist networks spreading death and destruction, it is crucial that drug use in our societies be drastically curtailed. Furthermore, we must not allow differences in national tax regimes in various countries to be used as an instrument to foster capital flight, to the detriment of economic development, or to help finance organized crime, including terrorist actions. If the existence of tax havens is inseparable from these problems, then tax havens should not exist. We must put an end to such safe harbors for corruption and terror, with regard to which some Governments have, to date, been complacent.

It is only natural that, since September 11, issues of international security should have been given high priority. Yet terrorism must not be allowed to stifle the debate on cooperation and other issues of global interest. The road to the future requires the forces of globalization to be harnessed in the pursuit of lasting peace – a peace sustained not by fear, but rather by the willing acceptance by all countries of a just international order.

On this theme, I have sought to mobilize numerous world leaders. Brazil wishes to do its part to ensure that the world does not squander the opportunities that are contained in the present crisis. Let us focus on our fundamental imperative of promoting development. The process of globalization is tainted by an undeniable sense of unease. I am not referring to the ideological disquiet of those who oppose globalization on principle or who reject the very notion of universal values which inspire freedom and the respect for human rights. Rather, I have in mind the fact that globalization has not lived up to its promises. There is a governance deficit in the international sphere, and it results from a democratic deficit. Globalization will be sustainable only if enriched by a sense of justice. Our aim should be "globalization in solidarity", rather than the asymmetrical globalization of today.

In the field of trade, it is high time that multilateral negotiations were translated into greater access for goods from developing countries to the more prosperous markets. The ministers meeting in Doha have a heavy responsibility: to ensure that the new round of multilateral trade negotiations is a development round. To this end, it is crucial for priority to

be given to those issues most conducive to the dismantling of protectionist practices and barriers in developed countries.

Brazil has taken the lead in negotiations to ensure greater market access and better humanitarian conditions in the fight against disease. We will seek to strike a balance between the requirements of patent rights and the imperative of providing care to those most in need. We favor market practices and the protection of intellectual property, but not at the cost of human lives. This is a point that must be carefully defined: life must prevail over material interests.

The Bretton Woods institutions must be revamped if they are to respond to the challenges of the twenty first century. The International Monetary Fund must be allotted greater resources so as to allow it to function as a lender of last resort. The World Bank and regional banks must be given a more active part in fostering economic growth and development.

The volatility of international capital flows must be contained and the financial system made more predictable and less crisis-prone, as proposed by the G20.

Similarly, although measures such as the Tobin tax present practical difficulties, it should be possible to look into better and less compulsory alternatives. I submit that these issues should be given special attention at the United Nations International Conference on Financing for Development, to be held next year in Monterrey.

We must also envisage practical forms of cooperation to alleviate the tragedy of AIDS, above all in Africa. How long will the world remain indifferent to the plight of those who might yet be saved from disease, deprivation and exclusion?

The twentieth century came to an end amid a growing sense of global citizenship and universally shared values. Brazil is determined to forge ahead in this direction.

The International Criminal Court will be a historic victory for the cause of human rights. The protection of the environment and sustainable development are equally pressing challenges of our time. The process of climate change has been scientifically ascertained as a fact, but it is not unstoppable. What the future holds depends on what we do today, in particular as concerns the Kyoto Protocol.

I have just been informed of the successful outcome of the Marrakesh meeting. Brazil warmly welcomes this development, which is a fundamental step towards controlling, and eventually reversing, the warming of the atmosphere. I will submit to the Congress a proposal for the prompt ratification of the Kyoto Protocol.

Recent events in this city and elsewhere have clearly demonstrated the grave threat posed by weapons of mass destruction. No matter the nature of the menace – be it bacteriological, such as anthrax; chemical; or nuclear – there is no alternative to disarmament and non-proliferation.

It is an ethical imperative that science and technology must not be turned into a weapon in the hands of the irresponsible. This requires the active and legitimate involvement of the United Nations in the control, destruction and eradication of these arsenals.

Just as it supported the creation of the State of Israel, Brazil today calls for concrete measures towards the setting up of a Palestinian state that is democratic, united and economically viable.

The right of the Palestinian people to self-determination and respect for the existence of Israel as a sovereign, free and secure State are essential if the Middle East is to rebuild its future in peace.

This is a moral debt owed by the United Nations. It is a task that must not be postponed.

It is equally urgent that a lasting solution be found to the conflict in Angola, which deserves the opportunity to get back on the road to development. This is the same future that Brazil wishes for East Timor, which we hope will soon take its rightful place in the Assembly as a sovereign state.

A strong and flexible United Nations is required if the world is to respond to increasingly complex problems. The United Nations will only be strengthened if the General Assembly becomes more active and more respected, and if the Security Council becomes more representative. Its composition should no longer be a reflection of arrangements among the victors of a conflict that took place over 50 years ago, and for whose triumph Brazilian soldiers gave their blood in the glorious campaigns in Italy.

Brazil joins those who appeal for more democracy in international relations in calling for the enlargement of the Security Council. Common sense requires the inclusion, in the category of permanent members, of those developing countries with the necessary credentials to exercise the responsibilities that today's world imposes upon them.

By the same token, Brazil believes that an enlargement of the G7/G8 is called for in view of the transformations the world is presently undergoing. It is no longer admissible to restrict to such a limited group of countries the discussion of issues pertaining to globalization and its inevitable impact on the political and economic life of emerging countries.

An international order that is more just and based on solidarity will come about only through a concerted effort on the part of the community of nations. This is too precious a goal to be left to the vagaries of market forces or to the whims of power politics.

We do not aspire to a world government, but we cannot sidestep the obligation to ensure that international relations are not left rudderless, but reflect the legitimate aspirations of the majority. The nefarious shadow of terrorism points to what can be expected if we do not enhance mutual understanding among peoples.

This Organization was created under the sign of dialogue - a dialogue among sovereign States that are free nations, whose peoples actively participate in national decision-making.

With their help, we can ensure that the twenty-first century will not be a time of fear, but rather of the flourishing of a freer humanity, at peace with itself, and rationally oriented towards the building of an international order that is acceptable to all peoples and that provides a guiding framework for States at the global level.

This is the challenge of the twenty-first century. Let us face it inspired by the grand vision of the founding fathers of this Organization, who dreamed of a pluralistic world, founded on peace, solidarity, tolerance and reason, which is the ultimate source of the rule of law.

New York, November 10, 2001.

2002

2002

The level of violence in the Middle East increased considerably throughout the year 2002. The initial times of the Sharon/Arafat relation were tempestuous. Israel made several incursions into the West Bank and at a certain point even confined the President of the PLO to the seat of the government in Ramallah. The pressure on Iraq increased. The American Congress authorized President Bush to intervene against the regime of Saddam Hussein. The return of IAEA inspectors to Iraq brought some hope for a solution to the divergences.

The United States, however, kept preparing for conflict and explicitly opposed the constitution of the World Criminal Court.

The level of violence post-September 11 increased. Attacks in Indonesia resulted in several deaths. Chechen insurgents assaulted a theater in Moscow.

North Korea admitted the existence of its nuclear program.

Hunger in Africa reached catastrophic proportions. Instability took hold of a seemingly solid country: Côte d'Ivoire. Angola, however, started its pacification process with the death of the UNITA leader Jonas Savimbi.

The Islamic Party won the elections in Turkey, making it somewhat more difficult for that country to join the European Union. Jacques Chirac was elected President of France after an unexpected second round against the candidate from the extreme right, Jean Marie Le Pen. The Euro became the single currency in the majority of European Union member States.

International markets remained turbulent: several large corporations, among which Enron and Worldcom, collapsed as a result of excessive speculation, fraud and shady deals. After the resignation of President de la Rua, the economic crisis in Argentina reached its most critical moment: the currency was drastically devalued after the default of debt payments implemented by the government.

The Second Meeting of South American Presidents took place in Ecuador.

Meeting in South Africa, the Rio + 10 Conference was unable to take forward in a significant way the positive results of the United Nations Conference of the Environment and Development, held with considerable success in Brazil in 1992. The symptomatic absence of President George Bush from the Summit segment made clear the distance taken by the United States from the forefront of multilateral environmental negotiations.

Brazil remained much affected by the volatility of markets. The months that preceded the 2002 election and those that followed the victory of the candidate from the Workers Party (Partido dos Trabalhadores) were difficult for the Brazilian economy, due to capital flights and pressures on the currency.

Stepping on the United Nations podium, a few months before the close of the mandate of President Fernando Henrique Cardoso and a few weeks before the balloting that would end with the victory of President Luiz Inácio Lula da Silva, Minister Celso Lafer availed himself of the opportunity to set forth the fundamental lines of Brazilian external policy during the previous period, as well as the principles that guided it: democracy, multilateralism, legitimacy, dialogue and cooperation.

At the same time, Minister Lafer again took up the issues of the shortcomings of globalization, capital volatility, protectionism and trade barriers.

On the political and social level, the Minister reaffirmed Brazil's commitment to human, civil, political, economic, social and cultural rights. He also made a reference to several questions pertaining to peace and security:

> - He reiterated the support of Brazil to a democratic, safe and economically viable Palestine state, as well as to the existence of Israel in security and within recognized borders;
> - Reaffirming that the use of force only becomes legitimate by means of appropriate deliberations in the Security Council, he stressed that "in the

> specific case of Iraq" it was up to that central organ of the United Nations "to decide the necessary measures to ensure the full compliance with the relevant resolutions".

On the reform of the Security Council, the Minister again expressed the need to expand the number of its permanent and non-permanent members and stated that Brazil was "ready to give its contribution… and assume all its responsibilities".

LVII Regular Session of the General Assembly of the United Nations 2002

Minister Celso Lafer [*]

Mr. President,

I congratulate you, Sir, on your election to the presidency of the General Assembly. I thank your predecessor, Mr. Han Seung-soo, for the leadership he displayed at a particularly critical moment for the Organization.

To Secretary-General Kofi Annan, I reaffirm Brazil's confidence in his statesmanship.

I have the pleasure of greeting the entry of East Timor into the fold of the United Nations, just as we welcomed it last July in Brasília into our Community of Portuguese-Speaking Countries. A free Timor is a remarkable United Nations success story.

Brazil also welcomes Switzerland, as it has now become a full member of this global political forum.

I come to this Hall as the representative of a country that has faith in the United Nations and that views multilateralism as the guiding principle of relations among States. This is a conviction we hold dear at all times, good and bad. We are at a particularly difficult juncture for the Organization. This moment calls for measures sustained by the principles and values on which the United Nations was founded.

[*] **Celso Lafer**, Born in São Paulo, SP August 7, 1941. Bachelor in Law from the Faculty of Law of the University of São Paulo and Doctor in Political Science from Cornell University, USA. Minister of State for External Relations from 4/13/1992 to 10/5/1992 and in 2002.

Brazil has defended them since the first international conferences of the twentieth century.

We have never let ourselves be tempted by the argument of power. Rather, we have been guided by the power of argument. This has been the foreign policy of President Fernando Henrique Cardoso. Throughout the eight years of the two terms of office to which he has been democratically elected, certain fundamental guidelines have been recurrent: fostering democratic decision-making; overcoming the governance deficit in international relations; designing a new financial architecture and providing effective solutions for volatility in capital flows; defending a multilateral trade regime that is both fair and balanced – hence, the importance of the World Trade Organization and of the Doha mandate; correcting the distortions resulting from economic globalization that is not accompanied by a corresponding process of political and institutional globalization; and affirming the value of human rights and sustainable development. These are challenges that we cannot face alone.

For this reason, President Fernando Henrique Cardoso has sought to strengthen the Common Market of the South, together with South American integration, as instruments for peace, cooperation and greater competitiveness among our countries. Similarly, President Cardoso has promoted the development of partnerships in all continents, pursuing well-balanced negotiations for the establishment of free trade areas, in particular with the European Union, as well as with the countries taking part in the Free Trade Area of the Americas process.

We are committed to seeing the entry into force of the Kyoto Protocol and the establishment of the International Criminal Court; to furthering the social development agenda; and to moving forward on nuclear and conventional disarmament. The Brazilian vision of the world under the leadership of President Fernando Henrique Cardoso expresses goals not just of Government, but also of the entire country and society. That is why the electoral process now under way will further strengthen democracy in Brazil and highlight the country's international credentials.

Our commitment to the United Nations and to multilateralism will not waver "in times of storm and blustery winds", to quote Camões, the great poet of the Portuguese language. The greater the challenges, such as those facing us at this difficult juncture, the greater the need for answers grounded in legitimacy – legitimacy born of participation and consensus. Cooperation must be our *modus operandi.*

In the multilateral sphere, leadership is crucial to the tasks before us. We are clearly aware of that, yet the form and content of each task must

be defined through dialogue. Only through dialogue will a coalition of truly united nations be built – nations united by the power of persuasion. The tangled interests that form a global web of interdependence can be managed only through authority rooted in multilateral institutions and in respect for international law. The commitment to negotiated settlements, under the aegis of multilateralism, must be upheld.

At the time of the September 11 terrorist attacks, this Organization immediately showed its solidarity with the United States of America by adopting resolutions of the General Assembly and the Security Council. At the regional level, the Inter-American Treaty of Reciprocal Assistance was invoked on a Brazilian initiative as an expression of our firm repudiation and condemnation of all barbaric acts of terrorism and of our solidarity with the United States. These responses have taken the form of renewed collaboration in security, intelligence, police and judicial cooperation issues.

Lasting solutions to terrorism, international drug trafficking and organized crime require careful and persistent efforts to set up partnerships and cooperative arrangements consistent with the United Nations multilateral system.

Many countries and regions have been burdened with the costs of globalization, while at the same time being deprived of its benefits. The very same free flow of capital that can foster investment is responsible for speculative attacks against national currencies and balance of payment crises, with negative impact on the continuity of public policies and on the alleviation of social ills.

Protectionism and all forms of barriers to trade, both tariff and non-tariff, continue to suffocate developing economies and to nullify the competitiveness of their exports. Liberalization of the agricultural sector has been nothing more than a promise repeatedly put off to an uncertain future.

The globalization to which we aspire requires reform of economic and financial institutions. It must not be limited to the triumph of the market.

A modern understanding of development must encompass the protection of human rights, be they civil and political or economic, social and cultural. In this respect, the appointment of Sérgio Vieira de Mello as the new United Nations High Commissioner for Human Rights is a great honor for all Brazilians. He succeeds Mary Robinson, whose important achievements deserve recognition.

The United Nations was created to maintain peace and security. However, armed conflicts and pockets of irrational violence persist today.

The situation in the Middle East underscores how distant we still are from the international order imagined by the founders of the United Nations Charter.

Brazil supports the creation of a democratic, secure and economically viable Palestinian State, as well as the right of the Palestinian people to self-determination. Brazil defends the right of the State of Israel to exist within recognized borders and of its people to live in security. These are essential prerequisites for lasting peace in the Middle East. Only by mutually and comprehensively acknowledging the conflicting legitimacies in the region, as well as by building on existing agreements, can we staunch the indiscriminate destructiveness of violence and forge a way forward.

The use of force at the international level is admissible only once all diplomatic alternatives have been exhausted. Force must be exercised only in accordance with the Charter of the United Nations and in a manner consistent with the determinations of the Security Council. Otherwise, the credibility of the Organization will be undermined in a way that will not only be illegitimate, but that will also give rise to situations of precarious and short-lived stability.

In the specific case of Iraq, Brazil believes that it is incumbent upon the Security Council to determine the measures necessary to ensure full compliance with relevant resolutions. The Security Council's exercise of its responsibilities is the way to reduce tensions and to avoid risking the unpredictable consequences resulting from wider instability.

In Angola the international community must support recent positive developments that open the way to the rebuilding of the country and the consolidation of peace and democracy.

Strengthening the system of collective security remains a challenge. The Security Council needs reform in order to enhance its legitimacy and lay the foundations for more solid international cooperation in building a just and stable international order. A central feature of this reform should be the expansion of the number of members, both in the permanent and non-permanent categories.

Brazil has already made it known – and I reaffirm it here – that it is ready to contribute to the work of the Security Council and to assume all its responsibilities.

For Brazil, the United Nations is the public space for the creation of power, which, according to Hannah Arendt, can result only from the

human capacity to act in concert. The United Nations is the crucial hinge in creating global governance focused on a more equitable distribution of the dividends of peace and progress.

Therein lies our vision for the future, a vision of solidarity among peoples and nations, a vision made legitimate by renewed and inclusive understanding of power.

We are inspired by the observation of Guicciardini, the politically more successful Florentine contemporary of MachiavelIi: "Among men, hope is normally more powerful than fear".

New York, September 12, 2002.

2003

2003

The start of President Lula's term was marked by strong external pressures and by a set of decisions by the government aimed at assuring the commitment of the new Administration with macroeconomic stability. Upon taking office, President Lula travelled symbolically to Porto Alegre in order to participate in the meetings of the Social Forum and from there went on to Davos, where he spoke to the business community gathered at the World Economic Forum. His messages were effective. Soon Brazil recovered investors' trust and could continue on the path to stability. Investments began to flow in again. Economic growth remained on a reasonable level.

Having implemented at the same time social programs of global scope, such as Zero Hunger (Fome Zero) and others, President Lula quickly established himself as a political agent on the front line of the international scenery. Besides Latin America and the main partners of Brazil in the developed world, his international travels throughout the following years would encompass Africa, Asia and the Arab world. Under his leadership, the external policy of Brazil, whose direction was again entrusted to Minister Celso Amorim, was turned to the objectives of development and social justice.

Proclaiming Latin America and in particular South America as the first priority of Brazilian external policy, the new government embarked on a number of initiatives aiming at increasing regional integration and Brazilian ties with each of its neighbors. Soon Brazil would have to

face a panorama of instability in Venezuela, due to the action of groups opposed to the government of President Hugo Chávez. In Argentina, Nestor Kirchner succeeded Eduardo Duhalde and gradually managed to overcome the serious crisis experienced by the country since the end of the Menem government.

The picture of international tensions worsened considerably with the invasion of Iraq in March. Despite the fact the United Nations inspectors, under the leadership of Hans Blix, had not found any significant evidence of the existence of weapons of mass destruction in Iraq, the United States, supported by the United Kingdom, Berlusconi's Italy and Aznar's Spain built a formidable war machine to invade the country and change the existing regime of Saddam Hussein. In April, the Iraqi regime would be effectively dismantled and the United States would take charge of the provisional administration of the country.

In the Middle East, some progress seemed possible at the time: there was agreement on the so-called "road map" for peace between Israel and Palestine, negotiated under the auspices of the United States, European Union, Russia and the United Nations. At the same time the construction of the wall imagined by Sharon allegedly to isolate Israel from terrorist attacks coming from Palestine was begun.

In Asia, North Korea intensified its march toward the acquisition of military nuclear capability: the Pyongyang government withdrew from the NPT, restarted work in the nuclear facilities, announced it had acquired technology to build long range missiles and its decision to test them.

On September 23, 2003 President Luiz Inácio Lula da Silva stepped for the first time on the podium of the General Assembly to deliver the Brazilian statement.

The President started his words with a tribute to Sérgio Vieira de Mello, recently killed in the attack against the United Nations Mission in Baghdad. Next, he reaffirmed the full adherence of Brazil to multilateralism and democracy, as well as our belief that "the tragedies that have befallen Iraq and the Middle East" could only be dealt with in the context of the United Nations.

To resolve the shortcomings of the Organization it was imperative to reform it, the President went on, dwelling on the need to make changes in the Security Council, (its composition, "in particular as concerns permanent membership, cannot remain unaltered almost 60 years later.") in the ECOSOC and in the General Assembly (to strengthen it politically so that it can "assume its responsibilities for maintaining international peace

and security". He then stressed the importance of the relations of Brazil with its neighbors in the South American continent, aimed at creating "a unique sense of kinship and partnership" in the context of which "our relationship with Argentina remains crucial".

Since this was his first statement at the United Nations, President Lula made a general description of the Brazilian external policy, emphasizing, beside the regional priority, the importance of relations with Africa and the Arab world. He also stressed the establishment of the trilateral forum Brazil/India/South Africa (IBAS in the Portuguese acronym). He commented further on the results of the General Conference of the WTO in Cancún and the action of the G20, giving relevance to the link established by Brazil between international trade and development: "International trade should be a tool not only for creating wealth, but also for its distribution".

Starting from this formulation, the President took up in detail the theme that marked the initial moments of his international projection: the fight against hunger and extreme poverty. When describing the programs that were being implemented in Brazil, the President stressed the need for initiatives at the international level and recalled his previous proposal for the creation of a World Fund to Combat Hunger. He even suggested the constitution, within the United Nations, of a World Committee to Combat Hunger, composed by Heads of State and Government from countries of all continents. He concluded with a call in favor of the humanization of international relations and peace based on social justice.

LVIII Regular Session of the General Assembly of the United Nations 2003

President Luiz Inácio Lula da Silva [*]

Mr. President,

Let my first words before this world parliament be of confidence in the human capacity to overcome challenges and to move towards higher forms of partnership, both within and among nations. On behalf of the Brazilian people, I reaffirm our belief in the United Nations. Its role in promoting peace and social justice remain irreplaceable.

I pay tribute to Secretary-General Kofi Annan for the leadership that he has shown in defense of a world united through respect for international law and solidarity among nations.

The Assembly convenes under the impact of the brutal attack on the United Nations Mission in Baghdad, which took the life of its head officer, the High Commissioner for Human Rights, our compatriot Sérgio Vieira de Mello. Sérgio's renowned competence was nurtured by the only weapons in which he believed: dialogue, persuasion and, above all, concern for those who are most vulnerable. On behalf of the United Nations, he showed a tolerant, peace-loving and courageous humanism that mirrors Brazil's libertarian soul. Sérgio's sacrifice, and that of his colleagues, must not be in vain. We can best honor his memory by redoubling our efforts to protect human dignity wherever it is threatened.

[*] **Luiz Inácio Lula da Silva**, President of the Republic from 1/1/2003 to 12/31/2006 and from 1/1/2007 to 12/31/2010 (2nd term).

I warmly greet Mr. Julian Hunte, who was elected President of the Assembly at a particularly grave moment in the history of the United Nations. The international community faces enormous political, economic and social challenges requiring an accelerated pace of reform. Only thus will our collective decisions and actions be truly respected and effective.

In my nine months as President of Brazil, I have conferred with leaders of all continents, and I have sensed in them a deep concern to defend and strengthen multilateral institutions. The improvement of the multilateral system is a necessary counterpart to democratic practice within nations. Every nation that practices democracy must strive to ensure that in international affairs, decision-making is equally open, transparent, legitimate and representative. The tragedies that have befallen Iraq and the Middle East can be overcome only within a multilateral framework - one in which the United Nations is given a central role.

In Iraq, the prevailing climate of insecurity and growing tension makes national reconstruction an even more complex task. That impasse can be overcome only under the leadership of the United Nations leadership not only in re-establishing acceptable security conditions, but also in guiding the political process towards the restoration of Iraqi sovereignty as soon as possible. We must not shy away from our collective responsibilities. A war can perhaps be won single-handedly, but peace - lasting peace - cannot be secured without the support of all.

Two years later, the images of the barbaric attack on September 11 still haunt us. There is a commendable willingness today to adopt more effective measures to deal with terrorism, with weapons of mass destruction and with organized crime. Unfortunately, there are also worrisome signs of an attempt to discredit the Organization and even to divest the United Nations of its political authority. Let there be no ambiguity on this subject: no matter how invaluable its humanitarian work, the United Nations was conceived to do more than simply to clear away the rubble of conflicts that it was unable to prevent. Our central task is to preserve people from the scourge of war, to negotiate settlements inspired by the principles and objectives of the San Francisco Charter. Let us not place greater trust on military might than on the institutions we created with the light of reason and the vision of history.

Reform of the United Nations has become an urgent task, given the present risks to the international political order.

The Security Council must be fully empowered to deal with crises and threats to peace. It must therefore be equipped with the tools for effective action. Above all, its decisions must be seen as legitimate by the

community of nations as a whole. Its composition, in particular as concerns permanent membership, cannot remain unaltered almost 60 years later. It can no longer ignore the changing world. More specifically, it must take into account the emergence on the international scene of developing countries. They have become important actors that often exercise a critical role in ensuring the pacific settlement of disputes.

Brazil believes that it has a useful contribution to make. It seeks not to advance an exclusive conception of international security, but rather to give expression to the perceptions and aspirations of a region that today is a hallmark of peaceful coexistence among its members and that is a force for international stability. Given the support we received in South America and beyond, Brazil is encouraged to continue advocating for a Security Council that better reflects contemporary reality.

We also favor an Economic and Social Council capable of bringing about a fair and just economic order. It is crucial that the Economic and Social Council regain the role bestowed upon it by the founding fathers of the Organization. We wish to see the Economic and Social Council cooperate actively with the Security Council in preventing conflicts and in nation building.

The General Assembly, in turn, must be strengthened politically so as to focus on priority issues and avoid duplication of effort. The General Assembly has fulfilled a historically important role by convening major conferences and other meetings on human rights, the environment, population, women's rights, racial discrimination, AIDS and social development.

However, the General Assembly should not hesitate to assume its responsibilities for maintaining international peace and security. Our Organization has shown that there are legal and political alternatives to a veto induced paralysis and to actions lacking multilateral endorsement.

Peace, security, development and social justice are indivisible. Brazil has endeavored to practice with utmost consistency the principles for which it stands. The new relationship we are forging with our South American neighbors is founded on mutual respect, friendship and cooperation.

We are moving beyond our shared history and geography to create a unique sense of kinship and partnership. In this context, our relationship with Argentina remains crucial.

South America and Latin America are increasingly seen as a region of peace, democracy and development that aspires to become a new outpost for growth in a stagnating world economy.

We are deepening the already significant ties with traditional partners in North America and Europe, but we also seek to widen and diversify our international presence. Our relations with China and the Russian Federation have revealed unexpected complementarities.

We are proud to be the country with the second largest population of African descent in the world. In November, I will be travelling to five countries in Southern Africa to foster economic, political, social and cultural cooperation. With the same goal in mind, we will also host a summit meeting between South American countries and the member States of the League of Arab States. With India and South Africa we have established a trilateral forum for political consultations and joint projects.

The protectionism practiced by rich countries unfairly penalizes efficient producers in developing countries. Today this is the greatest obstacle to launching a new era of economic and social progress. Brazil and its partners in the G22 maintained during the World Trade Organization summit meeting at Cancun that the crucial goal of effectively opening markets is achievable through pragmatic and mutually reinforcing negotiations that bring about an effective opening of markets. I reaffirm our willingness to travel along a path that converges towards solutions that benefit all countries, taking into account the interests of developing countries.

We are entirely in favor of free trade as long as we can all compete on a level playing field. Liberalization should not require countries to abandon the prerogative of formulating industrial, technological, social and environmental policy. In Brazil we are engaged in setting up a new framework that balances economic stability and social inclusion. From that standpoint, trade negotiations are not an end in themselves, but rather a means to foster development and overcome poverty. International trade should be a tool not only for creating wealth, but also for its distribution.

I reaffirm before this truly universal Assembly the appeal I launched at the Davos and Porto Alegre forums and at the Enlarged Summit of the G8 at Evian. We must wage - both politically and materially – the only war from which we will all emerge victorious: the war against hunger and extreme poverty.

The eradication of hunger in the world is a moral and political imperative. And we all know that it is possible. What is truly required is political will.

I do not wish to dwell on indications of barbarism. I would rather acknowledge ethical and social progress, no matter how modest. Yet we cannot dismiss the statistics that expose the terrible scourge of extreme

poverty and hunger in the world. Hunger today touches a fourth of the world's population, including 300 million children. Daily, 24,000 people fall victim to malnutrition-related diseases.

Nothing is more absurd or intolerable than the pervasiveness of hunger in the twenty-first century, this golden age of science and technology.

With each passing day, human intelligence enlarges the horizons of the possible and achieves prodigious feats. Yet, hunger persists and, what is worse, it is spreading throughout various regions of the planet.

The more we seem to approach the divine through our creative abilities, the more humanity betrays its aspirations through our inability to respect and protect our fellow creatures. The more we celebrate God by generating riches, the more we hurt our ideals by not minimally sharing them.

What is the use of all our science and technology, of all the abundance and luxury that it has generated, if we do not put it to use, guaranteeing the most sacred of rights: the right to life?

I recall the penetrating warning, made by Pope Paul VI 36 years ago, but which is still surprisingly relevant: "The starving people of the world dramatically address their plea to the wealthy".

Hunger is an emergency, and it should be dealt with as such. The eradication of hunger is a civilizational challenge that requires that we seek a shortcut to the future. Will we act to eliminate hunger or will we forsake our credibility through omission? We no longer have the right to allege that we were not home when they knocked at our door asking for solidarity. We have no right to say to the famished who have waited for so long: come back next century. The true path to peace is to fight hunger and extreme poverty to the end, in a campaign of solidarity that unites the planet rather than deepening the divisions and the hatred that inflame people and sow terror.

Despite the failure of systems that favor the generation of wealth without reducing extreme poverty, many people still persist in their short-sightedness and greed.

Since my inauguration as President of Brazil on January 1, significant progress has been made on the economic front. Stability is back and the groundwork for a renewed cycle of sustained growth has been laid. We will continue to work hard to balance public accounts and to reduce external vulnerability. We will spare no effort to increase exports, raise the savings rate, attract foreign investment and start growing again.

Yet at the same time we must strive to cope with the need for food, jobs, education and health services for millions of Brazilians living below the poverty line. We are committed to bringing about major social reform in the country.

Hunger is the most dramatic and urgent expression of a structural imbalance requiring correction through integrated policies that foster full citizenship. That is why I launched the "zero hunger" program in Brazil. It seeks to eradicate hunger and its root causes in the shortest possible time by promoting major solidarity and wide-ranging program bringing together Government, civil society and the private sector. The results of those emergency and structural measures are already benefiting 4 million individuals who were previously denied the right to a daily meal. The goal of this program is to guarantee that no Brazilians will go hungry.

The United Nations adopted the highly acclaimed Millennium Development Goals. The Food and Agriculture Organization has at its disposal outstanding technical and social expertise. But we need to make a qualitative leap in the global endeavor to fight hunger. That is why I proposed setting up a global fund to fight hunger and suggested means to make it operational. Other proposals have been put forward as well, some already integrated into existing United Nations programs.

What has been lacking until now is the indispensable political will of us all, especially of those countries in a position to contribute most. Creating new funds is of no use if no resources are committed to them. The Millennium Development Goals are very worthy, but if we remain passive, if our collective behavior remains unchanged, those Goals may never materialize, and the ensuing frustration will be immense.

Now more than ever, good intentions must give rise to concrete gestures. We must put commitments into practice. We must practice what we preach – with audacity, good sense and our feet firmly on the ground, yet boldly, and with new methods, solutions and intense social participation.

For this reason, I am submitting a proposal for consideration by the General Assembly to establish a world committee within the United Nations itself to fight hunger. It would be made up of heads of State or Government from all continents with the purpose of unifying and operationalizing proposals. We hope to attract donations from developed and developing countries according to their capacities, as well as from large private enterprises and non-governmental organizations.

My life experience and political history have taught me to believe above all in the power of dialogue. I will never forget Gandhi's invaluable

lesson that when out of violence something good appears to result, this good is at best short-lived, while the evil that it produces is enduring. Democratic dialogue is the most efficient of all tools for change. With the same determination that goes into my endeavors and those of my partners to make Brazilian society more just and humane, I will invest in the establishment of international partnerships that foster equitable development and a more peace-loving, tolerant and unified world.

This century, so full of technological and material promise, must not be allowed to slide into political and spiritual decline. It is our obligation to mold, under the reinvigorated leadership of the United Nations, an international climate of peace and conciliation. True peace will bloom from democracy, from respect for international law, from the dismantling of deadly weapons arsenals and, above all, from the final eradication of hunger in the world.

We cannot afford to frustrate such high hopes. The greatest and noblest challenge facing humanity is precisely that of becoming more humane. It is time to call peace by its true name: social justice. I am convinced that together we shall be able to grasp this historic opportunity to bring about justice.

New York, September 23, 2003.

2004

2004

Throughout the year 2004 the international agenda remained essentially dominated by the different ramifications of the confrontation between Islamic radicalism and the Western powers. The United States started to face the hard reality in Iraq, enmeshing themselves in the disputes among the several groups that existed in the country.

Evidence of torture in the Abu Ghraib military prison unleashed internal and external reactions increasingly hostile to the military action of the United States in Iraq. Nothing, however, could prevent the reelection of President Bush in November.

In March, a violent attack against a train in Madrid produced more than 200 fatalities and provoked the fall of President Aznar and the return of the Socialists to power under the leadership of Rodriguez Zapatero, who soon announced the withdrawal of Spanish forces from Iraq.

Ten new members joined the European Union, consolidating the transformations that had taken place in previous years in Eastern countries: Cyprus, Estonia, Latvia, Lithuania, Malta, Poland, Czech Republic, Slovakia and Slovenia. For its part, NATO was enlarged with Bulgaria, the three Baltic countries, Romania, Slovakia and Slovenia.

The orthodox parties won the presidential elections in Iran. The moderated trend observed until then was reversed and Iran prepared to assume an increasingly preponderant role in the regional and world scene, in clear opposition to the United States and its European allies.

Hamid Karzai was elected in Afghanistan, opening some prospects of stability for that country devastated by the war and by the action of fundamentalist militants. Violence in Chechnya continued: more than a thousand children were taken hostage at a school in the province of North Ossetia.

Changes in Eastern Europe were accelerated by the electoral victory of the so called "orange revolution", led by Viktor Youchtchenko. In Russia, Vladimir Putin was elected for another term.

The death of Yasser Arafat provoked many doubts about the continuation of the peace process in Palestine.

In South America, the Third Summit of Presidents produced the Declaration of Cuzco, a document of intentions that set the basis for the establishment of the South American Community of Nations – CASA.

Returning to the podium of the General Assembly in 2004, President Lula started his statement by denouncing the inequality among nations. He spoke of the permanence of a logic of "draining the needy to irrigate the affluent" and brought back the "ill-inclusive and asymmetric" concept, expounding a set of data about inequality in the world and preaching the configuration of a new international order as the way to lasting peace.

In an allusion to Max Weber's formulations, he said: "When the sky is shown to us from between iron bars, let us not mistake the cage for freedom". And he quoted Franklin Roosevelt: "The only thing we need to fear is fear itself".

He again exhorted the United Nations to fight poverty and hunger, defending "an important shift in the financial flows from international multilateral organizations" (…) "created to provide solutions, but [that] have sometimes become part of the problem". He mentioned specifically the IMF and expressed the expectation that it would be possible to give "new impetus to international action against hunger and poverty".

On the peace of security level, the President, after mentioning the Middle East, stressed the participation of Brazil in the force created to deal with the situation in Haiti, which was experiencing a serious crisis since a popular revolt had forced President Aristide to relinquish power. He also emphasized the strengthening of MERCOSUR and the "strategic relationship" with Argentina. He announced "the emergence of a true South American Community of Nations".

Having mentioned the progress observed in the recovery of the negotiating *momentum* at the WTO through the approval, in Geneva, after the failure in Cancún, of the framework that made possible the restart of the negotiations, the President brought forth the role of the G20 and

the need to carry on building a new world economic and commercial geography that (…) allows for the establishment of solid bridges among the countries of the South".

The President concluded with a reference to the question of the reform of the Security Council. Without explicitly formulating the Brazilian aspirations, he called attention to the fact that "reform proposals that simply dress the current structure in new clothes and do not provide for an increase in the number of permanent members are manifestly insufficient". It was then already possible to discern a positive expectation regarding the possibility of reform. The Commission convened by the Secretary-General of the United Nations, in which an experienced Brazilian representative took part, was working hard in search of innovative proposals. While the United States did not show flexibility and China kept strong opposition to Japan's aspirations, the converging action of the so-called G4, composed of Brazil, India, Japan and Germany, made possible to foresee that the process of reform unleashed at the United Nations could lead to the concretization of the expectations for so long an so consistently held by Brazil.

In order to fully understand the context and the sense of President Lula's intervention at the General Assembly in 2004, it is indispensable to have in mind the whole set of his statements delivered the day before, such as they are equally reproduced in the present edition.

LIX Regular Session of the General Assembly of the United Nations 2004

President Luiz Inácio Lula da Silva [*]

Mr. President,

Through Foreign Minister Jean Ping of Gabon, I greet the representatives of all peoples gathered here today. I fraternally salute Secretary-General Kofi Annan, has been guiding the work of the United Nations with wisdom and devotion.

For the second time, I address this universal Assembly on behalf of Brazil. I have a lifelong commitment to those silenced by inequality, hunger and hopelessness. In the powerful words of Franz Fanon, the colonial past bestowed on them a common legacy: "If you so desire, take it: the freedom to starve to death".

Today, we are 191 nation-States. In the past, 125 of us were subjected to the oppression of a few Powers that originally occupied less than 2 per cent of the globe. The end of colonialism confirmed, in the political arena the right of peoples to self- determination. The Assembly is the highest expression of an international order based on the independence of nations.

However, such a political transformation has not taken place in the economic and social fields, and history shows that that will not happen spontaneously. In 1820, the per capita income of the richest nation in the world was five times greater than that of the poorest one. Today, that disparity has reached a ratio of 80-to-l.

[*] **Luiz Inácio Lula da Silva**, President of the Republic from 1/1/2003 to 12/31/2006 and from 1/1/2007 to 12/31/2010 (2nd term).

The former subjects have become perpetual debtors in the international economic system. Protectionist barriers and other obstacles to balanced trade aggravated by the concentration of investments, knowledge and technology have followed colonial domination. A powerful, all-encompassing and invisible wheel runs the system from afar. It often revokes democratic decisions, causes the sovereignty of States to shrivel and imposes itself on elected Governments. It demands that legitimate national development projects be renounced. The perverse logic of draining the needy to irrigate the affluent still stands. In recent decades, an ill-inclusive and asymmetric globalization has deepened the devastating legacy of poverty and social regression, which is now bursting into the agenda of the twenty-first century. Today, in 54 countries, per capita income is lower than what it was 10 years ago; in 34 countries, life expectancy has decreased; and in 14 countries, a greater number of children are starving to death.

In Africa, where colonialism resisted until the twilight of the twentieth century, 200 million people are caught in an existence marked by hunger, disease and neglect, to which the world has become oblivious, numbed by the routine of the distant suffering of others. Lack of basic sanitation has killed more children in the past decade than all military conflicts since the end of the Second World War.

Love cannot spring from cruelty. Peace will never rise from poverty and hunger. The hatred and senselessness that are spreading throughout the world feed on despair and on the absolute lack of hope for many people.

This year alone, more than 1,700 people have died as a consequence of terrorist attacks around the world – in Madrid, Baghdad and Jakarta. Those tragedies must be added to so many others in India, the Middle East and the United States, as well as to, more recently, the barbaric slaughter of children in Beslan. Mankind is losing the fight for peace. Only the enlightened values of humanism, applied with clarity of mind and determination, will be able to counter barbarism.

This situation imposes a new sense of collective and individual responsibility on the peoples and the leaders of the world. If peace is our goal, it is our task to build it. If we wish to eliminate violence, we must address its deep-rooted origins with the same resolve employed against the agents of hatred. The path to lasting peace must encompass a new international political and economic order, one that extends real opportunities for economic and social development to all countries. It therefore requires reform of the global development model, as well as

international institutions that are effectively democratic and based on multilateralism and on an acknowledgement of the rights and aspirations of all peoples.

The tortured look in the eyes of the outcast should do more to stir our conscience than the no less dramatic statistics on social inequality. Their gaze calls to us for a future of hope. Just as our destinies are now intertwined, every conflict has global effects. When the sky is shown to us from between iron bars, let us not mistake the cage for freedom.

We have the scientific knowledge and the scale of production necessary for resolving global economic and social challenges. Today, nature and progress can be reconciled by means of development models that are ethically and environmentally sustainable. Nature is not a museum of untouchable relics, but neither should it be further degraded by human and environmental exploitation in a search for wealth at any price.

A generation is remembered not only for what it accomplishes, but also for what it fails to accomplish. If our resources are so much greater than our achievements, how will we explain to future generations why we did so little when so much was within our reach? A neglectful civilization is condemned to wither like a body without a soul.

The exhortations from the great New Deal leader Franklin Delano Roosevelt still resonate with inescapable pertinence. What is needed today is "bold, persistent experimentation". "The only thing we need to fear is fear itself." Such boldness stems not from instinct but rather from political courage; not from irresponsible willfulness, but rather from a daring ability to reform. What sets civilization apart from barbarism is a political architecture that promotes peaceful change and advances social and economic life by means of democratic consensus. If we fall against hunger and poverty, what else will be able to bring us together?

I believe the time has come to state clearly that for us to once again grow in a fair way, an important shift in the financial flows from international multilateral organizations is necessary. Such organizations were created to provide solutions, but, by adopting excessive rigour, they themselves have sometimes become part of the problem. They must adjust their focus on development, thus restoring their original objectives. The International Monetary Fund should be able to provide the guarantees and the liquidity that are necessary for productive investment – especially in infrastructure, housing and sanitation – and which can also restore poor countries' capacity to pay.

Brazilian foreign policy, in all its dimensions, is focused on joining other nations in efforts aimed at the establishment of a world of justice

and peace. Yesterday, in a historic meeting, more than 60 world leaders gathered to give new impetus to international action against hunger and poverty. I firmly believe that the process launched yesterday will bring the fight against world poverty to a new level. As we advance in this new alliance, we shall have better means to attain the Millennium Development Goals, especially with regard to the eradication of hunger.

It was in this same spirit of contributing to the reduction of poverty that Brazil, India and South Africa established, last year, the India-Brazil-South Africa (IBSA) Fund. Our first project, in Guinea-Bissau, will be launched tomorrow.

HIV-AIDS and its nefarious connection to hunger and poverty is also a priority. Our international cooperation program with other developing countries in fighting HIV-AIDS is now operating in six developing countries and will soon be extended to another three.

I am fully aware of the serious security problems that pose a threat to international stability. There seems to be no prospect for improvement in the critical situation in the Middle East. In that and other conflicts, the international community cannot allow violence whether sponsored by States or by other actors – to prevail over democratic dialogue. The Palestinian people are still far from achieving the self determination to which they are entitled.

We know that the underlying causes of insecurity are complex. The necessary fight against terrorism cannot be conceived strictly in military terms. We must develop strategies that encompass both solidarity and firmness, but with strict respect for international law.

On that basis, Brazil and other Latin American countries have responded to the call of the United Nations and are engaged in the stabilization efforts in Haiti. If we seek new paradigms in international relations, we cannot shirk our responsibility to address the concrete situations that emerge.

The promotion of equitable development is crucial to addressing the centuries-old causes of Haitian instability. In our region, despite grave social and economic problems, a culture of peace prevails. Our continent is experiencing a period of democratic coming of age, with a vibrant civil society. We have learned that development and social justice must be sought with determination and openness to dialogue. The bouts of instability in our region have been dealt with while strictly respecting our institutions. Whenever requested, and within its means and capabilities, Brazil has made its contribution to help friendly countries overcome crises that threatened their constitutional order and stability. We do not believe

in interfering in the domestic affairs of other countries, but neither can we condone omission and indifference in the face of situations that affect our neighbors.

Brazil is committed to the establishment of a South America that is politically stable, prosperous and united, on the basis of strengthening the South American Common Market (MERCOSUR) and its strategic relationship with Argentina. The possibility that a community of South American States could emerge is no longer a distant dream, thanks to decisive initiatives in the areas of structural, economic, commercial, social and cultural integration.

Brazil is at work in multilateral negotiations with a view to reaching just and equitable agreements. At the last meeting of the World Trade Organization, we took a fundamental step towards the elimination of abusive restrictions that hamper developing countries. Coordination among countries from Africa, Asia and Latin America in the Group of 20 was decisive for keeping the Doha Round on the right track of trade liberalization with social justice. If successful, the Doha Round could lift more than 500 million people out of poverty. It is essential to carry on building a new world economic and commercial geography that, while maintaining the vital ties to developed countries, allows for the establishment of solid bridges among the countries of the South, which have remained isolated from one another for too long.

Brazil is committed to the success of the international climate change regime. We are developing renewable sources of energy. That is why we shall continue to actively strive for the entry into force of the Kyoto Protocol.

South America contains approximately 50 per cent of the world's biodiversity. We stand for combating bio-piracy as well as for the negotiation of an international regime for sharing the benefits derived from the use of genetic resources and traditional knowledge.

I reiterate what I stated at this very rostrum last year: only an international order based on multilateralism can promote peace and the sustainable development of nations. Such an order must be based on a constructive dialogue among different cultures and world visions. No organ is better suited than the United Nations to ensure the world's convergence around common goals. The Security Council is the only source of legitimate action in the field of international peace and security, but its composition must reflect today's reality – not perpetuate the post World War II era or the Cold War era. Reform proposals that simply dress the current structure in new clothes and do not provide for an increase

in the number of permanent members are manifestly insufficient. The difficulties inherent to any reform process must not cause us to lose sight of its urgency.

There will be neither security nor stability in the world until a more just and democratic order is established. The community of nations must give a clear and urgent response to this challenge. We can find such a response in the wise words of the Prophet Isaiah: the fruit of righteousness will be peace.

New York, September 21, 2004.

Statement by the President of the Republic, Luiz Inácio Lula da Silva*, during the High-Level Meeting on the Social Dimension of Globalization
2004

Tarja Halonen, President of Finland,

Mr. Benjamin Mkapa, President of Tanzania,

Mr. Jacques Chirac, President of France,

Ladies and Gentlemen, Heads of State and Government,

Mr. Jean Ping. President of the General Assembly of the United Nations,

My dear friend Juan Somavia, Director General of ILO,

Ladies and Gentlemen, Representatives of International Organizations,

Ladies and Gentlemen, Representatives of Non-governmental Organizations,

Ladies and Gentlemen,

I extend my appreciation to President Halonen, of Finland, and to President Mkapa, of Tanzania, for inviting me to take part in this debate on the implementation of the Millennium Declaration.

* **Luiz Inácio Lula da Silva**, President of the Republic from 1/1/2003 to 12/31/2006 and from 1/1/2007 to 12/31/2010 (2nd term).

During the Millennium Summit, a collective decision was solemnly taken, here at the United Nations, to turn the Third Millennium into an era of peace and development for all, particularly for those kept at the margins of the enormous economic, scientific and technological developments of the contemporary world.

We undertook lofty, but urgent, commitments. The goals are grand, but achievable. We do not wish, nor can we afford, to keep on living under the threat of war, and to keep on passively witnessing the spread of HIV/AIDS, and the growing frustration of those who are denied the right to dignity and hope.

The potential offered by globalization to reduce hunger and poverty, to provide dignified working conditions to all, to meet the demand of men and women alike for food, shelter, water, sanitation, education and culture is not being harnessed.

The report of the World Commission on the Social Dimension of Globalization comes at a good time. It demonstrates, with eloquent data, that globalization has increased the gap between the rich and the poor, enlarged asymmetries and deepened inequalities. The alleged rationality of such "globalization" does not cater to the interests of the greater part of us.

The challenges and dilemmas facing global society require integrated solutions and a common will to tackle them. The values of democracy, development and social justice must be globalized as an answer to the disconcerting deficit in global governance.

These are values that shall contribute decisively to broaden the meaning of collective security, diminishing, thus, the threats of terrorism and of the proliferation of weapons of mass destruction.

How many more times will it be necessary to repeat that the most destructive weapon of mass destruction in the world today is poverty?

We know that market forces do stimulate production and the effective allocation of resources. But market forces alone are not able to ensure, by themselves, the end of inequality and injustice. In some cases, they can even aggravate them. That is the reason why the engagement of leaders committed to social progress is necessary.

We must harness globalization. We must turn it into a positive force for all peoples of the world. The strengthening of the United Nations multilateral system is essential for the development of integrated and consistent strategies that address the multiple challenges ahead of us. A fair globalization means multilateral regimes that are more efficient, transparent and democratic.

It means regimes that reward the greater competitiveness of both small and large agricultural producers in developing countries, through the elimination of the trade barriers that restrict their capacity to offer their produce in the markets of rich developed ones.

The financial system must contribute to the growth in production and to a better income distribution at the global level. Its rules must offer developing countries the necessary margin of autonomy so that they may build their infrastructures and apply their own industrial and technological policies.

Ladies and gentlemen,

Another globalization, one that is both socially fair and politically sustainable, must begin with the right of all to employment, to a job that dignifies.

Access to decent work is at the center of the first and foremost of the Millennium Goals: the reduction of poverty and hunger.

The debate on decent work conditions applies to everyone.

Each international organization, each financial institution, each government has a responsibility.

Dignified work must be a reality for all of us.

It should not, however, serve as a pretext for the imposition of protectionist trade clauses that end up harming precisely those that they purport to defend.

Ladies and gentlemen,

These are the tasks we must fulfill. We know, however, that the example must be set at home. In Brazil, we have followed a difficult but necessary path against internal imbalances and external vulnerability. I am today more optimistic than ever.

The Director-General of the International Labor Organization, Ambassador Juan Somavía, was able to see the results of the "Zero Hunger" program during his recent visit to Brazil.

We are fighting poverty in its most urgent aspects, but we are also attacking its structural causes.

The good results we have obtained in Brazil give me confidence. Therefore, I have been working with other leaders to place the issue of social inclusion at the forefront of the international agenda. This is the

meaning of the meeting of world leaders on the fight against hunger and poverty that will take place shortly.

The positive response to the initiative that I have undertaken, together with Presidents Chirac, Lagos and Zapatero, with the support of Secretary-General Kofi Annan reinforces my certainty that we are on the right path.

I commend all of those who have participated in the elaboration of this report. Your conclusions will have a decisive role to play in strengthening the determination of the United Nations, of Governments and of civil society to act – and act with urgency.

Dignified work – like the fight against hunger – cannot wait.

Let us not waste further time.

Thank you very much.

New York, September 20, 2004.

Statement by the President of the Republic, Luiz Inácio Lula da Silva*, at the Meeting of World Leaders on "Action Against Hunger and Poverty" at the United Nations headquarters 2004

As we all know, this meeting is a joint initiative, in which I am joined by the Presidents of France, Jacques Chirac, Ricardo Lagos, of Chile, and José Luís Rodrigues Zapatero, head of the Spanish Government. On behalf of my colleagues present here I should like to express our satisfaction for the support and dedication of Secretary-General Kofi Annan to this initiative.

Before proceeding with the formal interventions, I should like to propose the adoption of the agenda that has been circulated to all participants. If there are no objections to the agenda, we may consider it adopted. As we know, our time is limited to three hours. We have therefore to be somewhat strict in order to observe the maximum limit of two to three minutes for each intervention, after the opening statements by my colleagues.

I am sure I can count with your understanding in this regard.

Ladies and Gentlemen,

I have now the honor to invite Secretary-General Kofi Annan to make his statement (words by the Secretary-General of the United Nations, Kofi Annan).

Mr. Jacques Chirac, President of France,

Mr. Ricardo Lagos, President of Chile,

* **Luiz Inácio Lula da Silva**, President of the Republic from 1/1/2003 to 12/31/2006 and from 1/1/2007 to 12/31/2010 (2nd term).

Mr. José Luís Rodrigues Zapatero, President of the Spanish Government,

Ladies and Gentlemen Heads of State and Government,

Mr. Kofi Annan, Secretary-General of the United Nations.

I wish in particular to thank the Presidents and also the Ministers and the representatives of the civil society organizations for being present here today.

May my first words be to of gratitude for all of you, ladies and gentlemen, for having heeded this call which is not only mine but also that of my colleagues Jacques Chirac, Ricardo Lagos and Rodrigues Zapatero, with the support of Secretary-General Kofi Annan. This is a call from our conscience.

The purpose of this meeting is to bring together the efforts of nations, peoples, societies and individuals around a common objective: to fight hunger and poverty, which still afflict so many men, women and children in the world.

The fact that we, the leaders of more than 50 peoples and nations, are meeting here already increases our hopefulness. It is a strong and concrete gesture toward a worldwide alliance against hunger and poverty.

Hunger is a social problem that must be urgently confronted as a political problem.

Mankind has achieved spectacular levels of scientific and technological progress. World production is more than enough to satisfy the hunger of populations. Unfortunately, however, we have not yet evolved to the stage of sharing the Planet's supper in order to bring to everyone at least the nourishment essential for survival.

Hunger robs one of dignity, destroys self-esteem and violates the most fundamental of human rights – the right to life.

Today, I am certain that our anguish in the face of the scourge of hunger is shared by all the leaders present here and by hundreds of millions of world citizens. More than that, we are together in the search for solutions. More and more leaders, peoples and nations come forward to fight the good fight.

Ladies and Gentlemen,

In 2008 we established together the Millennium Goals, giving the needed stress to the elimination of hunger. The Goals are fair and achievable. But they may become null and void for lack of political will.

We cannot allow this to happen. It would be a terrible disappointment for a large part of mankind, with extremely serious damage to world peace itself.

Stated intentions are no longer enough. It is time to make this commitment tangible and operational. It is not simply question of demanding from the rich countries what we can and must effectively demand: a radically new attitude and a higher commitment in the face of the absurd tragedy of hunger and poverty.

Poor and developing countries will have moral authority to make demands to the rich if they do not fail do act domestically, if they do their part, if they use their own internal resources with honesty and efficacy in the fight against hunger and poverty.

We in Brazil are determined to do our part. The program "Zero Hunger" is an objective we cannot evade and which we have pursued with tenacity. We have combined emergency measures that could not be postponed and structural, emancipatory solutions, by mobilizing every available tool.

Our program of income transfer, "Bolsa Família", already includes 5 million poor families, that is, more than 20 million people; we reduced taxes on popular consumption foodstuffs; we are carrying out the largest program of family agriculture financing in the history of Brazil; we have started to establish a new model of agrarian reform; we have increased the resources for school lunch which today nourishes 36 million deprived children.

Government and civil society are working hard to fulfill the Millennium Goals. We are also going to establish a national award for the cities that distinguished themselves in its fulfillment.

Ladies and Gentlemen,

We know that in several countries considerable efforts are also being made to combat hunger. But in today's world this is not a task that peoples may carry out in isolation. The world hungers for social inclusion, for economic opportunities and for democratic participation.

A policy of fight against hunger, indispensable for the social inclusion which we strive for, supposes the recovery of sustainable economic growth, with the expansion of employment and income of wide segments of our societies, which find themselves today alienated from production, consumption and citizenship rights.

It also supposes the reduction of the deep asymmetries in the world economy in order do balance trade relationships among nations and mitigate financial pressures on developing countries.

The technical report presented by France, Chile, Spain and Brazil examines some inovative financing mechanisms that may complement present efforts and make up for the well-known deficit of resources for development.

The report is neither exhaustive nor prescriptive. It examines alternatives and offers an array of options for every actor: governments, social organizations, private sector and individuals.

It includes measures that call for multilateral negotiation, such as taxes on financial transactions or on the armaments trade, among others that may be immediately adopted on a voluntary basis, like contributions via credit cards.

Ladies and Gentlemen,

We have not invited you here in order to discuss or even to endorse the technical aspects of the report. These will be examined in the required depth at the appropriate time.

We are here to start together a new stage in the efforts to combat hunger and poverty.

Let us never forget that hunger is the cruelest of all weapons of mass destruction. Hunger still kills twenty-four thousand people every day and eleven children every minute.

The challenge is so enormous that it requires us to humbly recognize that there are no ready-made solutions, magic formulae or boldness sufficient to face it with the priority and urgency demanded by the hungry human beings in the world. The worst answer to the drama of hunger is not to provide an answer.

Ladies and Gentlemen,

I appeal to government, social organizations, labor unions and corporations to confirm and widen their commitment by establishing a vigorous global partnership for the overcoming of poverty, so that we may be able to participate, in 2005, of the United Nations Summit on the Millennium Declaration with really innovative solutions to eliminate this economically irrational, politically unacceptable and ethically shameful phenomenon – hunger.

Thank you.

New York, September 20, 2004.

Words by the President of the Republic, Luiz Inácio Lula da Silva*, at the closure of the Meeting of World Leaders on "Action Against Hunger and Poverty" at the United Nations Headquarters
2004

Ladies and Gentlemen,

I should like at the outset to apologize. There is a large number of leaders, ministers, presidents, representatives of institutions that are important to us in the fight against extreme poverty, such as our dear Enrique Iglesias, from the Inter-American Development Bank, and our dear Juan Somavia, who did not take the floor today.

I believe, however, that those who spoke showed that we are already fully convinced of the seriousness of the problem of poverty in the world and of the need for a new economic order that takes the human being effectively into account.

I think we are beginning once again, because we have approved notes and other documents before, but when we go back to our countries each one worries about his or her problem and forgets the decisions taken in the previous year.

I think we should turn the policy of fighting against hunger and poverty into something almost like a profession of faith, in our day-to-day action, in the meetings we have from now on, among ministers of several countries, presidents, financial institutions, NGOs, labor unions and churches present here.

I think that a movement that encompasses society as whole, like this one, may give us the hope that we are taking another step, with a

* **Luiz Inácio Lula da Silva**, President of the Republic from 1/1/2003 to 12/31/2006 and from 1/1/2007 to 12/31/2010 (2nd term).

stronger commitment, together with what we learned in other occasions here at the headquarters of the United Nations.

Each one of you will receive the Declaration, which was already endorsed by 107 Heads of Government and Presidents. I believe that when we come back to our homes, often feeling hurt because the time was very short, two minutes, one minute, and on top of that with the bell ringing now and then – I do not know if you noticed that the bell startled President Kirchner, its sound is very worrisome – I know everyone had prepared a longer speech, they had more to say. But sometimes our ability for synthesis is so great that even speaking for two minutes I know that people conveyed the essence of what was important to say.

Therefore I wish to thank you from the bottom of my heart, to thank my peers here, who were the coordinators. But above all I wish to thank all of you, who heeded my call and came here and sat during all these hours in order to speak for only two minutes. But I know that those two minutes can contribute much more than many speeches of many hours that we have made in other venues without have been able to find a concrete way out.

In closing, I wish to say that I am grateful for your will, for your understanding. And I close by saying that I have no doubt that the poor of the world have started, thanks to the will that you have shown by coming to this meeting, to have a little more hope that we can defeat hunger and poverty.

Thank you, everyone, and until tomorrow.

New York, September 20, 2004.

2005

2005

New attacks, this time in London in July, kept the issue of terrorism at the center of international concerns. Attacks in Jordan and a series of disturbances in the periphery of French cities would maintain the attention of public opinion turned toward the growing gap between the so-called Western values and Islamic fundamentalism. The murder of the leader Rafic Hariri in Beirut, apparently instigated by Syria, opened a new period of trouble in that country, which after the Israeli occupation had quickly rebuilt and modernized itself. Sharon formed a new government of national unity in Israel, opened conversations with the Palestine government of M. Abbas, who had replaced Arafat, and started the Israeli withdrawal from the Gaza Strip under strong internal criticism and wide international discredit.

North Korea finally announced its possession of operational nuclear weapons.

The Conservative Angela Merkel succeeded Gerhard Schroeder in Germany. Unable, however, to form a government with the right, Merkel negotiated a "grand coalition" with her former Social-democrat adversaries.

The construction of Europe slid into crisis with the refusal of the French electorate to approve the Constitutional treaty of the European Union. The French "no" was followed by the Dutch "no" and the United Kingdom suspended its internal referendum process.

Brazilian external policy, under the leadership of Minister Celso Amorim, kept active in different fronts: in South America, integration processes were reinforced, also promoted by CASA, which would also permit an initiative of rapprochement with the Arab countries by means of a summit meeting of both parties in Brasília; MERCOSUR widened its operational mechanisms centered on the Brazil-Argentina relationship; at the United Nations, the convergences among the G4 countries (Brazil, Germany, India and Italy) increased until the end of the year, when some Japanese reticence and the change of government in Germany reduced somewhat the cohesion of methods (but not of the objectives) of the Group, which had succeeded in tabling – despite divisions among African countries – a draft resolution aimed at the reform of the Council, by then supported by a significant number of countries from all regions; and Brazilian leadership at the G20 gave Minister Amorim a salient role in the negotiation of the Doha round which, nevertheless, seemed to face continuing difficulties.

In his speech before the 2005 General Assembly, Minister Amorim analyzed issues pertaining to peace and security and called attention to the need for implementation of the Millennium targets. Stressing the satisfaction of Brazil with the progress achieved in the question of additional and innovative sources of financing for the action against hunger and poverty, he insisted on the need to increase development assistance.

He pledged the support of Brazil to the fight against terrorism and the elimination of its deep causes, based on the respect for international law and human rights. Brazil, he assured, was ready to work hard with a view to the swift conclusion of a comprehensive convention on terrorism. There is no automatic link between poverty and terrorism, he asserted, but severe economic problems, combined with the absence of civil and political freedoms, "communities can be exposed to extreme attitudes by fanatical groups".

In his statement, Minister Amorim emphasized especially the question of United Nations reform: "Reform must be our motto". A few days before the Security Council had held a summit meeting to take forward the issues pertaining to the reform. President Lula represented Brazil at the Summit. According to Minister Amorim, the final document then adopted was below our aspirations, but nevertheless could provide the directions to take the task to completion.

The Minister again presented Brazil's main concerns: 1) the General Assembly must be strengthened by means of changes that make it more

agile and productive; 2) The structure of ECOSOC should be elevated through the organization of a high level segment of which the Minister of the Economy of the country presiding the G7/G8 would participate; and 3) the Peace-building Commission must serve as the link between security and development, so far non-existent.

The human rights system must be improved, through the creation of a new Council based in the principles of universality, dialogue and non-selectivity. The High Commissioner should be tasked with the formulation of a global report covering all countries and situations. The international projection of human rights must be based on collective responsibility: the principle of non-intervention should be accompanied by the concept of "non-indifference". No intervention, however, can be envisaged without ensuring that all efforts have been exhausted.

The Security Council is the centerpiece of the process. No reform will have significance unless an expansion of the number of permanent and non-permanent seats is contemplated, with African, Asian and Latin American countries in both categories. The democratic deficit of the Council must be resolved.

Minister Amorim stressed the strategic alliance with Argentina; the vocation of the Community of South American Nations toward the integration of all Latin America and the Caribbean; the importance of IBAS; the role of the G20 in multilateral trade negotiations "to combine trade liberalization with social justice"; the strengthening of ties with Africa; the involvement of Brazil in peace efforts by the United Nations in Haiti ("first test case for the Peace-building Commission"); and the holding of the South America-Arab countries Summit meeting in May 2005 in Brasília.

The Brazilian contribution to the general debate at the Sixtieth Session of the General Assembly of the United Nations, such as expressed in Minister Amorim's statement, should be evaluated together with the participation of President Lula in the high level segment on the implementation of the Millennium targets (September 15, 2005), at the Summit meeting of the Security Council (September 14, 2005) and at the high level debate on financing mechanisms for development (September 14, 2005). The corresponding texts appear in the following pages.

Regarding the Millennium targets, the President summarized with remarkable precision the initiatives of the Brazilian government in the areas of the fight against hunger, right to work, racial and gender equality and environmental preservation. He insisted on the need for "a large" increase of the available resources to combat poverty and

hunger at a global scale, without which world peace and security would become "a chimera". He concluded by asserting that without the reform of the Security Council the United Nations would not be able to carry out the historical task that it is meant to achieve.

At the Summit meeting of the Council, the President took up the main themes on the multilateral agenda and summarized Brazil's views on 1) terrorism (firmness to combat this scourge, which cannot be defeated by repression only, but by "the culture of dialogue, the promotion of development and the unflinching defense of human rights"; 2) the situation in Africa (the African Union is the best instrument to overcome present conflicts and deal with the heritage of a past of dependence); 3) Haiti (the United Nations stabilization mission, headed by Brazil, contributes to the enduring stabilization of the country, without truculence or imposition); 4) the Peace Building Commission; 5) the need for better coordination between the Security Council and ECOSOC; 6) Middle East (support for the then current diplomatic efforts); updating of the Security Council (he condemned the persistence of a "clear deficit of transparence and representativeness") and called for the expansion of the composition of the Council "in an equitable manner" in the two categories of members in order to include developing countries in both; and 8) the fight against hunger and poverty.

Finally, in what regards the mechanisms of development financing, President Lula addressed his peers at the high level debate by recalling the progress achieved at the United Nations and other forums following the Brazilian initiative, with support from France, Chile and Spain. He expressed special satisfaction for the imminent implementation of President Chirac's proposal of a solidarity contribution on air fares. He also summarized the progress made by Brazil with the programs "Fome Zero" and "Bolsa Família".

Statement by President Luiz Inácio Lula da Silva* at the High Level Debate on Development Financing Mechanisms

Mr. President,

Josué de Castro, a Brazilian and a citizen of the world, once said that "hunger is the biological expression of sociological evils". Hunger is a scourge of our own making inflicted on our own kind. These ideas are still very up to date.

I have made the fight against hunger my Government's priority. That struggle reflects the broader challenge of promoting development with social justice and political democracy.

This is what we are doing in Brazil. We have achieved economic stability. We have recovered sustained development.

We expanded employment, income distribution and financial support to family agriculture and small businesses.

In 2004 in New York, I organized, together with my colleagues from France, Chile and Spain, a high level meeting to promote international action against hunger and poverty. Sixty heads of State and Government, along with more than 100 delegations, responded positively.

Today we are following up on the debate launched at the Millennium Summit. We are working to achieve the Millennium Development Goals, and the Sachs Report showed that this objective is attainable. The debate on innovative mechanisms for the financing of development is no longer taboo. The United Nations has brought this issue to centre stage. The World Bank, the International Monetary Fund

* **Luiz Inácio Lula da Silva**, President of the Republic from 1/1/2003 to 12/31/2006 and from 1/1/2007 to 12/31/2010 (2nd term).

and the G8 have been sensitized to the issue. This debate and the various parallel events related to the Millennium Development Goals reflect the extent of this mobilization.

The Goals will not be met unless the international community becomes seriously involved. We must act fast and move from words to deeds. We need to strengthen partnerships among Governments, business and civil society.

Last year, we put forward mechanisms to raise additional funds that would allow for more efficient aid, on a stable and predictable basis. This year, the technical group, which now includes Germany and Algeria, discussed short-term initiatives. We are moving to implement some of those ideas as pilot projects.

I support the proposal made by my friend President Chirac for a solidarity levy on airline tickets, and I know that other countries, such as Chile, have already adopted such measures. I have decided that technical studies should be undertaken in Brazil so that we, too, can take this measure as soon as possible. Such a mechanism will raise a considerable amount of funds, in addition to its even more important demonstration effect.

Creativity and solidarity will allow us to find innovative approaches to fight extreme poverty and hunger. We are also proposing in the General Assembly a reduction in the cost of international money remittances from migrant workers. We want that money to reach the recipients in full. That will help generate income and jobs for the families of those who have left their homes to seek to better their lives.

I am certain that Brazil's biggest contribution to eradicating hunger worldwide is the unprecedented effort we are making in our own country. All of the actions taken under the Zero Hunger program are part of the crucial transformations under way in Brazil and contribute directly to five of the eight Millennium Goals.

The *Bolsa Família* program provides guaranteed income to 7.5 million families and by the end of 2006 will reach all Brazilians living below the poverty line. About 37 million children and teenagers benefit today from school meals programs.

We are not only transferring income but also ensuring enjoyment of the right to education and health care.

We make benefits contingent on school attendance by children and on participation by children and expectant mothers in health-care programs.

Brazil is also helping to overcome poverty and inequalities by promoting discussions on the need for more balanced and fair international

trade. The outrageous economic subsidies granted every year to farmers in industrialized countries are six times greater than the additional US$50 billion needed annually to meet the Millennium Development Goals.

I am convinced that, in a world beset by instability, the eradication of hunger is a sine qua non condition for the emergence of a more stable and peaceful international order. The time to act is now.

New York, September 14, 2005.

Statement by President Luiz Inácio Lula da Silva* at the Summit Meeting of the United Nations Security Council 2005

I would like to congratulate you, Madam President, on the initiative of convening this meeting, which is being held at a critical juncture for the future of the United Nations. Efforts to strengthen the United Nations and its main bodies are being intensified. We need to adapt the Security Council to the political and economic requirements of a world that is undergoing a profound transformation. This is only the third summit of the Security Council in its 60 years of existence.

In 1992, we met to celebrate the end of the East-West confrontation, as new prospects dawned for the Council to act to promote international stability. There were reasons to believe in the future of collective security.

In 2000, our summit meeting coincided with brutal acts of violence fuelled by racial and religious intolerance. At that time, we were striving to learn lessons from the civil wars in former Yugoslavia and Rwanda and to restore the Organization's capacity to counter massive human rights abuses. Today, we face threats of growing complexity.

Both of the resolutions we have just adopted are attempts to respond to those challenges. Barbaric acts of terrorism continue to be perpetrated against innocent and defenseless people. Combating this scourge demands resolve, yet repression alone will not defeat it. We must prevent terror from breeding in hotbeds of hopelessness. We must reject prejudice and discrimination, whatever their guise or pretext. In combating

* **Luiz Inácio Lula da Silva**, President of the Republic from 1/1/2003 to 12/31/2006 and from 1/1/2007 a 12/31/2010 (2nd term).

irrational violence, the best means at our disposal are the promotion of a culture of dialogue, the promotion of development and the unyielding protection of human rights.

The Council must also continue to devote attention to African issues. During my visits to 14 African countries, as well as in contacts maintained with many African leaders in Brasília, I have witnessed major institutional and economic progress in the region. The firm political will of African leaders to overcome today's conflicts and to cope with a legacy of dependency has culminated in the establishment of the African Union. Their example should inspire parts of the world that are working towards integration with the international community in a sovereign and peaceful manner. In Haiti, Latin America wants to prove that the United Nations is not condemned to merely clean up the wreckage of conflicts it could not prevent. The United Nations Stabilization Mission in Haiti offers a new paradigm for responding to the challenges of conflict resolution and national reconstruction. We are contributing to the long-term stabilization of the country without resorting to the excessive use of force or to any imposed solution. We encourage dialogue among all political actors and support institutional and economic reconstruction. The establishment of a Peace-building Commission demonstrates that the international community shares that view. Better coordination between the Security Council and the Economic and Social Council would ensure that situations such as those in Haiti and Guinea-Bissau are adequately addressed. Those are deep crises in societies that seek to find their way back to development. With regard to issues such as these, United Nations action is irreplaceable. That is certainly the case with the Middle East conflict, where sensitive political issues need to be resolved with credibility and transparency. In that spirit, Brazil supports the efforts of the Quartet to promote the implementation of the road map to peace.

United Nations reform, now being discussed, cannot be dissociated from restructuring of the Security Council. New responsibilities — many of them not anticipated in the Charter of the United Nations — have arisen as a result of a broader agenda. The Council must stop running such a deficit in transparency and representativeness. The values of good governance and the democratic principles that we so cherish at home should lead us to embrace multilateralism and collective decision-making in multilateral institutions. We have before us an historic opportunity to expand the Council in an equitable manner. For the majority of United Nations Member countries, that means expanding the number of Council seats, with developing countries from all regions as both permanent and non-permanent Council members.

I am convinced that there will be no peace or security in the world as long as a billion people are oppressed by hunger. I insist that that evil can be considered the most devastating of all weapons of mass destruction. Hunger and poverty affect people's capacity to work, as well as their health, their dignity and their hopes; they also break down families, tear apart societies and weaken economies. Hunger and poverty fuel a vicious circle of frustration and humiliation that sets the stage for violence, crises and conflicts of all sorts. I would like to reiterate that, as far as Brazil is concerned, the Council must continue to be the principal international body for the promotion of international peace and security, as defined by the Charter.

Brazil will not shirk its responsibilities in promoting the reforms needed to strengthen this institution. A reformed Council will be better equipped to take the lead in facing the complex decisions required at this historic moment.

New York, September 14, 2005.

Statement by President Luiz Inácio Lula da Silva* at the Summit Meeting on the Implementation of the Millenium Goals 2005

Mr. President,

The Millennium Goals are a significant achievement of contemporary humanism. They represent the victory of the values of human solidarity over the doctrines of moral indifference and political omission with regard to the excluded. They show that we have achieved a higher level of collective awareness. They are rooted in the conviction that we must fight inequalities while respecting and appreciating diversity. They express the vision of democracy according to which political rights are inseparable from economic, social and cultural rights. They underline the need to increase the production of wealth, but to make the benefits available to all, never eliminating – but rather protecting and renewing – the sources of life. That will surely require new creative and responsible relations on the part of human beings with nature and with one another.

In short, the Goals express the ideal of a civilization in which peace is based on justice. No other goals could be more just or appropriate. Our challenge is to make them real. In order to do so, we need more than routine mechanisms and procedures. In most countries, the Goals will simply not be met under existing financing schemes and restrictions on aid flows. We must take immediate and courageous steps. The resources available for fighting poverty and hunger must be significantly expanded; we need to provide development opportunities to poor countries.

* **Luiz Inácio Lula da Silva**, President of the Republic from 1/1/2003 to 12/31/2006 and from 1/1/2007 a 12/31/2010 (2nd term).

If developed countries attain the required strategic vision, they will realize that that new posture, that additional effort, is not only fair, but absolutely necessary. Otherwise, I fear that international peace and security will remain a mirage.

I have always said – and I wish to reiterate – that each country must do its own part. In Brazil, we have strived to implement the same measures that we have been proposing in the international arena. We do not presume to be a model for others, but we are motivated by great enthusiasm and political resolve. We have adopted the Millennium Development Goals as mandatory benchmarks for all public policies. We have established a national award recognizing best practices in social solidarity in municipalities, churches, the business sector and social movements.

I should like briefly to highlight initiatives by our Government in four areas: the fight against hunger, the right to employment, the promotion of racial and gender equality and environmental preservation.

Today, the "zero hunger" program – whose primary tool is the family stipend – reaches 7.5 million families, or some 30 million Brazilians. By the end of my tenure, all families living below the poverty line will have been incorporated into the programme. Brazil will finally ensure for all its children the right to eat every day.

We have come far, and we have earned the credibility to aim at even more ambitious steps towards social justice. Brazil has resumed a sustained growth rate, creating jobs and distributing wealth. In the past 32 months, we have created 3.2 million new jobs in the formal sector, in addition to hundreds of thousands of jobs created in the area of family agriculture.

Attention to women's rights and the promotion of racial equality permeate all our public policies. We have created special secretariats with ministerial standing to ensure that our Government team will actually enable us to achieve the Goals. I am very moved by one example in particular: poor black and indigenous people educated in public schools can now attend universities because of our affirmative action program, with financial support for poor students. Another example: we have ended the centuries-old practice of discriminating against rural women by allowing only men to own land. Now both men and women can enjoy the right to land ownership. Agricultural credit also used to be the privilege of men alone, now both men and women farmers can take out loans.

With regard to the environment, I am pleased to highlight the consistent drop in deforestation rates in the Amazon region and the new

prospects emerging for the region's 22 million inhabitants as a result of the sustainable Amazon plan, an innovative project aimed at ecologically oriented social and economic development.

Brazil is becoming a more productive and caring country. We are ready and willing to join forces with nations around the world to achieve the Millennium Goals for the benefit of poor people and all of humanity throughout the world.

I should like to conclude by highlighting one point that I made yesterday in my statement to the Security Council. There is an urgent need to reform that body to make it more legitimate and representative; otherwise, the United Nations will not be able to carry out its historic role.

New York, September 15, 2005.

LX Regular Session of the General Assembly of the United Nations 2005

Minister Celso Amorim [*]

Mr. President,

I should like to extend my warmest congratulations to you, Sir, Ambassador Jan Eliasson of Sweden, on your assumption of the presidency of the General Assembly at its Sixtieth Session. I should also like to express fraternal greetings to Secretary-General Kofi Annan, whose wisdom and commitment to multilateralism have made an immense contribution to progress here at the United Nations. Minister Jean Ping of Gabon deserves special recognition for the competent and dedicated manner in which he presided over the General Assembly at its Fifty-Ninth Session.

This is a rare and historic opportunity to promote change; let us not waste it. Peace, development, democracy and respect for human rights are objectives that unite us. Reform must be our motto.

The final document adopted yesterday at the summit (resolution 601 I) has unquestionably fallen short of our expectations. However, it provides us with guidelines that will enable us to carry out our work.

The General Assembly must be strengthened. More than ever, we need a forum with universal representation, in which the crucial issues of today's world can be democratically debated. The General Assembly

[*] **Celso Luiz Nunes Amorim**, born in Santos, SP, June 3, 1942. Master in International Relations from the Vienna Diplomatic Academy. Doctor in Political Science/International Relations from the London School of Economics and Political Sciences. Third Secretary 1965. First Class Minister on 12/18/1989. Minister of State for External Relations from 8/31/1993 to 1/18/1995 and from 1/1/2003 to 12/31/2010.

must provide leadership and political guidance to the Organization as a whole. In supporting the authority of the General Assembly by enabling it to act more speedily and be more productive, we are supporting the very essence of the United Nations.

The Economic and Social Council must again become a dynamic and influential organ. It must help us to come together on issues related to trade, finance and development in an environment free from prejudice and dogma. The Economic and Social Council should be a privileged, deliberative forum in our quest for reconciliation between the objectives of sustainable economic growth and the reduction of the inequalities caused by asymmetric globalization. President Lula suggested this year at the summit of the Group of Eight (G8) at Gleneagles, that we could start raising the profile of the Economic and Social Council by organizing a high-level segment, with the participation of the Finance Minister of the country holding the G8 presidency. The Economic and Social Council must also help to promote peace and stability in partnership with the Security Council, as provided for in Article 65 of the Charter.

The establishment of a Peace-building Commission will bridge an important institutional gap. It will be a link between security and development. Currently, there is no such link.

The structures and mechanisms of the Organization in the human rights field must be improved and reinforced. We support the creation of a Human Rights Council, based on the principles of universality, dialogue and non-selectivity. The elaboration of an annual global report on human rights by the Office of the United Nations High Commissioner for Human Rights, covering all countries and situations, will help to increase the credibility of the United Nations human rights system.

The Secretary-General has called for better coordination in our work to protect victims of grave and systematic violations of human rights. International cooperation in the field of human rights and humanitarian assistance must be guided by the principle of collective responsibility. We have maintained on several occasions - in our region and elsewhere - that the principle of non-intervention in the domestic affairs of States must be associated with the idea of "non-indifference".

We have been called upon to deal with new concepts, such as human security and the responsibility to protect. We agree that they merit a proper place in our system. But it is an illusion to believe that we can combat the dysfunctional politics at the root of grave human rights violations by military means alone, or even by economic sanctions, without fully utilizing diplomacy and persuasion.

Human security is mainly the result of just and equitable societies that promote and protect human rights, strengthen democracy and respect the rule of law, while creating opportunities for economic development and social justice. The United Nations was not created to disseminate the notion that order should be imposed by force. That extreme expedient can be considered only when all other efforts have been exhausted and peaceful solutions have proved not to be viable. A judgment as to the existence of such exceptional circumstances must always be a multilateral one.

The Charter foresees two situations in which the use of force is permissible: to restore or maintain international peace and security, and in the case of the right to self-defense. Mixing those two concepts would blur the meaning of the very tenets of this Organization.

Security Council reform is the centerpiece of the reform process in which we are engaged. The vast majority of Member States recognize the need to make the Security Council more representative and democratic.

At this historic juncture, no Security Council reform effort will be meaningful unless it contemplates an increase in the number of permanent and non-permanent seats, with developing countries from Africa, Latin America and Asia included in both categories. We cannot accept the perpetuation of imbalances that run contrary to the very spirit of multilateralism.

Above all, a more efficient Council must be capable of ensuring that its decisions are implemented. It is not reasonable to expect the Council to continue to expand its agenda and responsibilities without addressing its democracy deficit.

Two years ago, President Luiz Inácio Lula da Silva declared before the Assembly that every nation that is committed to democracy at the domestic level must strive for more transparent, legitimate and representative decision-making processes in its external relations. In the same spirit, Secretary-General Kofi Annan pointed out the contradictions to be overcome, stating:

"We are the ones who go around the world lecturing everybody about democracy. I think it is about time we apply it to ourselves, and then show that there is effective representation".

We are still far from accomplishing the goals of the Millennium Declaration. This week's summit has stressed the importance of a renewed commitment to development assistance and contributed to promoting universal acceptance of the target of 0.7 per cent of gross national product devoted to official development assistance. At the same time, we must

continue to work on innovative and additional sources of financing. I note with satisfaction that since the Summit of World Leaders for Action against Hunger and Poverty, convened last year by President Lula, we have achieved significant progress. A growing number of Governments and non-governmental organizations have joined in the effort to eradicate hunger and poverty. This is the only war in which we are engaged. This is the only war we can all win.

This year we witnessed yet again brutal acts of terrorism. Innocent civilians, women and children are today victims of groups who stand as adversaries to the values we share. As a country whose identity cannot be dissociated from the notions of tolerance and diversity, Brazil rejects in the strongest terms those abhorrent acts, which go against the very notion of humanity. We will continue to lend our support to increased international cooperation in the fight against terrorism and in the struggle to eliminate its deep-rooted causes.

Such efforts must be undertaken with due respect for international law and human rights. The fight against terrorism cannot be viewed in terms of police repression alone. Nor can such repression result in absurd and indiscriminate killing like terrorism itself. Despite the fact that there is no automatic linkage between poverty and terrorism, communities can be exposed to extreme attitudes by fanatical groups as a result of grave social and economic problems, especially when associated with the absence of civil and political liberties. I wish to express Brazil's readiness to work intensively with a view to the prompt conclusion of a comprehensive convention against terrorism.

We recognize the risks of the proliferation of weapons of mass destruction. At the same time, we cannot disregard the importance of reducing and dismantling existing arsenals of all such weapons. We regret that the seventh Review Conference of the Parties to the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons did not produce tangible results. Together with non-proliferation efforts, we must continue to work tirelessly towards nuclear disarmament.

In addition to the challenges I have just referred to, we are faced with two crises of global scope: the pandemic explosion of HIV-AIDS and the serious threats posed by climate change. Brazil will continue to promote the implementation of existing multilateral instruments to fight those scourges.

Brazil is committed to reinforcing the strategic alliance with its main partner in our region – Argentina – and to the promotion of a prosperous, integrated and politically stable South America, building upon

our experience in the Southern Cone Common Market (MERCOSUR). We will tirelessly strive for MERCOSUR's advancement in the economic and political fields. The South American Community of Nations, which was founded last year in Cuzco, Peru, can be seen as a driving force for integration in Latin America and the Caribbean as a whole.

Our efforts in establishing partnerships with other developing countries go beyond our immediate region. The India-Brazil-South Africa Dialogue Forum (IBSA) has brought together three large democracies from Africa, Asia and Latin America that are keen on deepening the economic, political and cultural ties between them and between their regions. Together with other partners, we have joined in setting up the Group of Twenty (G20), which places developing countries at the centre of agricultural trade negotiations of the World Trade Organization's Doha round. Thanks to the role played by the G20, it has been possible to combine trade liberalization with social justice in the context of the multilateral trading system.

Strengthening our ties with Africa has been a long-standing aspiration of Brazil's. No previous Government has pursued that objective with the resolve demonstrated by President Lula. Trade and cooperation between Brazil and Africa have grown significantly. Political dialogue has intensified. We have been contributing to the consolidation of peace and democracy in countries such as Guinea-Bissau and São Tomé and Príncipe. We have helped to fight hunger, develop agriculture and combat the scourge of HIV-AIDS in various brother countries of Africa.

The same sense of solidarity inspires us to participate in United Nations peace efforts in Haiti. The Brazilian and Latin American presence in Haiti is unprecedented, in terms of both troops and political commitment. We are motivated by three main objectives: establishing a safe environment, promoting dialogue among the various political actors with a view to a genuine democratic transition and securing effective international support for institutional, social and economic reconstruction. Haiti is likely to be the first test case for the Peace building Commission.

Brazil and the Arab world are renewing their ties of friendship, inspired by strong historical and cultural affinities. Apart from bilateral initiatives, Brazil has been strengthening its relations with regional groupings such as the Gulf Cooperation Council and the Arab League. In May 2005, an unprecedented summit of South American and Arab States took place in Brasília. That pioneering initiative brought together two regions of the developing world in a concrete demonstration of harmony of civilizations.

On several trips to the Middle East, I had the opportunity to talk to variety of people, including leaders from Israel and Palestine. They are aware of Brazil's willingness to support the work of the Quartet as a partner for peace. The practice of tolerance and respect for others, as well as the harmonious coexistence of different communities in our country, constitute our comparative advantage. I believe that conviction is shared by eminent persons and political leaders from both Israel and Palestine.

At the beginning of this new chapter in the life of the United Nations, Brazil remains committed to the ideals that led to the creation of the only Organization of universal scope, the only body that can guarantee a future of peace and prosperity – not for the few, but for all.

New York, September 17, 2005.

2006

2006

With elections in Bolivia, Chile, Colombia, Mexico, Peru and Brazil, the year 2006 was marked by high political activity in Latin America. In the case of Bolivia, the decision by the Evo Morales government to nationalize oil and gas deposits, as well as foreign refineries in operation in the country, directly affect the interests of Petrobrás and generated intense diplomatic activity between Brazil and Bolivia. Venezuela, on its part, broke off definitively its ties to the Andean Community of Nations and formally joined MERCOSUR. At the same time, the Venezuelan government, which was campaigning for a non-permanent seat at the United Nations Security Council, intensified its international mobilization effort as President Chávez increased his antagonistic discourse directed at the United States.

At the global level, the international panorama was characterized by 1) the continuing instability of the oil and gas markets; 2) by a protracted crisis around the Iranian nuclear program; and 3) by the bombing and invasion of Lebanon by the Israeli armed forces in retaliation for actions carried out by Hezbollah in Israeli territory.

These three angles of the international crisis combined with the renewed intensification of the conflict in Afghanistan, where the NATO forces were unable to contain the activities of the Taliban militias, and with the continuing violence in Iraq. Despite the heavy involvement, chiefly by the United States and the United Kingdom, the conflict in Iraq

became extremely harmful to the projects of leadership and "diplomacy of change" put into practice by the Bush administration.

The situation in the Middle East became more serious for Israel, which finally suffered what could be called its first "non-success" in the long history of military episodes in the region. Palestine leaders operating in Lebanon emerged from the conflict with reinforced prestige. But the continuing refusal of the government of the Palestine Authority in Ramallah, now under the control of Hamas, to recognize the existence of Israel, added to the aggravation of the disputes with Iran, whose leaders also denied the right of the State of Israel to exist, as well as the inflexibility of Syria at negotiating, seemed to provide little encouragement to negotiated solutions for the Palestine-Israeli conflict.

Brazilian diplomacy was present in the Middle East: Brazil promoted the removal of thousands of Lebanese refugees from the theatre of operations and sought to keep high level contacts, including through a visit of Minister Amorim, with a view to encouraging negotiated solutions for the crisis. For its part, Brazil continued heading the peace operation in Haiti.

Following up on a diplomatic project initiated in the first year of President Lula's administration, the First Summit meeting of the Dialogue Forum India-Brazil-South Africa (IBAS) was held in Brazil, when a large number of commitments aimed at strengthening the tri-continental dialogue between the three big developing countries was approved.

In the area of multilateral trade, the negotiations of the Doha Round suffered an interruption, due on the one hand to the inability of the United States to signal commitment with deeper reductions in its proposals of domestic support to agricultural production and, on the other, to the immobility in the negotiating positions of the European Union. In its capacity as coordinator of G20, Brazil exerted intense diplomatic efforts with a view, initially, to preventing the interruption of the negotiations, and after that to restarting them, by means of the convening of a Ministerial meeting of the G20 which took place in August in Rio de Janeiro, with the presence of the Director-general of WTO and the Ministers of the United States, European Union and Japan.

This whole set of problems was reflected in President Lula's statement on September 19 at the opening of the general debate of the Sixty-First Session of the General Assembly of the United Nations. In pursuance of the priority guidelines of his Administration, the President emphasized issues related to the fight against hunger and poverty, establishing clear links between international security and the right to economic and social

development: "no one is secure in a world of injustice". Praising the progress achieved in the international action against hunger and poverty, the President highlight the results reached in Brazil and renewed the challenge to the international community: "If we in Brazil have done so much with so little, imagine what could have been done on a global scale".

President Lula also identified a nexus between the fight against hunger and poverty and the establishment of a world order capable of putting economic and social development as a first priority. Against this background, he again condemned agricultural protectionism and valued the action of G20, as he insisted on positive results at the multilateral trade negotiations under the aegis of the WTO. He even made an explicit linkage between the credibility of the WTO system and the negative repercussions on the political and social fields: "Scourges such as organized crime, drug trafficking and terrorism will find fertile ground in which to proliferate".

Reaffirming the adherence of Brazil to the values represented by multilateralism, the President expressed confidence in the United Nations and warned against the risk of erosion of its credibility due to the protracted worsening of the conflict in the Middle East. Mentioning the harmonious and integrated way in which the Arab and Israeli communities lived side by side in Brazil, the President asked: "is it not time to convene a broad-based conference under United Nations auspices, with the participation of countries of the region and others that could make a contribution on the basis of their successful experiences in living peacefully despite differences?

In the final segment of his statement, the President took up once again the issue of the reform of the United Nations and in particular the expansion of the Security Council: "Together with the other members of the Group of Four on Security Council reform, Brazil believes that any expansion of the Council must envisage the admission of developing countries as permanent members".

He concluded by insisting that "the fight against hunger and poverty, the breakdown of the Doha round and the stalemate in the Middle East are interconnected issues".

LXI Regular Session of the General Assembly of the United Nations
2006

President Luiz Inácio Lula da Silva [*]

Mr. President,

When I first addressed the Assembly from this rostrum, in 2003, I stressed the need for urgent and relentless action to fight the scourge of hunger and poverty in the world. This is what we are doing in Brazil: we have combined economic stability with social inclusion policies; the standard of living of Brazilians has improved; employment and income have grown; the purchasing power of the minimum wage has increased. Our resources are scarce, but even so we have achieved surprising results.

The family stipend at the core of our zero-hunger program assures a basic income to over 11 million Brazilian families. Well-fed people can enhance their dignity, their health and their learning capacity. Putting resources into social programs is not expenditure; it is investment.

If we in Brazil have done so much with so little, imagine what could have been done on a global scale if the fight against hunger and poverty had been a real priority for the international community. Where there is hunger, there is no hope; there is only desolation and pain. Hunger nurtures violence and fanaticism. A world where people starve will never be safe.

[*] **Luiz Inácio Lula da Silva**, President of the Republic from 1/1/2003 to 12/31/2006 and from 1/1/2007 a 12/31/2010 (2nd term).

The sheer size of the task will not daunt us, especially if we are not alone. All here know that some 840 million human beings - nearly one out of seven on the planet - do not have enough to eat.

An additional US$50 billion each year are needed to reach the Millennium Development Goals on time. The international community can afford it. On the positive side, think, just for instance, of the hundreds of billions of dollars invested to move forward with the full integration of Eastern European countries into the European Union. Then, on the other hand, think of the cost of wars and other conflicts. Everyone here is aware that the second Gulf war has probably cost hundreds of billions of dollars to date. With much less will extend far beyond trade, we could change the sad reality of a large portion of the world's population. We could alleviate the plight of those people and lift them out of destitution. We could save millions of lives.

However strong they are today, rich countries should have no illusions: nobody is safe in a world of injustice. War will never bring security; it can only generate horrors, bitterness, intolerance and fundamentalism and create damage associated with hegemonism. The poor must be given reasons to live, not to kill or die. Humanity's greatness lies not in bellicosity, but in humanism, and there can be no true humanism without respect for the other.

There are, in fact, those who are different from us, but who are no less dignified, no less precious and no less entitled to the right to happiness, because we are all creatures of the same creator.

There can be security only in a world where all have the right to economic and social development. The true path to peace is shared development. If we do not want war to go global, justice must go global.

That is why, with the serene conviction of a man who has dedicated his life to fighting peacefully for the rights of working people, I say to the Assembly: the search for a new, fairer and more democratic world order is not only in the interests of poor or emerging nations; it is also – and perhaps to an even greater extent – in the interests of rich countries, so long as they have eyes to see and ears to hear, so long as they do not make the mistake of ignoring the haunting cry of the excluded.

We have seen some progress in the past few years. At the Summit of World Leaders in 2004, we launched the Action against Hunger and Poverty initiative. Together, we were able to achieve strong international engagement around that issue. Our collective efforts have begun to bear fruit. We are establishing innovative mechanisms, such as a solidarity levy on international air tickets.

Hunger and disease walk hand in hand.

Therefore, we have joined with other Governments in establishing an International Drug Purchase Facility to combat AIDS, tuberculosis and malaria. That initiative will provide new sources of funding and facilitate access to medication at lower costs. We cannot shirk our responsibilities in this area.

That is why I salute the leaders of vision who are engaged in this war: the war against the debasement of human beings and against hopelessness. That is the only war in which final victory will mean a triumph for all of humanity.

The fight against hunger and poverty is based on the creation of a world order that gives priority to social and economic development. There will be permanent solutions to destitution only when poorer countries can make progress through their own efforts.

Once international trade is free and fair, it will be a valuable tool for wealth creation, income distribution and job creation. It is essential that we break the bonds of protectionism. Subsidies granted by richer countries, particularly in the area of agriculture, are oppressive shackles that limit progress and doom poor countries to backwardness. Time and again, I must repeat that, while trade-distorting support in developed countries amount to the outrageous sum of US$1 billion a day, 900 million people get by on less than US$1 a day in poor and developing countries. That situation is politically and morally untenable.

The only thing worse than inaction stemming from ignorance is neglect born of accommodation. The old geography of international trade must be profoundly reshaped. Brazil, together with its partners in the Group of Twenty (G20), is engaged in that task. The creation of the G20 has changed the dynamics of negotiations at the World Trade Organization (WTO): until recently, developing countries played only peripheral roles in the most important negotiations.

Eliminating the barriers that prevent poor countries from developing is an ethical duty of the international community. It is also the best way to ensure prosperity and security for all.

Today, for the first time in the history of the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade/WTO system, the word “development” appears in the title of a round of trade negotiations. However, the Doha Development Agenda, which will decide the future of the world trade system, is now in crisis.

If they are successful, the WTO negotiations will help to pull many people out of extreme poverty. Farmers who cannot compete against multi-billion dollar subsidies will at last have a chance to prosper. Poor African countries will finally be able to export their products. If the round fails, however, the fallout will be felt much beyond the commercial field.

The credibility of the WTO system itself will be jeopardized, with negative political and social repercussions. Scourges such as organized crime, drug trafficking and terrorism will find fertile ground in which to proliferate.

I have called on world leaders to shoulder their responsibilities. The importance attached to this issue at the most recent summit of the Group of Eight has not yet produced practical results. Our generation has a unique opportunity to show the world that selfish interests will not prevail over the common good. History will not forgive us if we miss that opportunity. Fair trade, based on a solid consensus and on a transparent WTO that is aware of the needs of developing countries, is one of the pillars of the world order that we uphold.

In the field of international peace and security, another such pillar is the United Nations. Brazil is a staunch supporter of international organizations as forums for cooperation and dialogue. There is no more effective way to bring States together, to keep the peace, to protect human rights, to promote sustainable development and to work out negotiated solutions to common problems.

Conflicts such as that in the Middle East continue to challenge the authority of the United Nations. The recent crisis in Lebanon exposed the Organization to a dangerous erosion of credibility. The effectiveness of the United Nations is being seriously questioned. Unable to act when it is needed, the Security Council is accused of being lethargic.

World public opinion is impatient in the face of such incomprehensible difficulties. The deaths of innocent civilians – including women and children – have shocked all of us. In Brazil, millions of Arabs and Jews live together in harmony. Thus, Brazil's interest in the Middle East stems from a profound objective social reality in our own country.

Apart from the countries directly involved, Middle Eastern issues have always been addressed exclusively by the major Powers. So far, they have found no solution. Thus, we might ask: is it not time to convene a broad-based conference under United Nations auspices, with the participation of countries of the region and others that could

make a contribution on the basis of their successful experiences in living peacefully despite differences?

Brazil believes in dialogue. For that reason, we held a summit of South American and Arab countries in 2005. We also have good relations with Israel, whose birth as a State came about when a Brazilian, Oswaldo Aranha, was the President of the General Assembly. Conflicts among nations are not resolved only with money and weapons; ideas, values and feelings also have their place, particularly when they are based on real-life experiences.

More than ever before, the authority of the United Nations needs to be strengthened. We have already made significant progress through the administrative reform process and the establishment of both the Human Rights Council and the Peace-building Commission. But the task will remain irreparably incomplete without changes in the Security Council, the body responsible for overseeing issues related to peace.

Together with the other members of the Group of Four on Security Council reform, Brazil believes that any expansion of the Council must envisage the admission of developing countries as permanent members. That would make the Council more democratic, legitimate and representative. The great majority of Member States agree with that view and recognize the urgency of this matter.

We cannot deal with new problems using outdated structures. Sooner or later, we must open the way to democratizing international decision-making bodies. As the Secretary-General has said, we travel around the world preaching democracy to others; we must now apply democracy to ourselves and show that there is genuine representation in the political bodies of the United Nations.

South America is a priority for Brazilian foreign policy. Our region is our home. We are expanding the Common Market of the South (MERCOSUR) and strengthening the South American Community of Nations. The future of Brazil is linked to that of its neighbours. A strong and united South America will contribute to the integration of Latin America and the Caribbean.

We also feel connected to the African continent by historical and cultural ties. As the country with the second-largest black population in the world, we are committed to sharing Africa's challenges and its destiny. But regional matters are only part of the global problems we face.

The fight against hunger and poverty, the breakdown of the Doha round and the stalemate in the Middle East are interconnected issues.

The appropriate handling of these matters requires trust in negotiated solutions at the multilateral level.

This trust has now been shaken. This is extremely serious. The world order that it is our task to build must be based on justice and respect for international law. That is the only way to achieve peace, development and genuine democratic coexistence within the community of nations.

There is no lack of resources. What is missing is the political will to use them where they can make a difference. They can then turn despair into joy and find a reason to live.

New York, September 19, 2006.

2007

2007

Reelected in November 2006, President Lula started in 2007 his second term as President of Brazil. Political and economic prospects for stability and growth in Brazil were auspicious. Later on, however, the country would be affected by the global financial crisis. In fact, 2007 will be remembered in History as the year when the biggest financial crisis of the post-war period started to be felt. Beginning in Wall Street with the bankruptcy of large capital market institutions due mainly to overexposure to subprime mortgages in the American real estate market, the crisis would spread to every European and Asian financial centers, generating bankruptcies, unemployment and a marked retraction in the growth rates of several countries.

After the breaking out of the crisis, however, international stock exchanges, led by New York, broke a series of records. In July, the Dow Jones index passed the 14 thousand point barrier for the first time in history.

The crisis took time to reach Brazil, and when it did it took a much softer form than in most developed countries. The policy of high interest rates followed by the Central Bank ensured the attractiveness of the Brazilian market, which was further reinforced by the growth of internal demand as result of the social policies put into practice by the government. At the start of the year the adoption of the "Growth Acceleration Plan"(PAC) was announced to stimulate investment in infrastructure and

thus increase growth. The long term prospects of the Brazilian economy were also reinforced by the announcement, in November, of the discovery of the giant Tupi oil field, in the Santos basin. In the oil sector, the crisis resulting from the expropriation of the Petrobras refineries in Bolivia was settled by means of a financial agreement with the administration of President Morales.

While marked by a series of crisis at the Legislative branch, the internal political situation in Brazil remained solid, allowing President Lula's administration to take forward the program that had supported his reelection, based on sustained growth with social inclusion and income redistribution, as he had asserted in his inauguration speech.

Distinguished visitors came to Brazil, among which: President Bush (March), with whom agreements were reached to reinforce the international ethanol market; Pope Benedict XVI (May), who attended the Conference of Latin American Bishops (CELAM) at Aparecida do Norte, where the first Brazilian-born saint was canonized – Frei Antônio de Sant'Anna Galvão.

2007 was also a year of renewal of rulers in several important countries for Brazil: in January, Rafael Correa assumed the Presidency of Ecuador; Daniel Ortega that of Nicaragua; in May, Nicolas Sarkozy was inaugurated as President of France; in June, Gordon Brown replaced Tony Blair as Prime Minister of the United Kingdom. In December, Cristina Kirchner took up the Presidency of Argentina, replacing her husband Nestor. In Venezuela, Hugo Chávez started his third presidential term.

Also at the beginning of the year the European Union completed its most controversial expansion, with the accession of Bulgaria and Romania.

The crisis dominated the annual Summit meeting of the G7/G8 in Germany. The exhaustion of the world governance model based on the tutelage by the great powers became evident. The Heiligendam Summit showed the need for a more interactive dialogue with the countries of the group known until then as the G5: Brazil, India, China, South Africa and Mexico.

High tension continued to prevail in the Middle East, with the increase in the internal dissensions among the Palestine factions; the fragile coexistence between Fatah and Hamas was broken. The latter had established itself *de facto* in the Gaza Strip. In Iraq, the United States started an escalation of actions ("surge") aiming at creating conditions for the withdrawal from the country of its forces already under pressure on

account of the quagmire in Afghanistan, with the continuing growth of Taliban forces and the permeability of the border with Pakistan, whose military government was facing growing opposition.

In Iran, the announcement that new uranium enrichment centrifuges had been put in operation reignited in Israel and in the countries of the Atlantic Alliance the fear that the Islamic regime of President Ahmadinejad could be close to developing a military nuclear capability. Concentrated international efforts were then intensified with a view to preventing, through positive and negative incentives, the military nuclearization of Iran. Iranian leaders, however, continued to insist on the peaceful nature of the country's nuclear program.

President Lula started his statement at the Sixty-Second Session of the General Assembly by congratulating Secretary-General Ban Ki-moon, who had assumed his post in January, as well as his initiative in promoting high level debates on the question of climate change, which had been identified as a special priority for European developed economies. The President insisted, however, on the traditional Brazilian posture: all countries comply with the commitments of the Kyoto Protocol in accordance with their differentiated responsibilities: "It is unacceptable that the cost of the irresponsibility of a privileged few be shouldered by the dispossessed of the Earth.

The President highlighted, at the same time, the important progress achieved by Brazil to lessen the effects of the climate change, by means of a drastic reduction of Amazon deforestation without jeopardizing the sustainable development of the inhabitants of the region. He formally proposed that as the host country for the 1992 Rio de Janeiro Conference on Development and Environment, Brazil be also chosen to host the Rio + 20 Conference in 2012. Still on environmental issues, the president availed himself of the opportunity to reinforce the positive image of Brazilian biofuels, particularly ethanol, presented as safe from the environmental, social and economic points of view and capable of providing "excellent opportunities for more than a hundred poor and developing countries in Latin America, Asia and especially in Africa".

As in previous years, the President emphasized in his statement the progress of the Brazilian social policies, particularly the fight against hunger and poverty and access to Médicines. He did not neglect to link the elimination of poverty to the establishment of new economic relations that avoid penalizing the poor countries and insisted on the conclusion of the Doha Round at the WTO, through the adoption of just and balanced norms for international trade and the elimination of agricultural protectionism.

In this context, the President highlighted the progress achieved under Brazilian inspiration in the process of South American integration, as well as the dialogue established with Arab, African and Asian countries.

As usual, the President gave special emphasis to the themes of the reform of the Security Council and of the restructuring of the international decision-making organs on financial matters, with which he concluded his statement: "The time has come to move from words to action".

LXII Regular Session of the General Assembly of the United Nations
2007

President Luiz Inácio Lula da Silva [*]

Mr. President,

I congratulate the Secretary-General on his assumption of such a high office within the international system. I welcome his decision to encourage high-level debate on the extremely grave issue of climate change. It is most appropriate that this discussion take place here at the United Nations.

Let us not delude ourselves. If the groundwork of global development is not rebuilt, the risks of unprecedented environmental and human catastrophe will grow. We must overcome the apparently pragmatic and sophisticated notion which is actually anachronistic, predatory and senseless – that profits and wealth can grow forever, at any cost. There are prices that humanity cannot afford to pay at the risk of destroying the material and spiritual foundations of our collective existence – at the risk of self-destruction. The preservation of life must prevail over mindless greed.

The world will not correct its irresponsible relationship with nature, however, until we change the way development relates to social justice. If we want to salvage our common heritage, a new and more balanced distribution of wealth is needed, both internationally and within each country. Social equity is our best weapon against the

[*] **Luiz Inácio Lula da Silva**, President of the Republic from 1/1/2003 to 12/31/2006 and from 1/1/2007 a 12/31/2010 (2nd term).

planet's degradation. Each one of us must do our part. It is unacceptable that the cost of the irresponsibility of a privileged few be shouldered by the dispossessed of the Earth.

The most highly industrialized countries can and must set the example. Full compliance with their commitments under the Kyoto Protocol is indispensable. That is not enough, however. We need to set more ambitious goals for 2012 onwards and we must take strong action to ensure universal accession to the Protocol. Developing countries must also help in combating climate change. We need clear national strategies to hold Governments accountable to their peoples.

Brazil will soon launch its own national plan to combat climate change. The Amazon forest is one of the most vulnerable areas to global warming, but the threats cover all continents. They range from greater desertification to the outright disappearance of territories or even of entire countries lost to rising sea levels. Brazil has undertaken major efforts to minimize the impact of climate change. Suffice it to say that, in recent years, we have halved the rate of deforestation in the Amazon region.

Results like that should come as no surprise.

Brazil will under no circumstance abdicate either its sovereignty or its responsibilities in the Amazon. Our recent achievements derive from an increasing presence of the Brazilian State in the region, fostering sustainable development with economic, social, educational and cultural benefits for its more than 20 million inhabitants.

I am convinced that our experience can enrich similar endeavors in other countries. In Nairobi, Brazil proposed the adoption of economic and financial incentives to reduce deforestation on a global scale. We must also increase South-South cooperation while promoting innovative modalities of joint action with developed countries. That is how we can materialize the principle of shared but differentiated responsibilities.

It is very important to adopt an integrated political approach to the environmental agenda as a whole. Brazil hosted the United Nations Conference on Environment and Development – the Earth Summit. We need to review what has been achieved since then, and set a new course of action. I therefore propose that we hold a new Conference, in 2012, the "Rio +20" Conference to be hosted by Brazil.

We will not overcome the terrible impacts of climate change until humanity changes its patterns of energy production and consumption. The world urgently needs to develop a new energy matrix in which bio-fuels will play a vital role. Bio-fuels significantly reduce greenhouse gas emissions. With its increased and more efficient use of ethanol, Brazil

has kept 644 million tons of carbon dioxide from being emitted into the atmosphere over the past 30 years.

Biofuels can be much more than a clean-energy alternative. Ethanol and biodiesel can open up excellent opportunities for over 100 poor and developing countries in Latin America, Asia and, especially, Africa. They can enhance energy autonomy, without costly investments. They can create jobs and income and promote family fanning. They can help balance trade deficits by reducing imports and generating surplus exportable crops.

Brazil's experience over three decades has shown that biofuel production does not affect food security. Sugarcane crops cover just 1 per cent of the country's arable land, and yields continue to rise. People do not go hungry around the world for lack of food, but rather for lack of income, which afflicts almost 1 billion men, women and children.

It is entirely possible to combine biofuels with environmental protection and food production. We will ensure that biofuel production complies with all "social and environmental guarantees. Our Government has decided to implement a complete agro-ecological zoning of the country in order to identify farmland best suited to producing biofuels. Brazilian biofuels will reach the world market with a seal of assurance for their social, labor and environmental quality.

In 2008, Brazil is set to host an international conference on biofuels that will lay the foundations for wide-ranging global cooperation. I hereby invite all countries to participate.

Sustainable development is not just an environmental issue; it is also a social challenge. We are making Brazil less unequal and more dynamic. The country is growing again, creating jobs and distributing income. This time, opportunities are being created for all. We are paying off a centuries-old social debt, while at the same time investing heavily in quality education, science and technology.

We have honored our commitment to "zero hunger" by sweeping away that scourge from the lives of over 45 million people. We achieved the first Millennium Development Goal 10 years ahead of schedule, cutting extreme poverty in our country by more than half. Fighting hunger and poverty should be the concern of all peoples. A global society held back by growing income disparities is simply not viable. There will be no lasting peace if we do not progressively reduce inequality.

In 2004, we launched the global Action against Hunger and Poverty. Early results are encouraging, particularly the creation of the International Drug Purchase Facility (UNITAID). UNITAID has already

achieved 45 per cent price cuts in drugs used against AIDS, malaria and tuberculosis for the poorest countries of Africa. The time has come for us to give it a new push. We cannot allow ideas that so mobilized our countries to fade because of bureaucratic inertia.

However, the final defeat of poverty demands more than international solidarity. It depends above all on new economic relations that no longer penalize poor countries. The Doha Round of the World Trade Organization should promote a true pact for development by adopting fair and balanced rules for international trade. Farm subsidies that make the rich richer and the poor poorer are no longer acceptable. We cannot accept agricultural protectionism that perpetuates dependency and underdevelopment. Brazil will spare no effort for a successful conclusion of those negotiations, which must, above all, benefit the poorest countries.

Building a new international order is no rhetorical turn of phrase; it is a matter of common sense. Brazil is proud of its contribution to South American integration, particularly through the Common Market of the South. We are working to bring together peoples and regions. We seek to enhance political dialogue and economic links with the Arab world, Africa and Asia, and we do so without sacrificing our traditional partners. Brazil has set up an innovative cooperation mechanism with India and South Africa. Together we are working on specific projects to help in various countries, including Haiti and Guinea-Bissau.

We all agree on the need for increased participation by developing countries in the major international decision-making bodies, in particular the Security Council. The time has come to move from words to action. We appreciate recent proposals by President Sarkozy to reform the Security Council, with the inclusion of developing nations. A review of decision-making processes within international financial institutions is also required.

The United Nations is our best tool to deal with today's international challenges. It is through multilateral diplomacy that we find the way to fostering peace and development. Brazil's role alongside other Latin America and Caribbean nations in the United Nations Stabilization Mission in Haiti highlights our efforts to strengthen multilateral institutions. In Haiti, we are showing that peace and stability are built with democracy and social development.

Walking into this building, representatives to the United Nations can admire a work of art that Brazil presented to the United Nations 50 years ago. I am referring to the murals that portray war and peace painted by a great Brazilian artist, Cândido Portinari. The suffering so expressively

portrayed in the mural depicting war brings to mind the United Nations crucial responsibility in containing the risk of armed conflict. The second mural reminds us that peace is much more than the absence of war. It evokes well-being, health and harmonious coexistence with nature. It calls for social justice, freedom and overcoming the scourges of hunger and poverty. It is not by mere chance that those who enter the building face the mural portraying war, while those who leave see the mural depicting peace. The artist's message is simple but powerful: transforming suffering into hope, and war into peace, is the essence of the United Nations mission. Brazil will continue to work to realize those high expectations.

New York, September 25, 2007.

2008

2008

The financial crisis outlined in 2007 struck the world economy in 2008 with particular strength. All the principal economies were forced to deal with the need to adopt expensive measures to stimulate economic activity and "salvage" financial and industrial companies from bankruptcies which – as was feared – could generate a recession even worse than that of 1929.

Brazil, however, continued to sail away in the crisis at relatively low cost. President Lula even stated confidently that what to the rest of the world looked like a tsunami, in Brazil was but a low wave! The confidence in the potential of Brazil was reinforced by new discoveries of oil reserves in the pre-salt layer. In April, Standard and Poor raised the sovereign rating of Brazil to the "investment degree". Fitch did the same in the following month.

These auspicious decisions permitted the maintenance of the economic and financial flow in Brazil amidst the turbulence that affected the international markets. The confidence in the prospects of the Brazilian economy was so high that a decision was formally taken to undertake the construction of the Angra-3 nuclear power plant, after obtaining the environmental license from IBAMA.

In September, the crisis in the markets reached its apex with the bankruptcy of the investment bank Lehman Brothers (the fourth largest in the United States) and the publication of unfavorable data on the financial health of Merril Lynch Bank and AIG insurance company.

AIG was considered too big to fail and was saved by a billion dollar loan from the American government. Bankruptcies spread to Europe: Ireland was the first country from the euro zone to enter into recession and was soon followed by others. Outside the European Union, Iceland went bankrupt on account of its financially weak economy. The United States had a negative growth in the third quarter of the year. International stock exchanges collapsed. In October, the Bovespa index registered its worse fall in ten years: 11,4 per cent in a single day. Stocks traded at Bovespa within five months lost 60 per cent of their value.

The Central Banks of the main economies of the world agreed to take coordinated measures to fight the credit crisis and offer help to banks. The European Union announced a package of nearly 200 billion euro (about 1,5 per cent of the GDP of the block) to stimulate the economy and recover the employment level. The Federal Reserve Board lowered the interest rate in the United States from 1 per cent to a margin between zero and 0,25 per cent. About 17.5 billion dollars were earmarked to help the automotive industry. Brazil took similar measures by reducing taxes and injecting resources in the economy, particularly in order to stimulate the automotive industry, strongly touched by the reduction of consumption.

Organized in the midst of the crisis and based on the experience of the extended G7/G8, the Financial G20 met in Washington in November. A declaration of principles and several proposals for the reform of financial markets were approved. It was the start of the change that would be brought to international decision-making circles, albeit not institutionalized at the level of the international organizations.

The year also witnessed important changes in governments: in February, Romano Prodi called early elections in Italy which resulted in the victory of a center-right coalition led by Silvio Berlusconi. Still in February, Fidel Castro announced his resignation and was replaced by his brother Raúl. In March, Dmitri Medvedev was elected President of Russia and named his predecessor and mentor, Vladimir Putin, as Prime Minister. In Spain, the Socialist government managed to stay in power, in spite of the crisis, in the elections that took place in March. In April, Fernando Lugo was elected President of Paraguay. And in November, on a program of renovation, Barack Obama won the presidential elections in the United States. His opponent at the primary election within the Democratic Party, Hillary Clinton, became Secretary of State. Obama pledged to withdraw the American combat troops from Iraq by 2010.

In Europe, under strong pressure from the main NATO powers, the independence of Kosovo, a Serbian province with a majority population

of Albanian origin, was declared. In apparent retaliation, Russia soon entered into open conflict with Georgia by supporting the claims of two separatist provinces.

Pakistan experienced an important political transformation with the resignation of General Pervez Musharraf and the election of Azif Ali Ardari, widow of Benazir Butho (who had been killed in an attack in December 2007). Pakistan then slid into a period of great instability, aggravated by the growing boldness of Taliban groups in the border region with Afghanistan. In South Africa, President Thabo Mbeki was driven to resign, opening the way for the election of Jacob Zuma in the next year.

In Israel, corruption charges led to the fall of the government headed by Ehud Olmert and its replacement, in 2009, by a coalition of rightist parties, under the direction of Benjamin Netanyahu. The year closed with an ill-planned and poorly conducted military offensive against Hamas in the Gaza Strip, which elicited strong international condemnation against the Hebrew state.

In South America a serious crisis involving Colombia, Ecuador and Venezuela broke out in March when Colombian armed forces, claiming the presence of FARC guerrilla bases in the region of the border, invaded the Ecuadorian territory and murdered a guerrilla chief.

Soon in May, however, with the creation of UNASUL, under Brazilian inspiration, an effective forum for the consideration of the current integration processes was established, which also could deal with eventual crises involving the countries of the region.

In 2008 President Lula made two statements at the United Nations. The first one was delivered in May, on the occasion of the special meeting of the Economic and Social Council (ECOSOC) to deal with the world food crisis. The President availed himself of the opportunity to report on the results of the program against hunger and poverty put into practice by his government. He used strong wards to dramatize the "humanitarian disaster" brought about by the crisis and by the rise in the cost of food caused by the increase of oil, fertilizers, energy and transportation prices. He linked the food problems to structural distortions in the international commerce of agricultural products. The President blamed the protectionism by industrialized countries and urged once again the "balanced conclusion" of the Doha Round through the application of the multilateral WTO rules to agricultural products. He also mentioned the need to harmonize energy security and environmental protection and did not refrain from

pointing out the excellent results achieved by Brazil in the use of sugar cane for ethanol production. He announced the convening by Brazil in the following year of a conference on biofuels in São Paulo.

The second presidential statement was delivered, as usual, at the opening of the general debate at the Sixth-Third Session of the General Assembly. The speech took a strongly critical tone about international structures, singled out as having caused the crisis which had already reached Brazil and threatened to push the world toward unprecedented recession: "Because of the euphoria of speculators, entire peoples are suffering anguish in the wake of successive financial disasters that threaten the world's economy". Calling for the adoption of mechanisms of prevention and control, as well as full transparency of financial activities, the President criticized the supranational economic organizations which lacked instruments to curb the anarchy of speculation: "We must rebuild them on entirely new foundations".

Coming back to the main themes of his past statements, the President once again linked together the global food crisis, the impasse in the WTO trade negotiations ("We are still pushing for an agreement to reduce scandalous farm subsidies in rich countries") and the environmental degradation. The responsibility for that state of affairs falls on the industrialized countries of the North: "A supposedly 'populist nationalism', which some forces seek to identify and criticize in the South, is being unabashedly promoted in the developed countries"…"Gradually, countries are moving beyond old conformist alignments with traditional centers." Highlighting the initiatives already taken and in course among Southern countries (IBAS, G20, Summits South America-Africa and South America-Arab countries, BRICS), as well as the creation of UNASUR, first instrument that brought together all South American countries, the President reaffirmed one of the most recurring points in his international analysis: "A new political, economic and trade geography is being built in today's world". He emphasized the active and innovative role played by Brazilian diplomacy in the international scene by promoting the First Latin America-Caribbean Summit at Salvador, Bahia (December 2008) and showing solidarity with the poorest countries, particularly in Africa and also Haiti.

The President again called for the reform of the Security Council: "Its distorted form of representation stands between us and the multilateral world to which we aspire". He did not refrain from stressing the related issues of energy security and global warming, which should be resolved on the basis of common but differentiated responsibilities. Biofuels, especially

ethanol from sugar cane, as well as biodiesel, are the most adequate option to reduce dependence on fossil fuels, he emphasized, expressing the wish to deepen the debate of such questions with the international community at the World Conference on Biofuels convened by Brazil on the month of November 2008 in São Paulo.

The President also mentioned Brazil's leadership in having launched four years before the initiative against hunger and poverty, of which UNITAID, the Central Médicine Purchasing Agency, was the first result. Recalling the sixtieth anniversary of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights, to be celebrated in December 2008, President Lula concluded his speech by calling attention to the current changes in Brazil since 2003, when he started his first term: "Our Government and society have taken decisive steps to transform the lives of Brazilians". Quoting expressive data, the President asserted that the improvements taking place in Brazil had been achieved "in an environment of strong growth, economic stability, reduce external vulnerability and, above all, a stronger democracy". Recalling Josué de Castro, who pioneered the reflection about the problem of hunger in the world, he said: "I am proud to state that Brazil is overcoming hunger and poverty. (…) We are much greater than the crises that threaten us."

Message from President Luiz Inácio Lula da Silva*on the occasion of the special meeting of the United Nations Economic and Social Council on the World Food Crisis 2008

Mr. President,

I wish to greet Ambassador Mérorès, President of ECOSOC and Permanent Representative of Haiti, for his initiative in convening this meeting. I also salute the presence of Secretary-General Ban Ki-moon and other high officials and delegates from the Member States of the United Nations.

Since the first day of my mandate as President of Brazil I have devoted myself to the fight against hunger and poverty in Brazil and in the world. Almost four years ago, in this ECOSOC Chamber, at a meeting with dozens of world leaders, we launched the International Action Against Hunger and Poverty. With this mobilization we achieved important progress, particularly in the field of health. We are fully aware, however, that there is still much to be done. The recent increases in food prices shape this challenge dramatically. Hungry men and women are participating in demonstrations worldwide, in some cases jeopardizing international stability. We are facing the real threat of a huge humanitarian disaster that touches the poorest among us, those who proportionally spend more to feed themselves. The prospect of retrogression in the fight against hunger and malnutrition make the Millennium targets seem even farther away. Action is needed in different fronts, including emergency

* **Luiz Inácio Lula da Silva**, President of the Republic from 1/1/2003 to 12/31/2006 and from 1/1/2007 a 12/31/2010 (2nd term).

measures to contain the most adverse effects of the crisis. Brazil is doing its part in Haiti, by sending food assistance and support to the recovery of the local agriculture. We must urgently make an in-depth reflection on the problem in order to better confront it. This is complex question that needs objective and dispassionate analysis, avoiding hasty and partial conclusions.

Secretary-General Ban Ki-moon rightly observed last month, at UNCTAD, that there are multiple causes for the crisis. Higher prices of oil and consequently, of fertilizers, energy and transportation had all had a significant impact on food production costs. Seasonal price fluctuations, aggravated by crop failures due to climate, along with realignment of exchange rates and financial speculation on commodities, have played a role as well. However, a new and auspicious fact has emerged behind this worrisome panorama of pressure on food prices: a growing number of persons are eating more and better in many developing countries. The increasing inclusion of people in the numbers of those who can eat better show, however, that existing international structures and current practices in the international scenario were not designed to incorporate these new consumers smoothly. Food production and distribution must be improved, but above all, conditions must be created for poor countries to produce their own food.

Hunger is spreading throughout poorer countries that suffer a double vulnerability: they can neither afford to import food at ever-increasing prices nor produce it locally in sufficient quantities to feed their own populations. How can we explain that regions particularly favorable for agriculture have not invested in the production of food to ensure at least the subsistence of its own people? The answer can be found essentially in the existing distortions in the international trade of agricultural products, especially the protectionism carried out for decades, not to mention centuries, by the industrialized countries. Farm subsidies in rich countries make it impossible for poor farmers to compete in international markets, leading to dependency on imported food and foreign aid. Agricultural subsidies reward inefficiency, perpetuate the privileges of a few and aggravate the hunger of many. In the Doha Round, Brazil favors an agreement that placed agricultural products under the World Trade Organization (WTO) once and for all. Enforcing fair rules in international agricultural trade is fundamental, not only to eradicate hunger but to reconcile environmental protection with energy security. It is necessary to expose the campaigns driven by trade protectionism and oil industry interests, aiming at the demonization of the production of biofuels.

Biofuels have been blamed both for the increases in food prices and for global warming, this dismissing the successful experience of Brazil with ethanol base on sugar cane. In 30 years we have achieved drastic cuts in CO^2 emissions and reduced demand for fossil energy, to the point of virtual self-sufficiency in energy with no adverse effect on food production. Much to the contrary. In this period, Brazilian agricultural production increased exponentially, thanks to gains in productivity, including sugar cane. The fight against hunger and poverty should start by awakening production possibilities in the most vulnerable countries. Brazil is doing its part. We have made massive investments in agricultural research and improvement. We are making our experience and knowledge available to other developing countries. One example is the opening of an office of the Brazilian Agricultural and Cattle-raising Corporation (EMBRAPA) in Ghana in 2007. Biofuels can contribute to reduce vulnerability, especially in the field of energy, not to mention that the production of biofuels means not only renewable, but also cleaner and cheaper energy. It also creates income and jobs, particularly in the countryside, helping sustain a robust agriculture. It is hard to understand why ethanol imports are taxed while oil is exempted from import duties, at a time when the international community is discussing alternatives to fossil fuels. Brazil does not intend to impose its model on others. The potential for biofuels should be assessed according to each country's reality. If they are wisely adopted, biofuels can help rescue many countries from food and energy insecurity.

It is irresponsible, however, to preclude that strategic option for countries that have neither oil nor food, and do not possess the means to buy them. Brazil does not fear that debate. Rather the opposite is true. I am inviting government high officials, scientists and representatives of civil society from all interested countries to participate in the International Biofuels Conference this coming November, in São Paulo. A through and dispassionate examination of all aspects of this issue will be a valuable contribution to build a truly world partnership for sustainable development. Let us strive to put a dignified and prosperous life at everyone's reach at the same time as we ensure energy security and preserve the planet for future generations. In this task, Mr. President, the role of the United Nations, and more specifically that of ECOSOC is essential. I wish you success in your endeavors.

New York, May 20, 2008.

LXIII Regular Session of the General Assembly of the United Nations 2008

President Luiz Inácio Lula da Silva [*]

Mr. President,

It is my great pleasure to greet my dear friend Mr. Miguel d'Escoto Brockmann, President of the General Assembly. I wish you much success in your mission.

The present session of the General Assembly is being held at a particularly serious time. An often predicted economic and financial crisis is now today's harsh reality. Because of the euphoria of speculators, entire peoples are suffering anguish in the wake of successive financial disasters that threaten the world's economy. Indispensable interventions by State authorities have defied market fundamentalists and shown that this is a time for political decisions. Only decisive action by Governments - particularly those of countries at the epicenter of the crisis - will be able to rein in the disorder that has spread through the world's financial sector, with perverse effects on the daily lives of millions of people. The lack of rules favors adventurers and opportunists, to the detriment of real companies and workers.

The great Brazilian economist Celso Furtado said that we must not always allow speculators' profits to be privatized while their losses are invariably socialized. We must not allow the burden of the boundless

[*] **Luiz Inácio Lula da Silva**, President of the Republic from 1/1/2003 to 12/31/2006 and from 1/1/2007 a 12/31/2010 (2nd term).

greed of a few to be shouldered by all. The economy is too serious a matter to be left in the hands of speculators. Ethics must also apply to the economy.

A crisis of such magnitude will not be overcome through palliative measures. Mechanisms for both prevention and control are needed to ensure full transparency for international finance. Today's supranational economic institutions have neither the authority nor the workable instruments that they need to control the anarchy of speculation. We must rebuild them on entirely new foundations.

The global nature of this crisis means that the solutions we adopt must also be global and must be decided upon in legitimate and trusted multilateral forums, without coercion. The United Nations, as the world's largest multilateral arena, must call for a vigorous response to the weighty threats that we all face.

Yet there are other, equally serious matters facing the world today. One of them is the food crisis, which afflicts more than a billion human beings. The energy crisis is also growing worse every day, as will the risks to world trade if we fail to achieve an agreement at the Doha Round; another is the unrestrained degradation of the environment, which lies behind so many natural calamities whose victims are overwhelmingly the poor.

The fall of the Berlin Wall was expected to open up possibilities for building a world of peace, free from the stigmas of the cold war. However, it is sad to see other walls going up so quickly.

Many of those who preach the free circulation of commodities and capital continue to fight the free movement of men and women, using nationalistic and even racist arguments that evoke unpleasant memories and fears of times that we thought were behind us.

A supposedly "populist nationalism", which some forces seek to identify and criticize in the South, is being unabashedly promoted in the developed countries. The financial, food, energy, environmental and migration crises, to say nothing of threats to peace in several regions of the world, reveal that the multilateral system must be overhauled to meet the challenges of the twenty-first century.

Gradually, countries are moving beyond old conformist alignments with traditional centres. That new attitude, however, does not imply a confrontational stance. Simply by using direct dialogue without intermediation by major powers, developing countries have stepped into new roles in designing a multipolar world, with examples such as India, Brazil and South Africa (IBSA), the G20, the summits between South

America and Africa and between South America and the Arab countries and the BRIC countries – Brazil, Russian Federation, India and China.

A new political, economic and trade geography is being built in today's world. While navigators in the past would look to the North Star, today we are trying to find our way by looking at multiple dimensions of our planet. Now we often find our North Star in the South. On my continent, the Union of South American Nations (UNASUR) was created last May, as the first treaty – after 200 years of independence – that brings together all South American countries. This new political union will coordinate the region's countries in terms of infrastructure, energy, social policies, complementary production mechanisms, finance and defense.

Meeting in Santiago, Chile, just over a week ago, the Presidents of South America demonstrated UNASUR's ability to respond quickly and effectively to complex situations, such as the one in our sister nation, Bolivia. We supported its legitimately-elected Government, its democratic institutions and its territorial integrity and we issued a call for dialogue as a path to peace and prosperity for the people of Bolivia.

Next December, in the state of Bahia, Brazil will host the first summit of all of the countries of Latin America and the Caribbean on integration and development. This will be a high-level meeting under no umbrella, based on Latin America's and the Caribbean's own perspectives. All these efforts in the multilateral sphere are complemented by my country's solidarity initiatives with poorer nations, particularly in Africa.

I also wish to emphasize our commitment to Haiti, where we command troops of the United Nations Stabilization Mission in Haiti and are helping to restore peace. I reiterate my appeal for the solidarity of developed countries with Haiti, since implementation has fallen far short of the many promises.

The strength of values must prevail over the value of strength. Only legitimate and effective instruments can assure collective security. The United Nations has spent 15 years discussing the reform of its Security Council. Today's structure has been frozen for six decades and does not match the challenges of today's world. Its distorted form of representation stands between us and the multilateral world to which we aspire. Therefore, I am much encouraged by the General Assembly's decision to launch negotiations in the near future on the reform of the Security Council.

It is multilateralism that must also guide us toward solutions to the complex problems of global warming based on the principle of common but differentiated responsibilities. Brazil has not shirked its

responsibilities. Our energy matrix is increasingly clean. Today's food and energy crises are deeply intertwined. The inflation of food prices is affected not only by climatic factors and speculation in agricultural commodities it is also driven by rising oil prices which affect the prices of fertilizers and transportation. Attempts to tie high food prices to the distribution of biofuels do not stand up to an objective analysis of reality.

Brazil's experience demonstrates – and this could be the case for countries similar to ours – that sugar-cane ethanol and biodiesel production reduce our dependency on fossil fuels, create jobs, regenerate degraded land and are fully compatible with expanding food production. We wish to intensify all aspects of that discussion at the world conference on energy and biofuels which we will be holding in November 2008, in the city of Sao Paulo.

My obsession with the hunger problem explains my ongoing efforts, along with other world leaders, to reach a positive conclusion to the Doha Round. We are still pushing for an agreement to reduce scandalous farm subsidies in rich countries. A successful Doha Round will have a very positive impact on food production, particularly in developing and poor countries.

Four years ago, along with several world leaders, I launched the Action Against Hunger and Poverty here in New York. Our proposal, then and now, is to adopt innovative funding mechanisms. The International Drug Purchase Facility is one early result of that initiative, helping to fight AIDS, tuberculosis and malaria in several African countries. But it is not enough. We still have a long way to go if we want humanity to actually achieve the Millennium Development Goals.

In December 2008, we will commemorate the sixtieth anniversary of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights, paying a tribute that will go far beyond mere formalities. That document expresses inalienable commitments that challenge us all. As Governments, we must do more than support the Declaration with rhetoric. We are called upon to fight for the values proclaimed six decades ago and to make them a reality in each country and around the world.

Today's Brazil is very different from what it was in 2003, when I became President of my country and stood for the first time before the General Assembly. Our Government and society have taken decisive steps to transform the lives of Brazilians, creating nearly 10 million formal jobs, distributing income and wealth, improving public services, lifting 9 million people out of extreme poverty, and bringing another 20 million into the middle class. All this has occurred in an environment of strong

growth, economic stability, reduce external vulnerability and, above all, a stronger democracy with the intense participation of our people.

In the year when we commemorate the one-hundredth birthday of the great Brazilian Josué de Castro – the first Director-General of the Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations and a pioneer in the studies concerning the problem of hunger in the world – it is worthwhile to reread his warning: "It is no longer possible to sit back and let a region go hungry without the entire world suffering the consequences."

I am proud to state that Brazil is overcoming hunger and poverty. I reiterate the optimism that I expressed here five years ago. We are much greater than the crises that threaten us. We have the heart, the right-mindedness and the will to overcome any adversity. More than ever, that is the spirit of Brazilians.

New York, September 23, 2008.

2009

2009

The effects of the world crisis and political movements with a view to the 2010 presidential elections dominated developments in Brazil during the whole of 2009. PMDB captured the Presidencies of the House and the Senate. Brazilian economy started to emit signs that it had been truly affected by the crisis. The year opened with growing rates of unemployment, especially in industrial activity. As predicted, the recession in Brazil did not last long. Already at the close of the second quarter rates climbed back to the positive side and the São Paulo stock exchange index gradually recovered.

Recovery in the economies of developed countries, however, seemed slow and expensive, making up a gloomy background for international developments – as well as the internal conjuncture in many countries – in 2009. In parallel, facing the double threat of the continuation and deepening of the conflict in Afghanistan and the stubborn fragility of the situation in Iraq, the United States and the powers militarily involved in the operations had difficulty to find military and political solutions in both theaters.

After his inauguration in January, Barack Obama had to face immediately and simultaneously the need to control the crisis that threatened the stability of the American economy and the urgency in finding a way out of the protracted conflicts in Iraq and Afghanistan. Started by the Bush administration, both conflicts hindered the ability of

the new Democrat government to make the transformations promised in its campaign.

In response to the crisis, the United States, soon followed by the European Union, set in motion very costly programs of economic stimulus. Unemployment had reached unprecedented heights in comparison with the previous four decades and stock exchanges showed very low indexes. Ireland entered formally into a recession, followed by Spain. Meeting in London with full participation by emerging countries, the Financial G20 approved global plans to stimulate the world economy. China was minimally affected by the crisis and overcame Germany to become the third world power in terms of Gross Domestic Product, behind only the United States and Japan.

As if the wars in Iraq and Afghanistan were not enough, the continuing tension in the Middle East, the deterioration of the situation in Pakistan and the global crisis, a marked worsening of the relationship between the Atlantic alliance and Iran also developed throughout 2009, as a result of the twin effect of the imminent start of the operation of new uranium enrichment plants – which potentially would enable the country to produce nuclear artifacts – and of the protests against the electoral results that brought President Ahmadinejad back to power. In November, the Iranian President, during an official visit to Brasília, proposed that Brazil should act as a mediator between his country and the Western powers.

In South America, President Hugo Chávez's administration obtained the legal tools to ensure his indefinite permanence in power. In February, a popular referendum approved the Constitutional amendment that allowed the unlimited election of the President and State Governors in Venezuela. In October, Colombia and the United States signed an agreement that permitted the use of Colombian military bases by American armed forces, allegedly to combat drug trafficking. That decision reopened tensions, especially between Colombia, Venezuela and Ecuador.

In June, the Honduran military deposed the Constitutional President, Manuel Zelaya, opening a protracted crisis within hemispheric relations. Brazilian diplomacy became more directly involved in September, when the deposed President returned to his country and took refuge in the Embassy of Brazil in Tegucigalpa. Elected in November under questionable circumstances, President Porfirio Lobo, with support from the United States, devoted himself without success to reintegrate Honduras into the OAS. Zelaya left the Brazilian Embassy after Lobos' election.

At the end of the year Evo Morales was reelected as President of Bolivia and José Mujica became President of Uruguay.

The world economic and financial crisis continued to dominate the substance of President Lula's statement at the 2009 General Assembly. The Presidential speech centered on three themes, enunciated right at the start of the text: "Three perils that haunt our planet are the ongoing economic crisis, the lack of stable, democratic world governance and the threat posed by climate change to all of our lives". "More than a crisis of big banks, this is a crisis of big dogmas … A senseless way of thinking and acting which dominated the world for decades has proven itself bankrupt (…) the absurd doctrine that markets could regulate themselves (…) the thesis of absolute freedom for financial capital (…) an iniquitous defense of a minimal (…) State (…) the demonization of social policies(…) most of the sovereignty of peoples and nations (…) had been confiscated by autonomous networks of wealth and power".

After these harsh words at the outset, the President blamed the developed countries – "and the multilateral agencies that they run" – for their inability to foresee the catastrophe that was coming and even less to prevent it. The crisis had spread all over the world and by that time in the year seemed to have been contained, generating "an irresponsible acquiescence in certain sectors". In fact, however, the President warned, in what has been perhaps his most bruising speech at the Assembly, "most of the underlying problems have been ignored", among which the regulation of financial markets, the reform of the IMF and the World Bank, the Doha Round, protectionism and the fight against fiscal havens.

Brazil, he said proudly, did not stand idly by: "one of the last countries to be hit by the crisis, is now one of the first to emerge from it. Mentioning the areas in which the action of the government had been successful, the President expressed satisfaction for the fact that the Brazilian economy had recovered its vigor, foreshadowing a promising 2010.

He went on saying that we should not believe that we will be able to resolve our problems by ourselves, solely within the national space: "We must therefore establish once again the world economic order" by flooding the world economy with substantive credit, financial regulation, generalization of anti-cyclic policies, ending protectionism, combating fiscal havens and reforming multilateral financial organizations and the Security Council of the United Nations "renewed and open to new permanent members".

Next, he proposed that the multi-polar and multilateral world should avail itself of successful regional experiences in order to enable the United Nations to deal effectively with the conflicts in the Middle East, "assuring the coexistence of a Palestinian State with the State of Israel"; and with terrorism "without stigmatizing ethnic groups and religions, instead dealing with underlying causes and promoting dialogue among civilizations"; an international organization that helps Haiti and be committed to the "African Renaissance", that is able to go forward on the path of disarmament and non-proliferation and adopt effective policies of preservation and widening of human rights, as well as conserving the environment.

Affirming that he did not believe in voluntarism, the President called for more political will to face the great questions that "conspire against peace, development and democracy". In this context, he mentioned specifically the embargo against Cuba and the overthrowing of President Zelaya in Honduras, who a few days before had been sheltered at the Brazilian Embassy in Tegucigalpa: "The international community demands that Mr. Zelaya immediately return to the presidency of his country, and it must be alert to ensure the inviolability of Brazil's diplomatic mission". The President also devoted an important part of his statement to the question of climate change. The Assembly was meeting on the eve of the Copenhagen meeting from which an agreement able to replace the Kyoto Protocol was expected. Copenhagen would fail. Brazil, however, announced its willingness to do its part and the President gave an account of the objectives achieved in the country with the "Climate Change Plan". He also enunciated, in this context, the basic principle behind the policy of Brazil: the rich countries must assume their part in the solution of the problems related to climate change: "They cannot burden developing and poor countries with tasks that are theirs alone". He praised once again the advantages of the energy mix in Brazil, particularly the program of biofuels based on the environmentally responsible exploitation of sugar cane with a social concern.

To conclude his presentation, the President adopted a peremptory tone: it is necessary "to build a new international order that is sustainable, multilateral and less asymmetric, free of hegemonies and ruled by democratic institutions. Such a new world is a political and moral imperative. We cannot just shovel away the rubble of failure; we must be midwives to the future. That is the only way to make amends for so much injustice and to prevent new collective tragedies".

LXIV Regular Session of the General Assembly of the United Nations
2009

President Luiz Inácio Lula da Silva [*]

Mr. President,

The General Assembly has been and must continue to be the great forum for general debate concerning humankind's major problems.

I wish to discuss three crucial issues which I believe to be interconnected. Three perils that haunt our planet are the ongoing economic crisis, the lack of stable, democratic world governance and the threat posed by climate change to all of our lives.

Exactly one year ago, at the outset of the economic crisis that overtook the world economy, I said from this rostrum that history would never forgive us for the serious blunder of dealing only with the impact of the crisis rather than its causes, More than a crisis of big banks, this is a crisis of big dogmas. An economic, political and social outlook held to be unquestionable has simply fallen apart. A senseless way of thinking and acting which dominated the world for decades has proven itself bankrupt.

I refer to the absurd doctrine that markets could regulate themselves with no need for so-called intrusive State intervention. And I refer to the thesis of absolute freedom for financial capital, with no rules or transparency, beyond the control of people and institutions. It was an iniquitous defense of a minimal, crippled, weakened state, unable to promote development or to fight poverty and inequities.

[*] **Luiz Inácio Lula da Silva**, President of the Republic from 1/1/2003 to 12/31/2006 and from 1/1/2007 a 12/31/2010 (2nd term).

It included the demonization of social policies, an obsession with precarious labor relations and an irresponsible commoditization of public services. The real cause of the crises is that most of the sovereignty of peoples and nations and their democratic governments had been confiscated by autonomous networks of wealth and power.

I said then that the time had come for political decisions. I said that leaders, rather than arrogant technocrats must take responsibility for bringing worldwide disorder under control. Controlling the crisis and changing the course of the world's economy could not be left to the usual few.

Developed countries and the multilateral agencies that they run had been unable to foresee the approaching catastrophe, much less prevent it. The impact of the crisis spread around the world, striking, above all, countries that for years, and at great sacrifice, had been rebuilding their economies.

It is not fair that the price of runaway speculation be paid by those who had nothing to do with it, by workers and by poor or developing countries. Twelve months later, we can see some progress, but many doubts still persist. No one is yet clearly willing to confront serious distortions of the global economy in the multilateral arena.

The fact that we avoided a total collapse of the system has apparently given rise to an irresponsible acquiescence in certain sectors. Most of the underlying problems have been ignored. There is enormous resistance to the adoption of effective mechanisms to regulate financial markets.

Rich countries are putting off reform at multilateral agencies such as the International Monetary Fund (IMF) and the World Bank. We simply cannot understand the paralysis of the Doha Round, whose conclusion will, above all, benefit the poorest countries of our world. There are also worrisome signs of return to protectionist practices, while little has been done to fight tax havens.

Many countries, however, have not sat waiting.

Brazil, fortunately one of the last countries to be hit by the crisis, is now one of the first to emerge from it. There is no magic in what we did. We simply kept our financial system from being contaminated by the virus of speculation. We had already cut back our external vulnerability as we turned from debtors into international creditors. Along with other countries, we decided to contribute resources for the IMF to lend money to the poorest countries, free of the unacceptable conditions imposed in the past.

Above all, however, both before and after the crisis broke out, we implemented countercyclical policies. We intensified our social programs, particularly income-transfer programs. We raised wages above inflation rates. We used fiscal measures to stimulate consumption and keep the economy moving.

We have now emerged from our brief recession.

Our economy has regained its impetus and shows promise for 2010. Foreign trade is recovering vitality, the labor market is doing amazingly well and macroeconomic equilibrium has been preserved, at no cost to the victories of our people's movements. What Brazil and other countries have shown is that, at times of crisis, we must still carry out bold social and development programs.

Yet I hold no illusions that we might solve our problems alone, within our own borders. Because the global economy is interdependent, we are all obliged to intervene across national borders and must therefore establish once again the world economic order.

At meetings of the Group of 20 and many other meetings I have held with world leaders, I have insisted on the need to irrigate the world economy with a significant volume of credit. I have defended the regulation of financial markets, the widespread adoption of countercyclical policies, the end of protectionism and the fight against tax havens.

With the same determination, my country has proposed a true reform of the multilateral financial institutions. Poor and developing countries must increase their share of control in the IMF and the World Bank. Otherwise, there can be no real change, and the peril of new and greater crises will be inevitable. Only more representative and democratic international agencies will be able to deal with complex problems such as reorganizing the international monetary system.

Sixty-five years on, the world can no longer be run by the same rules and values that prevailed at the Bretton Woods Conference. Likewise, the United Nations and its Security Council can no longer be run under the same structures imposed after the Second World War. We are in a period of transition in international relations. We are moving towards a multilateral world. However, it is also a multipolar world, based on experiences in regional integration such as South America's experience in creating the Union of South American Nations.

This multipolar world will not conflict with the United Nations. On the contrary, it could be an invigorating factor for the United Nations. It would create the platform for a United Nations with the political and moral authority to solve the conflicts in the Middle East, assuring

the coexistence of a Palestinian State with the State of Israel; a United Nations that confronts terrorism without stigmatizing ethnic groups and religions, instead dealing with underlying causes and promoting dialogue among civilizations; a United Nations that can truly help countries such as Haiti that are trying to rebuild their economies and mend their social fabric after achieving political stability; a United Nations committed to the African renaissance that we are now seeing; a United Nations able to implement effective policies that preserve and expand human rights; a United Nations that can make real progress towards disarmament in true balance with non-proliferation; a United Nations that can timely lead in initiatives to protect the planet's environment; a United Nations that can use its Economic and Social Council to forge decisions on confronting the economic crisis; and a United Nations that is representative enough to address threats to world peace through a reformed Security Council that is renewed and open to new permanent members.

We are not wishful thinkers. Yet it takes political will to confront and overcome situations that conspire against peace, development and democracy. Unless political will is present, throwbacks such as the embargo against Cuba will persist.

Unless there is political will, we will see more coups such as the one that toppled the constitutional President of Honduras, José Manuel Zelaya, who has been granted refuge in Brazil's embassy in Tegucigalpa since Monday. The international community demands that Mr. Zelaya immediately return to the presidency of his country, and it must be alert to ensure the inviolability of Brazil's diplomatic mission in the capital of Honduras.

Finally, unless political will prevails, threats to the world such as climate change will continue to grow. All countries must take action to turn back global warming. We are dismayed by the reluctance of developed countries to shoulder their share of the burden when it comes to fighting climate change. They cannot burden developing and poor countries with tasks that are theirs alone.

Brazil is doing its part. We will arrive in Copenhagen with precise alternatives and commitments. We have approved a national climate change plan that includes an 80 per cent cut in deforestation of the Amazon by 2020. We will reduce carbon dioxide emissions by 4.8 billion tons – more than the sum total of all the commitments of developed countries. In 2009, we can already boast the lowest deforestation rate in 20 years.

Brazil's energy blend is in one of the cleanest in the world. Forty-five per cent of the energy that my country consumes is renewable. In

the rest of the world, only 12 per cent is renewable, while no country in the Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development has a rate higher than 5 per cent. Eighty per cent of our electric power also comes from renewable sources.

All the gasoline sold for our passenger cars has 25 per cent ethanol blended into it. More than 80 per cent of the cars produced in our country have flexible fuel engines that enable them to use any blend of gasoline and/or alcohol. Brazil's ethanol and other biofuels are produced in ever-improving conditions under the ecological zoning plan that we have just sent to OUT National Congress. We have banned sugar cane plantations and alcohol plants in areas with native vegetation. That decision applies to the entire Amazon region as well as to other major biomes. Sugar cane production covers no more than 2 per cent of our tillable land. Unlike other biofuels, it does not affect food security, much less compromise the environment. Companies, farm workers and the Government have signed an important commitment to ensure decent working conditions on Brazil's sugar cane plantations.

All those concerns are part of the energy policies of a country that is self-sufficient in oil and has just found major reserves that will put us in the forefront of fossil fuel production. Even so, Brazil will not relinquish its environmental agenda and simply turn into an oil giant. We plan to consolidate our role as a world Power in green energy. Meanwhile, developed countries must set emission-reduction goals that go far beyond those tabled to date, which represent a mere fraction of the reductions recommended by the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change. We are also deeply concerned that the funding announced to date for technological innovations needed to protect the environment in developing countries is totally insufficient.

The solutions to those and other impasses will arise only if the perils of climate change are confronted with the understanding that we share common but differentiated responsibilities.

The issues at the core of our concerns – the financial crisis, new global governance and climate change – have one strong common denominator: the need to build a new international order that is sustainable, multilateral and less asymmetric, free of hegemonies and ruled by democratic institutions. Such a new world is a political and moral imperative. We cannot just shovel away the rubble of failure; we must be midwives to the future. That is the only way to make amends for so much injustice and to prevent new collective tragedies.

New York, September 23, 2009.

2010

2010

Minister Celso Amorim was tasked with delivering the last statement of the Lula administration at the Fifty-Fifth Session of the General Assembly, which started a few days before the first round of the presidential elections. In November, at the second round, Ms. Dilma Rousseff was elected President of the Republic.

The volatility of markets continued to create uncertainties among developed countries. Foreign exchange rate fluctuations also caused significant troubles in commercial and investment operations. Several European countries, especially Greece, Spain, Portugal and Ireland experienced serious problems of fiscal adjustment, budget cuts and other measures to contain spending which generated repeated manifestations of popular repudiation. In the United States, the impression of an unfinished economic recovery prevailed: the recession had been halted by the return of positive growth rates, but high unemployment levels persisted. At the close of the year, China, which had been raised to the level of second largest economy in the world, still kept its currency, the *renminbi*, below the value considered adequate in the light of the economic and financial situation of the country. The dollar, for its part, experienced strong depreciation, slipping to quite low levels against the main currencies of reference, such as the euro. In Brazil, the increase in the value of the real due to the influx of foreign money to the vigorous emerging Brazilian economy started in the second semester to create more significant problems to the country's balance of payments by causing a marked acceleration in imports and

expenditures in foreign travel. At the G20 meeting to be held in Korea more effective measures of exchange coordination among the main economies of the world were expected. Such hopes, however, did not materialize. The inability of the large market economies to take appropriate and timely measures was one of the causes of the crisis whose effects would be widely felt in 2011.

The year 2010 began under the impact of a natural catastrophe of extremely serious consequences for Haiti. On January 12, a highly strong earthquake shook a large area around the capital Port-au-Prince. The destruction was unprecedented. Intense international action was mobilized. Is its capacity as commander of the United Nations Peace Force, Brazil played a leadership role in the assistance to victims and reconstruction of the country. In the earthquake, Dr. Zilda Arns, a great Brazilian catholic leader who had founded *Pastoral da Criança*, lost her life. The Haitian disaster was followed by an equally devastating one in Chile. The earthquake happened right at the time of the transition between the Bachelet and Piñera presidencies and had serious consequences for the Chilean economy, which was regaining its growing pattern amid the political changes resulting from the end of the several years of government by the *Concertación*. Further on, Chile would also be struck by a tragedy caused by an explosion in a mine, in which about thirty miners were trapped for a long time over one kilometer deep down.

Not less devastating remained the consequences of the conflicts in Iraq, Afghanistan and the Middle East. Attacks against foreign forces operation in Afghanistan and Iraq occurred during the whole year, making clear on the one hand the growing vulnerability of Pakistan to the action of the Talibans and, on the other, the efforts of the fronts led by the United States in Iraq. In August, following his promise during the electoral campaign, President Barack Obama ordered the withdrawal of all American combat forces in the country, leaving behind only support and training units for Iraqi forces. In parallel, military actions against the Taliban were intensified as the protracted war effort in Afghanistan continued to give concrete signals of exhaustion in the face of the combined effect of Taliban resistance and the inconsistence of President Karzai's regime.

In the Korean peninsula there was continuous friction, the most evident being the sinking, in March, of a ship belonging to the South Korean Navy, with the loss of 104 lives, by a torpedo launched by North Korea. The tension between the two countries reached extreme levels, increased by the succession process in Pyongyang which would culminate

with the mysterious designation of the young son of President Kim Jong-il, whose health was quickly deteriorating.

In April, a natural catastrophe of extremely wide proportions happened in the Gulf of Mexico with the explosion of a drilling platform belonging to BP and the ensuing oil leak, causing serious damage to the environment and to the economy of wide coastal regions in the United States. The leak was only stopped in the end of August after a very expensive operation which put into doubt the off shore exploitation of oil, a question of singular importance for Brazil.

At the same time, the United States and Russia reinforced the convergent angle of their relations by signing at a solemn ceremony an agreement of reduction of nuclear arms in large scale. Both countries also pledged to act in a compatible way regarding Iran, whose nuclear program seemed to be in an accelerated stage of development.

The situation in the Middle East continued to deteriorate, particularly after the attack by Israeli forces, in the end of May, to a peaceful flotilla organized by Turkish activists to attempt to pierce the blockade of the Gaza Strip. There were deaths among the activists. The Israeli action was repudiated by the international community, calling once again attention to the need to unblock the conversations between the State of Israel and the Palestine Authority. A new attempt at negotiations, once again mediated by the United States, was made between the months of August and September.

In Brazil the year was marked mainly by the intense political debate that preceded the October 3 elections, when the exercise of the right to vote consolidated further the democratic process and institutions. In light of the significant progress achieved in the economic and social spheres of the country, the perception that Brazil had definitely come to occupy a preeminent place among world economies was reinforced.

Accordingly, Brazilian diplomacy sought to develop policies based on the increased importance of the country that would put Brazil at the center of the decision-making processes on issues previously beyond our reach. That was notably the case of the intermediation taken forward, together with Turkey, to obtain an agreement with Iran about its nuclear program that could prevent the application of new sanctions by the Security Council. Despite the Brazilian-Turkish mediation, the permanent members of the Security Council decided to go ahead with the sanctions.

This was, in its broad lines, the background of the statement delivered by Minister Celso Amorim at the Fifty-Fifth Session of the General Assembly of the United Nations, a few days before the first round

of the October 3 elections. Minister Amorim's intervention, by the way, must be analyzed in conjunction with the speech he made on the previous day before the Summit of Heads of State and Government represented at the Security Council, whose whole text is also reproduced below. The Minister started his speech recalling the progress achieved by Brazil in the consolidation of democracy, sustained economic growth, financial stability and social inclusion, illustrated by the fact that over twenty million Brazilians had left the state of poverty and as many others the state of extreme poverty.

Recalling that the promotion of development is a collective responsibility, the Minister highlighted the cooperation rendered by Brazil to other developing countries, mentioning specifically several projects and partners, particularly in Africa. He also made specific references to Haiti, renewing the commitment of Brazil to that country.

The Minister also dwelt on the themes related to integration and peace in South America in general, stressing the foundation of UNASUR as a factor of prevention of external interference in the region. He did not neglect to condemn vehemently the coup in Honduras and called for the return of President Zelaya "without threats to his freedom" as an "indispensable condition to the full normalization of the relations of Honduras with the region as a whole".

In consonance with the Brazilian view of the world, the minister insisted on the need for the redefinition of the norms that govern international interaction. He examined the picture of world governance, calling attention to the importance assumed by G20; to the need for a balanced solution for the negotiation process taking place at the WTO; to the lack of legitimacy of the international financial institutions, as well as to the necessity of reaching a "comprehensive and ambitious" agreement on climate change.

He did not neglect to insist on the need for a reform of the Security Council, as Brazil had coherently and consistently advocated throughout the years. On the previous day, in his intervention before the Summit of Heads of State and Government, the Minister had criticized the shortcomings of the multilateral system to deal with the crisis of the contemporary world and called for greater cohesion among the multilateral institutions turned to security and those that deal with economic and social development; "The security issues that affect the whole international community cannot be treated as if they belonged to the private sphere of a limited number of countries". He stressed the importance of increasing the effectiveness of the role of the non-

permanent members of the Council, so that they participate fully in the decision-making process. Equally important, he insisted, is to deal with imagination with the question of the veto, making its use more difficult and encouraging the self-restraint of those who hold that power.

As an evidence of Brazilian involvement in the great questions linked to peace and security – "as one expects from a member of the Security Council, albeit a non-permanent one" – the Minister examined in detail the Brazilian-Turkish initiative to negotiate with Iran the "May 17 Declaration", whose objective was to remove the obstacles to a solution of the Iranian nuclear dossier. In spite of the sanctions that followed the failed Brazilian-Turkish effort, the Minister expressed "hope that the logic of dialogue and understanding" could prevail.

In his statement of the day before, the Minister had mentioned expressly the issue of sanctions. Without questioning their legitimacy, he called attention to the fact that often the imposition of sanctions brings undesired effects, in particular to the most vulnerable sectors of the civil society. They should only be resorted to, therefore, with extreme caution, when all possibilities of dialogue and understanding have been exhausted.

In the statement at the General Assembly, the Minister also made a reference to the problems of the Middle East, expounding that the fundamental elements for the peace process in the region are: "the freezing of the construction of settlements in the occupied territories, the lifting of the blockade of the Gaza Strip and an end to the attacks against civil populations".

At the close of his intervention, the Minister mentioned the "steadfast commitment of Brazil with human rights". He called on the international community to a treatment of the issue "without politicization or partiality, in which every one is subject to the same scrutiny". He went on saying that "In our view, dialogue and cooperation are more effective means to ensure the exercise of human rights than arrogance based on a supposed self-conferred moral authority".

He finally summarized the sense of the diplomatic activity developed by Brazil during the eight years of the Lula administration: "an independent diplomacy, without subservience and respectful toward its neighbors and partners. An innovative diplomacy, but one that does not deviate from the fundamental values of the Brazilian nation – peace, pluralism, tolerance and solidarity".

Statement by Minister Celso Amorim* at the Summit Meeting of Heads of State and Government of the United Nations Security Council
2010

Mr. President,

I would like to congratulate President Gül on his initiative to hold this high-level meeting.

Sixty-five years ago, the United Nations was founded to prevent another war of great proportions. For many, however, real peace has never come about. Millions still live in a world where conflict and poverty nurture each other.

International efforts to promote stability have been hindered by a narrow view, in which peace was only seen as the absence of armed conflict.

Today it is clear that peace, security, development, human rights and the rule of law are interrelated. Peace can never flourish where there is hunger and poverty.

As much as an "exit strategy", peacekeeping operations must have a "strategy of sustainability". A strategy that would deliver the real dividends of peace – stability, development and strong national institutions.

Peacekeeping and peace-building should, to the extent possible, go hand in hand.

* **Celso Luiz Nunes Amorim**, born in Santos, SP, June 3, 1942. Master in International Relations from the Viena Diplomatic Academy. Doctor in Political Science/International relations from the London School of Economics and Political Sciences. Third Secretary, 1965. First Class Minister 12/18/1989. Minister of State for International Relations from 8/31/1993 to 1/18/1995 and from 1/1/2003 to 12/31/2010.

Let me be clear: we are not advocating that the Security Council be given a mandate to promote development. But, in most cases, the Security Council would benefit from the advice of the Peace-building Commission.

Other bodies of the UN system must also be involved. The coordination between the Security Council and ECOSOC, foreseen in Article 65 of the UN Charter, should be fully exercised.

Let me give you a couple of examples. In Haiti, where Brazil is proud to have contributed to the UN-led stabilization efforts, it is clear that there will be no lasting peace if extreme poverty and deprivation are not adequately addressed, and that was true even before the earthquake.

Real stability will only prevail if the window of opportunity created by MINUSTAH is seized to strengthen institutions and to improve the living conditions of the Haitian people.

This will require a deep involvement of the different bodies dealing with economic and social matters, as well as of the international financial institutions – all under appropriate coordination by the UN.

Guinea Bissau is another situation in which poverty and institutional instability hamper peace. The reforms needed by that country, especially of its armed forces, will require courageous decisions on the part of its authorities, but cannot dispense with substantial international cooperation.

In order to achieve these combined goals, proper attention by this Council may be needed.

In the same way, coordinated actions to maintain and build peace will also be extremely valuable in situations like the one prevailing in the DRC (Democratic Republic of Congo).

Interaction with other UN bodies and the ability to cope with complex situations are indispensable to make the Security Council more effective. But this is not enough. The Council needs to be more representative and legitimate. The Council's working methods must be more transparent.

Security issues that concern the whole of the international community cannot be dealt with as the private domain of a limited number of powers.

Improving the effectiveness of the Security Council depends also on the role of the non-permanent members. They must fully participate in the decision-making process. Non-permanent members can bring a diversity of views and regional experiences to the Council. It is not appropriate to call upon them only to ratify decisions already taken by the permanent members.

It is also impossible to discuss the Council's effectiveness without addressing the question of the veto. We are realistic. We are not proposing to abolish the veto. However, imaginative formulas that make its use more difficult or encourage self-restraint are necessary.

All of the measures listed above – a holistic approach the crises, the reform of the Council's composition, increasing the role of the non-permanent members, and restraining the use of the veto – should contribute to make the international community more engaged in the Council's decisions.

Finally, one word on sanctions. Sanctions, in particular economic sanctions, are foreseen in the UN Charter for especially intractable situations. Therefore, there should be nothing illegitimate about them in principle. But more often than not the imposition of sanctions brings about unintended effects and impacts negatively on the civilian population, especially on its more vulnerable sectors. So they constitute an instrument to be used with great caution, and only when all avenues of dialogue and understanding have been exhausted.

New York, September 23, 2010.

LXV Regular Session of the General Assembly of the United Nations
2010

Minister Celso Amorim [*]

Mr. President,

It is a great honor for me to come to this rostrum to speak on behalf of the people and Government of Brazil. I bring the greetings of President Lula.

Within days, over 130 million Brazilians will go to the polls and will write another important chapter in the history of our democracy. During President Lula's two terms, Brazil has changed. Sustained economic growth, financial stability, social inclusion and the full exercise of democracy have converged and reinforced each another. Over 20 million Brazilians rose out of poverty, and many others out of extreme poverty. Nearly 30 million people joined the middle class.

Strong and transparent public policies reduced inequalities in income, access and opportunities. Millions of Brazilians rose to dignity and real citizenship. The strengthened domestic market protected us from the worst effects of the global crisis set in motion by the financial casino in the richest countries in the world.

Brazil is proud to have achieved almost all of the Millennium Development Goals and to be well on the way to meeting them all by

[*] **Celso Luiz Nunes Amorim**, born in Santos, SP, June 3, 1942. Master in International Relations from the Vienna Diplomatic Academy. Doctor in Political Science/International Relations from the London School of Economics and Political Sciences. Third Secretary 1965. First Class Minister on 12/18/1989. Minister of State for External Relations from 8/31/1993 to 1/18/1995 and from 1/1/2003 to 12/31/2010.

2015. The inability of any country to achieve those Goals must be seen as a failure of the entire international community. The promotion of development is a collective responsibility.

Brazil has been working to assist other countries to replicate its successful experiences. In the past years Brazil's actions on the international stage have been driven by a sense of solidarity. We are convinced that it is possible to have a humanistic foreign policy without losing sight of national interests. That policy is supported by South-South cooperation. The IBSA Facility for Poverty and Hunger Alleviation, created by India, Brazil and South Africa, finances projects in Haiti, Guinea-Bissau, Cape Verde, Palestine, Cambodia, Burundi, Laos and Sierra Leone. Brazil has substantially increased its humanitarian aid and the number of its cooperation projects with poorer countries.

Africa occupies a very special place in Brazilian diplomacy. Since taking office, President Lula has been to Africa 11 times and visited over 20 countries in the continent. We have set up an agricultural research office in Ghana, a model cotton farm in Mali, a manufacturing plant for antiretroviral drugs in Mozambique and professional training centers in five African countries. Through trade and investment, we are helping the African continent to develop its enormous potential and reduce its dependency on a few centers of political and economic power.

Brazil is particularly concerned about Guinea Bissau. It is not by isolating or abandoning Guinea Bissau that the international community will help it address the challenges it still faces. We need intelligent modalities for cooperation, which can promote development and stability and encourage the necessary reforms, especially with regard to the armed forces.

This year, in which a significant number of African countries celebrate the Fiftieth anniversary of their decolonization, Brazil renews its commitment to an independent, prosperous, just and democratic Africa.

There are few places where international solidarity is more needed than Haiti. We joined the United Nations in mourning the tragedy that took the lives of hundreds of thousands of Haitians. We ourselves lost great Brazilians, including Dr. Zilda Arns – a woman who dedicated her life to the poor, especially children – Mr. Luiz Carlos da Costa, Deputy Head of the United Nations Stabilization Mission in Haiti, and 18 of our peacekeepers.

We would like to express our compassion for the suffering of the Haitian people and, above all, our admiration for the stoicism and courage with which they have been facing adversity. The Haitian people know

that they can count on Brazil to not only help them maintain order and defend democracy, but also assist in their development. We are keeping our promises and will keep a watchful eye on the situation to ensure that the commitments of the international community go beyond rhetorical statements. In recent years, the Brazilian Government has invested heavily in South America's integration and peace. We have strengthened our strategic partnership with Argentina. We have reinforced MERCOSUR, including through financial mechanisms unique among developing countries.

The establishment of the Union of South American Nations (UNASUR) aims at consolidating a genuine zone of peace and prosperity. UNASUR has already demonstrated its value in promoting understanding and the peaceful resolution of conflicts among and within countries in South America and has made foreign interference in our region even more unwarranted. By creating the Community of Latin American and Caribbean States, launched in Bahia, Brazil, and confirmed in Cancun, Mexico, we have reaffirmed the region's willingness to extend to Central America and the Caribbean the integrationist ideals that animate South Americans.

Brazil reiterates its condemnation, shared by all in Latin America and the Caribbean, of the illegitimate embargo against Cuba. Its sole result has been to hamper the efforts of millions of Cubans in their struggle for development.

We condemn anti-democratic moves, such as the *coup d'état* in Honduras. The return of former President Zelaya without threats to his freedom is indispensable for the full normalization of Honduras' relations with the region as a whole.

When President Lula first spoke in this Hall, in 2003, the world lived under the shadow of the invasion of Iraq. We hope we have learned the lessons of that episode. Blind faith in intelligence reports tailored to justify political goals must be rejected. We must ban once and for all the use of force that is inconsistent with international law. Furthermore, it is fundamental to value and promote dialogue and the peaceful resolution of disputes.

In order to achieve a truly secure world, the promise of the total elimination of nuclear weapons must be fulfilled. Unilateral reductions are welcome but insufficient, especially when they occur in tandem with the modernization of nuclear arsenals.

As President Lula has often stated, multilateralism is the international face of democracy. The United Nations must be the main center of decision-making in international politics.

The changes that have occurred in the world over the past few decades and the series of crises we have faced in food security, climate change, the economic and financial sphere and peace and security, make it urgent to redefine the rules that govern international relations.

The financial crisis of 2008 accelerated change in global economic governance. The Group of Twenty (G20) replaced the Group of Eight as the primary forum for deliberation on economic issues. The G20 was a step forward, but it must be adjusted to ensure, for instance, greater African participation. The relevance and legitimacy of the G20 can be preserved only if it maintains frank and permanent dialogue with all the nations represented in this General Assembly.

At the height of the crisis, we succeeded in avoiding the worst-case scenario: a surge of uncontrolled protectionism, which would have thrown the world into a deep depression. But the developed countries have not demonstrated the necessary commitment to global economic stability. They continue to let themselves be guided by parochial interests. Nowhere is that more evident than in the Doha round of negotiations in the World Trade Organization. A balanced solution to that negotiating process, which has lasted for almost 10 years, would promote economic expansion and the development of the poorest countries, with the end of distorting subsidies and protectionist barriers. After all, poor countries are the greatest victims of the narrow and selfish view that still prevails in international trade.

Reforms have also been insufficient in the financial sector. Unjustified resistance is preventing the implementation of agreed-upon changes. Obstinacy in maintaining anachronistic privileges perpetuates and deepens the illegitimacy of institutions.

Another major challenge we face is achieving a global, comprehensive and ambitious agreement on climate change. In order to move forward on this matter, countries must stop hiding behind each other. Brazil, like other developing countries, has done its part. But in Copenhagen, several delegations, especially from the rich world, sought excuses to evade their moral and political obligations. They forgot that one cannot negotiate with Nature.

A positive outcome of the sixteenth Conference of the Parties to the United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change, with real progress in forests, financing for adaptation and mitigation and a reaffirmation of the Kyoto commitments, is indispensable. The Mexican presidency can count on Brazil's engagement to achieve this objective.

In 2012, we will host, in Rio de Janeiro, Brazil, the Rio+20 Conference. On behalf of the Brazilian Government, I invite all delegations to fulfill the promise of truly sustainable development.

The reform of global governance has not yet reached the field of international peace and security. In the economic and environmental areas, the wealthiest nations have already understood that they cannot do without the cooperation of the poor and emerging countries. When it comes to war and peace, however, the traditional players are reluctant to share power.

The Security Council must be reformed and expanded to allow for greater participation by developing countries, including as permanent members. We cannot continue with working methods that lack transparency and that allow the permanent members to discuss behind closed doors and for as long as they wish issues that concern all mankind.

Brazil has sought to live up to what is expected from all Security Council members, including non-permanent ones – namely, that they contribute to peace. For this reason, we made a serious effort to find an instrument that could enable progress towards a solution of the Iranian nuclear question. In so doing, we relied on proposals that had been presented as a unique opportunity to build confidence between the parties. The Tehran Declaration of May 17, signed by Brazil, Turkey and Iran, removed obstacles that, according to the very authors of those proposals, had previously prevented an agreement.

The Tehran Declaration does not exhaust the issue and was never intended to do so. We are convinced that, once back to the negotiating table, the parties will find ways to resolve other issues, such as 20 per cent enrichment and the stock of enriched uranium accumulated since October 2009. In spite of the sanctions, we still hope that the logic of dialogue and understanding will prevail. The world cannot run the risk of a new conflict like the one in Iraq. We have been insisting, therefore, that the Iranian Government maintain an attitude of flexibility and openness towards negotiations, but it is necessary that all those concerned also demonstrate such willingness.

We are closely following developments in the peace process in the Middle East. We hope the direct talks between Palestinians and Israelis launched earlier this month will produce concrete results that lead to the creation of a Palestinian State within the pre-1967 borders, a State that ensures for the Palestinian people a dignified life, co-existing side by side and in peace with the State of Israel.

However, it is not the format of the dialogue that will determine whether it will yield results. What matters is the willingness of the parties to reach a just and lasting peace. That will be easier with the involvement of all those concerned. Freezing the construction of settlements in the occupied territories, lifting the Gaza blockade and ending attacks against civilian populations are crucial elements in the process.

In his visit to Israel, Palestine and Jordan in March, President Lula spoke with government leaders and representatives of civil society about those issues. We frequently receive in Brasília the leaders of various countries of the region, who seek support in resolving problems that have afflicted them for decades and have not been solved through the traditional means and actors. Brazil, which has about 10 million people of Arab descent and a sizeable Jewish community living together in harmony, will not shy away from making its contribution to the peace that we all yearn for.

Brazil's commitment to the promotion of human rights is also unwavering. We favour a non-selective, objective and multilateral treatment of human rights, without politicization or bias, in which everyone – the rich and the poor, the powerful and the weak – is subject to the same scrutiny. In our view, the exercise of human rights is more effectively ensured by dialogue and cooperation than by arrogant attitudes derived from self-declared moral superiority.

During his eight years in office, President Lula has developed a foreign policy that is independent, free of any sort of submission, and respectful of Brazil's neighbors and partners. It is an innovative foreign policy, which does not distance itself from the fundamental values of the Brazilian nation: peace, pluralism, tolerance and solidarity.

Just as Brazil has changed and will continue to change, the world is also changing. We must deepen and accelerate this process. With the technology and wealth at our disposal, there is no longer any justification for hunger, poverty and epidemics of preventable diseases. We can no longer live with discrimination, injustice and authoritarianism. We must face the challenges of nuclear disarmament, sustainable development and freer and fairer trade. Rest assured, Brazil will continue to fight to make these ideals a reality.

New York, September 23, 2010.

2011

2011

On September 21, 2011, President Dilma Rousseff delivered her first statement at the General Assembly of the United Nations. In the course of the year, developments at the international level had been marked chiefly by a series of popular uprisings in Arab countries – the "Arab Spring" – and by the worsening of the crisis in the financial system in developed countries, in particular at the European Union.

The "Arab Spring" started in Tunisia, unleashed by the immolation in public of a worker who protested against the authoritarian and police-minded regime of President Ben Ali. In January, after the death of the worker, who had been admitted to a hospital in Tunis, thousands of Tunisians poured into the streets to demonstrate against the government. Weeks later, when efforts to control the demonstrations were not successful, Ben Ali left the country and took refuge in Saudi Arabia, beset by accusations of illicit enrichment.

Later on, the streets of Cairo were filled with demonstrators hostile to President Hosni Mubarak, whose regime dated from the death of Anwar Sadat. The military, partners of Mubarak in the government, tried to keep order without systematically antagonizing the demonstrators concentrated in Tahrir Square. Excesses, however, were committed by the security forces loyal to Mubarak. Three weeks after the start of the demonstrations Mubarak resigned. He was arrested and indicted, in spite of a serious illness.

The demonstrators also occupied the streets of Sana to demand the ouster of the President of Yemen. Xiites protested in Bahrain against the government of the Sunni minority, resulting in the use of military force from Saudi Arabia to keep the order. In Morocco and Jordan, popular movements of lesser intensity were defused by government initiatives toward reforms and some opening of the respective political and institutional systems.

In Libya, an armed conflict of large proportions developed as the leader Muammar Khadaffi (in power since 1969) started to use force to contain armed demonstrations from a heterogeneous group of insurgents concentrated in the city of Benghazi. NATO supported the rebels by interdicting the Libyan airspace. Several European governments – who just before still supported Khadaffi's regime, from which they benefitted by investing in the oil sector – turned to openly supporting the insurgents. The United States kept aloof from the theater of operations, despite its sympathy towards the military action. President Obama, who was busy with the definitive withdrawal of American troops from Iraq and the worsening of the situation of lack of control in Afghanistan and Pakistan decided to "lead from behind", a contradictory concept to a certain extent, mentioned at the time by the White House to define a new phase of the American national security policy.

The rebels reached their objective. After several months of armed conflict, Khadaffi was arrested and summarily executed by a military unit. A government with a strong confessional character, composed of the several elements behind the revolt, was organized.

The focus of the transformations in the Arab nucleus then shifted to Syria, where scattered protests against President Assad's regime slowly grew. The repression by the government became increasingly violent, with thousands of deaths, to the point that the Arab League took to calling for Assad's removal from office.

In practically all the episodes of the "Arab Spring" allegedly democratic and civilian trends were mixed with movements of more or less Islamic fundamentalist inspiration.

Significantly, an episode from the early times of the movement strengthened the permanence of the Islamic fundamentalist phenomenon in the wider politico-strategic international scenario: American forces spotted Osama Bin Laden in his Pakistani hideout (a few kilometers from Islamabad) and murdered him. The episode marked the start of disagreements between the United States and its erstwhile ally, Pakistan. From then on, the United States would find increasing difficulties

in controlling the movement of the Talibans in the border between Afghanistan and Pakistan.

The process of insecurity and growing radicalization of the Islamic world was marked at the same time by the persistence of Iran in taking forward its program of uranium enrichment despite the threats of oil embargo from the United States and reluctantly echoed by the European Union and Japan.

The great factor of change at the international level, however, was the financial crisis. What really occurred was a second movement of the crisis that had started years before in the United States with the bankruptcy of Lehman Brothers and the collapse of the international financial system. The marginal economies in the European Union, the so-called PIGS (Portugal, Ireland, Greece and Spain) entered one by one in a situation of financial discredit. A deep crisis in the euro zone ensued and spread along the rest of the calendar year 2011. Portugal received US$ 116 billion in aid; in Italy, the Berlusconi government was compelled to resign and was replaced by a technocratic Cabinet led by Mario Monti, a well-known expert in the financial sector; Greece approached bankruptcy on several occasions but was kept solvent after the constitution of a technical Cabinet and the acceptance by the creditors of a "haircut" of 50 per cent in their dues. Ireland received a second share of European capitals. And Spain, highly in deficit, was compelled to take austerity measures which would result in the fall of the Socialist government and the return of the Popular Party to power.

Faced with the possibility of implosion of the euro zone, the European Union was forced to adopt severe measures under the leadership of Germany, which, supported by France, kept the direction and the pulse of the European process, in a duet that became known as "Merkozy". The United Kingdom, displeased with the fact that its requests to protect the financial center at the "City" in London had not been heeded, vetoed the measures aimed at "salvaging" the euro. These measures had to be implemented by instruments signed by the government of the Monetary Union outside the institutional framework of the European Union.

In Brazil, President Dilma Rousseff found herself in the situation of having to start her government amid the presage of the international financial crisis. She had to impose cautionary policies. Results in practically all sectors of activity were below those of the previous year, when Brazil had grown at a rate of 7.5 per cent under the impulse of the rise in China's demand (which would become Brazil's first trade partner) for commodities and the massive influx of capitals attracted by the country's growth and by the high interest rates. The government put into practice a policy

aimed at keeping the high level of internal demand without neglecting the control of inflation. The growth rate of the GDP remained at the low limit predicted, around 3.5 per cent. Despite this reduction, in 2010 Brazil became the seventh economy in the world, overcoming Italy and coming nearer to the United Kingdom (whom it surpassed in 2011), to become the sixth largest world economic power in terms of its product.

The Rousseff administration maintained the general lines of the political basis that had supported President Lula's government. There were no marked changes in the external policy, except for some variations dictated by intra-regional circumstances and by the financial crisis.

In his message to the Ministry of External Affairs at the end of the year, Minister Antonio Patriota summarized the panorama prevailing in 2011:

> (This) turbulent year… will be remembered, above all, by the worsening of the international financial crisis originated in the most developed countries and now located in Europe, in particular in the euro zone, and by the "Arab Spring" [as well as] by the international debate generated by further developments in Libya and Syria. On the economic level, it became even clearer that the emerging countries – especially the BRICS – took the place as the most important engines of the international economy. [In the field of human rights and the promotion of democracy] Brazil and South America distinguished themselves as a region of development with poverty reduction, and of peace. The world [the Minister said] increasing looks at Brazil for the treatment of important questions.

By the end of 2011 Brazil had expanded its diplomatic network to 228 posts abroad: 140 Embassies, 13 Missions to International Organizations, 2 Offices and 72 Consulates.

The statement delivered by President Dilma at the opening of the Sixty-Sixth Session of the General Assembly was particularly sharp. It started with a reflection on the meaning of the fact that for the first time "a feminine voice opens the general debate", after which the President stated that she was sharing [her] emotion with more than half of the human beings who (…) were born women and who are occupying with tenacity their deserved place in the world". "This will be", she concluded, "the century of women".

The first part of the speech was entirely devoted to the crisis, which she characterizes as economic, of governance and of political coordination. Mentioning the traditional line followed by Brazil of

widening the international decision-making circles, the President said it was essential that the crisis should be no longer managed by "only a handful of countries". Political resources and ideas were lacking, she insisted, stressing that the challenge of the moment was "to replace obsolete theories from an old world by new formulations or a new world". She emphasized the risks of increasing unemployment, "the bitterest face of the crisis". She exhorted the United Nations, G20 and the IMF to show "clearer signs of political cohesion and macroeconomic coordination". She called attention to the need to give priority to the solution of the problems of countries in sovereign debt crisis (the problem of the euro zone was then in the threshold of its full characterization) and to revert the recessive picture (the Brazilian economy already gave the first signs of deceleration). She insisted on the necessity that the fight against the crisis did not aggravate unemployment and also on the importance of putting an end to the so-called "exchange rate war" by means of the adoption of fluctuating rates, as well as eliminating commercial protectionism.

The President displayed the strategy followed by Brazil to control the effects of the crisis, through 1) control of government expenditure and 2) strengthening of the internal market with income distribution and technological innovation.

Next, she mentioned the lines followed by Brazil at the international level in search of development, peace and security. She mentioned specifically the Brazilian contribution to the recovery of Haiti and Guinea Bissau.

She was emphatic when mentioning the uprisings of the so-called "Arab Spring": it was necessary to find "a legitimate and effective way to help societies that cry out for reform, without taking away from the citizens the conduct of the process".

She affirmed, in this connection, that the maintenance of international security should not be limited to interventions in extreme situations, but instead concentrate on conflict prevention, through the exercise of diplomacy and the promotion of development. In an indirect reference to the situation in Iraq and Afghanistan, she condemned undue external interventions as factors of aggravation of conflicts and facilitation of the infiltration of terrorism where it does not exist and the opening up of new cycles of violence (Libya).

In this context, the President introduced an original concept in the Brazilian discourse by referring to the "responsibility while protecting" as a corollary principle to that of the "responsibility to protect".

She did not refrain from pointing to the need that the action, the representativeness, the credibility, the efficacy and the legitimacy of the Security Council be promoted by means of its reform. Expounding the credentials of Brazil (peace, integration and cooperation with its regional neighbors, use of atomic energy exclusively for peaceful purposes and promotion of human rights), she reiterated the willingness of the country to "assume its responsibilities as a permanent member of the Council".

When mentioning the request presented by Palestine to became a member State of the United Nations, the President expressed that "the moment has come to have Palestine represented here with full title", so that the possibilities of peace in Middle East could be improved.

At the end of her statement, the President reaffirmed the importance attached by Brazil to the United Nations Conference on Sustainable Development (Rio + 20), scheduled to take place in 2012, and recalled the successes obtained by Brazil in the fight against poverty and the reduction of social inequality, pledging to realize the goal of eliminating of extreme poverty in the country.

Coming back to the initial theme of her statement (and "as a woman who suffered torture in prison") she closed her speech with an exhortation to "valorization and affirmation of women", adding her voice to "the voices of the women who dared to fight, who dared to participate in politics and in professional life and who have conquered the power space that allowed me to be here today".

Opening of the General Debate of LXVI Session of the General Assembly of the United Nations
2011

President Dilma Rousseff[*]

Mr. President,

For the very first time in the history of the United Nations, a female voice is opening the general debate. It is the voice of democracy and equality that reverberates from a forum that is committed to being the most representative in the world. It is with a sense of personal humility, but with justifiable pride as a woman, that I greet this historic moment.

I share this emotion with more than half of the human beings on this planet, who, like me, were born women and who, with a sense of purposeful determination, are now taking the place in the world they rightly deserve. I am certain that this will be the century of women. In the Portuguese language, words such as life, soul and hope are feminine nouns. Two other words in Portuguese that are especially dear to me are also feminine, namely, courage and sincerity. And it is in a spirit of courage and sincerity that I wish to address the General Assembly today.

The world is experiencing an extremely delicate period, one that at the same time offers us a major historic opportunity. We face an economic crisis that, if not overcome, could become a source of serious political and social disruption, an unprecedented upheaval capable of causing serious imbalances in relationships between people and nations. More than ever before, the fate of the world is in the hands of its rulers and leaders, with

[*] **Dilma Rousseff**, President of the Republic since 1/1/2011.

no exceptions. Either we combine our efforts and emerge victorious together, or we will all emerge defeated. It is now less important to know or decide who caused the situation we are facing – because, after all, that is clear enough by now. What does matter is that we start finding collective, speedy and genuine solutions.

The current crisis is too serious to be managed by a few countries. Their Governments and central banks still have the greatest responsibility in implementing the process. Yet, since all countries suffer the consequences, all are entitled to participate in their solutions. It is not because of a lack of financial resources that the leaders of developed countries have not yet found a solution to the crisis. Rather, if I may put it this way, it is due to a lack of political resources and, at times, of clear ideas. There is a part of the world that has not yet found a balance between appropriate fiscal adjustments and correct and precise fiscal stimuli conducive to demand and growth. They have been caught in a trap that does not distinguish between partisan interests and the legitimate interests of society. The challenge posed by the crisis entails replacing outdated theories that belong to an old world with new proposals crafted for a new world.

While many Governments are shrinking, unemployment, the bitterest face of the crisis, is growing. There are already 205 million unemployed people in the world, of whom 44 million are in Europe and 14 million in the United States. Tackling this scourge and preventing it from spreading to other regions of the planet is vitally important. We women know better than anyone that unemployment is not just a statistic; it affects our families, children and husbands. It takes away hope and leaves a trail of violence and pain.

It is quite telling that it is the President of an emerging country, a country experiencing almost full employment, who has come here today to speak in such stark terms of a tragedy that has mainly hit developed countries.

Like other emerging countries, Brazil has thus far been less affected by the global crisis. But we know that our ability to withstand the crisis is not unlimited. We are willing and able to help those countries that are already facing an acute crisis, while there is still time. A new kind of cooperation between emerging and developed countries is an historic opportunity to redefine, with solidarity and responsibility, the commitments that govern international relations.

The world of today faces a crisis that is at once of economics, governance and political coordination. There will not be a return to confidence and growth until we intensify coordination efforts among

United Nations Member States and other multilateral institutions, including the Group of Twenty, the International Monetary Fund, the World Bank, and other organs.

The United Nations and those organizations must act urgently to send clear signals of political cohesion and macroeconomic coordination. For example, fiscal and monetary policies should be submitted to mutual assessment in such a way as to ultimately prevent undesirable effects on other countries, thus avoiding defensive reactions that in turn lead to a vicious circle.

The solution to the debt problem should be combined with economic growth. There are obvious signs that several advanced economies are on the threshold of recession, which will significantly hamper resolution of their fiscal problems.

It is clear that the priority for the world economy at this moment should be to solve the problems of those countries that are facing a sovereign debt crisis and reversing the current recession scenario. The most developed countries must establish coordinated policies to stimulate economies that have been extremely weakened by the crisis. Countries with emerging economies can help in that effort. Countries with a high surplus should strengthen their domestic markets and, as appropriate, make their foreign exchange rate policies more flexible in such a way that contributes to the eventual rebalancing of global demand.

Deepening the regulation of the financial system and controlling that inexhaustible source of instability is a pressing need. Controls must be imposed on the foreign-exchange war by adopting floating foreign exchange regimes. The task at hand is about preventing the manipulation of foreign exchange that occurs not only through excessively expansionist monetary policies but also through an artificially fixed foreign exchange.

Without a doubt, the reform of multilateral financial institutions should continue, thus increasing the participation of emerging countries, which, as driving forces, are responsible for the growth of the world's economy. We should fight protectionism and all forms of commercial manipulation. They do increase competitiveness, but in a spurious, fraudulent fashion.

Brazil is doing its homework. With sacrifices, but at the same time with a sense of insightfulness, we have kept Government spending under strict control, to the point of generating a sizable surplus in Government accounts while ensuring that those steps will not compromise the success of our social policies or the pace of our investment and growth. We are also taking additional precautions to buttress our ability to withstand the

crisis by strengthening our domestic market with income distribution and technological innovation policies.

For at least three years now, Brazil has reiterated time and again, from this very podium – that we must all tackle the causes, and not only the consequences, of global instability. We have emphasized time and again the interrelationships among development, peace and security. We have often underscored that development policies should be increasingly coupled with the Security Council's strategies in the pursuit of sustainable peace.

That is how we have acted as part of our commitments to Haiti and to Guinea-Bissau. As a leading country in the United Nations Stabilization Mission in Haiti, Brazil has since 2004 undertaken humanitarian projects that integrate security and development. With deep respect for Haitian sovereignty, Brazil is proud to assist in the consolidation of democracy in that country.

We are in a position to provide a solidarity-based contribution to brotherly countries in the developing world in matters such as food security, agricultural technology, generation of clean and renewable energy and the fight against hunger and poverty.

Since late 2010, we have witnessed a series of grass-roots demonstrations that have come to be known as the Arab Spring. Brazil is the adopted homeland of many immigrants from that part of the world. Brazilians sympathize with the pursuit of an ideal that belongs to no culture in particular, because it is by definition universal: freedom.

The nations united here today must find a legitimate and effective way to aid those societies that cry out for reform – without, however, depriving their citizens of a lead role in the process. We strongly repudiate the brutal crack down episodes that victimize civilian populations. We remain convinced that for the international community, resort to force must always be the last alternative.

The quest for peace and security in the world cannot be limited to interventions in extreme situations only. We support the Secretary-General in his efforts to engage the United Nations in conflict prevention by tirelessly exercising diplomacy and promoting development. The world of today suffers from the painful consequences of interventions that have worsened existing conflicts. That has allowed terrorism to creep into areas where it previously did not exist, thus generating new cycles of violence and multiplying the number of civilian victims.

Much is said about the responsibility to protect, yet little is said about responsibility while protecting. These are concepts that we must

develop and mature together. To that end, the role of the Security Council is critical, and the more legitimate its decisions are, the more appropriate that role will be. And the Council's very legitimacy increasingly depends upon its reform.

With each passing year, a solution to the lack of representativeness in the Security Council becomes an ever more urgent need, which in turn erodes its efficacy. Former Assembly President Joséph Deiss reminded me of an impressive fact, namely, that the debate on the proposed reform of the Security Council is now entering its eighteenth year.

We can delay no longer. The world needs a Security Council that reflects contemporary realities, a Council that will incorporate new permanent and non-permanent members, especially those representing developing countries.

Brazil is ready to take on its responsibilities as a permanent member of the Council. We have lived in peace with our neighbors for more than 140 years and have fostered successful integration and cooperation processes with them. Our Constitution expressly states our commitment to abstain from the use of nuclear energy for non-peaceful purposes. I am proud to say that Brazil is a driver of peace, stability and prosperity in the region and even beyond it.

In the Human Rights Council, we have drawn inspiration from our own history of endeavor as a nation. We desire for other countries what we desire for ourselves. Authoritarianism, xenophobia, poverty, capital punishment and discrimination are all sources of human rights violations. We know that violations occur in every country, without exception. We must recognize this reality, and we must accept criticism. We will ultimately benefit from criticism, and we should pointedly criticize flagrant violations wherever they occur.

I welcome South Sudan to our family of nations.

Brazil is ready to cooperate with the youngest Member of the United Nations and to contribute to its sovereign development.

I regret, however, that from this podium I am still unable to welcome Palestine into full membership of the Organization. Brazil has recognized the Palestinian State as defined by the 1967 borders, in accordance with United Nations resolutions. Like most countries in the Assembly, we believe that the time has come for Palestine to be represented as a full Member in this forum.

The recognition of the Palestinian people's legitimate right to sovereignty and self-rule expands the possibilities and prospects for a lasting peace in the Middle East. Only a free and sovereign Palestine can

respond to Israel's legitimate desire for peace with its neighbors, security within its borders and political stability in its region. I come from a country where descendants of Arabs and Jews are compatriots and live together in harmony, which is as it should be.

Brazil advocates for a global, comprehensive and ambitious agreement within the framework of the United Nations to fight climate change. To achieve this, countries must shoulder their respective responsibilities. Brazil submitted a concrete, voluntary and significant proposal for reducing greenhouse gas emissions during the 2009 United Nations Climate Change Conference in Copenhagen. We hope to be able to make progress at the upcoming meeting in Durban by supporting developing countries in their efforts to reduce emissions, and at the same time ensuring that developed countries fulfill their obligations, beyond 2012, on the basis of new targets under the Kyoto Protocol.

Brazil will have the honor of hosting the United Nations Conference on Sustainable Development Rio+20 in June of 2012. Along with Secretary -General Ban Ki-moon, I reiterate our invitation to all heads of State and Government to join us at that Conference next year.

Brazil has learned that fighting poverty is the best development policy, and that a genuine human rights policy must ultimately be based on reducing inequalities and discrimination between and among regions, people and genders. Brazil has made political, economic and social progress without compromising any of its democratic freedoms. We have met almost all of the Millennium Development Goals before 2015. Forty million Brazilian men and women have come up out of poverty and been lifted into the middle class. I am fully confident that we will achieve our goal of eradicating extreme poverty in Brazil by the end of my term in office.

In my country, women have been vital to the task of overcoming social inequalities. Our income distribution programs place mothers as the central figures in the scheme. It is they who manage the resources that allow families to invest in the health and education of their children. Yet my country, like every other nation, still has to do much more when it comes to valuing women and asserting their status. In that regard, I would like to congratulate the Secretary-General for making women a priority during his tenure at the head of the United Nations. I particularly welcome the creation of UN-Women and the appointment of its Executive Director, Ms. Michelle Bachelet.

Besides speaking on behalf of my own beloved country, I feel that when I stand up here I am representing all the women of the world - the

anonymous women, those who starve and cannot feed their children, those who are suffering from illnesses and cannot get treatment, those who are victims of violence or who are discriminated against at work, in society and in their family life, and those who labor at home to bring up future generations. I add my voice to those of the women who have dared to struggle, to take part in political and professional life, and who have thus gained the spheres of power that allow me to stand here today.

As a woman who was the victim of torture while in prison, I am all too aware of how important values such as democracy, justice, human rights and freedom are to all of us. It is my hope that these values will continue to inspire the work of this house of nations, where I am honored to open the general debate of the Sixty-Sixth Session of the General Assembly.

New York, September 21, 2011.

Formato	15,5 x 22,5 cm
Mancha gráfica	12 x 18,3cm
Papel	pólen soft 80g (miolo), cartão supremo 250g (capa)
Fontes	Verdana 13/17 (títulos), Book Antiqua 10,5/13 (textos)

Since 1949, Brazil has been the first country to occupy the tribune of the United Nations General Assembly. This volume presents all Brazilian speeches made at the opening of the General Debate of the Assembly from 1946 to 2011 – preceded by a brief contextualization in which the external and internal factors that influenced each of them are highlighted.

Its study enables the distinction of the periods that characterize the Brazilian diplomatic performance, the different aspects that define each one and internal and external constraints that prevailed circumstantially. This identifies the elements of permanence and continuity that permeate Brazil's external projections. The set of speeches transcribed into this volume provides an accurate notion of the continuous debate between the emergence of Brazilian foreign policy, on one side, and the events which shaped the country's past, the risks and the opportunities that characterize its present days and the expectations placed in its future, on the other.

ISBN 857631431-2

FUNDAÇÃO ALEXANDRE DE GUSMÃO

www.funag.gov.br