

Statsminister Odvar Nordli.

Tale i FN's generalforsamling torsdag 21. oktober 1976.

Mr. President,

At the outset allow me to confirm what my Foreign Minister has already stated before this Assembly when he spoke in the General Debate last month: To the Norwegian Government it is a great pleasure to see you presiding over this important session of the General Assembly. We know from the Conference on the Law of the Sea the outstanding leadership qualities you are bringing to your high post.

We see your election also as a tribute to your country, Sri Lanka. I had the privilege earlier this month of welcoming as a guest to my country your highly respected Prime Minister, Mrs. Bandaranaike, thereby opening an era of closer development co-operation between our two countries.

I would also like to pay tribute to the Secretary-General, Dr. Kurt Waldheim. My Government is most impressed by the devotion and dedication he has shown in his service of the United Nations and of mankind as a whole. On the conclusion of your first term of office, my Government wants to assure you of our desire to see the world organization benefit from your service also

for the years to come.

Mr. President,

The United Nations was born out of a worldwide war against fascism and the basic role assigned to it was the prevention of future wars.

Through its more than 30 years of existence, the world organization has been able to make substantial contributions to the solution and prevention of dangerous conflicts. However, many of the hopes voiced in San Francisco in 1945 for a safer and better world have not been fulfilled. The co-operation which had prevailed between the victorious powers during the war, could not be sustained and developed globally and serve as the basis of a United Nations strong enough to repulse all threats to peace and security.

Events took another course.

New divisions along powerpolitical and ideological lines emerged, and confrontations inside the organization often paralyzed the United Nations during serious international conflicts. Peace, to the extent it was achieved, was based on a balance of power, rooted in increasingly sophisticated and frightening weapon systems instead of being based on international law and order.

The struggle for freedom and human dignity moved south and east, where people revolted against political

and economic suppression. The gap between the poor and the rich countries of the world was widened and could no more be ignored.

Gradually, however, events took a more encouraging turn and involved the United Nations increasingly in the process of decolonization and the struggle for political and economic liberation.

Throughout this process an ever increasing number of new nations joined the world organization. Small nations and their just demand for influence and a voice inside the United Nations became as much a part of the daily life of the Organization as is the influence of the big powers.

During the last few years the United Nations has emerged as the main global instrument in the quest for international economic and social solidarity. In this area the United Nations has taken up a historic challenge, and a realistic appraisal will tell us that in this area it has today its most important peace-building task. The priority now accorded to the needs of the poor in United Nations activities, should also encourage us to take an optimistic view of the future role of the world organization.

This does in no way mean a United Nations without problems.

We have seen - and we will still see - armed

conflicts in which the United Nations is powerless. Too many people on this globe are still living under conditions of suppression, suffering and fear. Human rights are being violated in many parts of the world with adverse consequences far beyond the borders of the countries concerned.

These hard facts should not be ignored in an appraisal of the challenge with which the United Nations is confronted or when we take stock of the present situation of the world organization.

The need for strengthening the United Nations as an instrument for concerted actions and co-ordination in international politics is no less today than was the case 30 years ago. The small countries have the largest stake in a United Nations in a position to act, but actions by the organization will always have to take account of the reality which big powers represent in global politics.

But of equal importance is a recognition of the rights of small and new nations to independence, social justice and a voice in the international community.

It is important to encourage the big powers to make full use of the United Nations and not yield to the temptation to solve their problems outside the framework of the world organization. Only through

a constructive co-operation between large and small countries will it be possible to solve the immense problems confronting the United Nations today.

We must ^{also} always bear in mind that the authority of the organization is being undermined whenever it is associated with resolutions which are not rooted in reality.

Moderation and a negotiated compromise inside the United Nations are preferable to a confrontation on which the organization can exercise no influence.

But here, of course, the substantive effects of the compromise are the decisive factor. The call for moderation and compromise must not serve as a cover-up for the preservation of existing injustice in the international community.

In wide areas of the world, progress towards human dignity has been too slow. This goes above all for Southern Africa.

The Norwegian Government has for years supported the struggle of the oppressed black population against the white minority regimes' policies of racial discrimination and economic exploitation.

We have from this rostrum stressed the particular responsibility resting with Western countries for the development in Southern Africa. This responsibility

stems from Western colonization and from the economic dependency of the white minority regimes on the Western world.

The initiative taken by the US Secretary of State Henry Kissinger in conjunction with the British Government and the efforts of the five front-line Presidents have created new hope that the Rhodesian conflict can be resolved at the conference table. The American initiative and the subsequent development confirm the necessity of outside pressure on the white minority rulers.

Also as far as Namibia is concerned, we can discern an outline of a negotiating process.

In this new and more hopeful situation it is of the utmost importance that Western countries are concentrating and intensifying their pressure on the Government of South Africa to abolish its system of apartheid, the core of the problems which we are facing in Southern Africa.

If the Government of South Africa does not demonstrate its readiness to meet the demands of the black population for basic human rights, sanctions have to be adopted by the United Nations. I would think of a binding arms embargo as an initial step.

Independence and majority rule for Zimbabwe and

Namibia are important aims in themselves. But Southern Africa will remain an area of international conflict till a democratically elected majority government has emerged also in the Republic of South Africa.

I would make an urgent appeal to the white minority leaders of Southern Africa to come forward and comply with the demands of the black population for human dignity and majority rule while there is still time left. The alternative is most frightening and can result in a tragedy for all races of Southern Africa and further threaten world peace.

Mr. President,

The last few years have witnessed the initiation of new contacts between the nations of the world with a view to seeking through negotiations a relaxation of tension and disarmament.

To many of us it is a most frightening paradox that peace among the peoples of the world is based on an ever-increasing and more efficient arsenal of mass destruction weapons. But this is a political reality.

We also have to accept as a fact that the modest contacts initiated between the super powers with a view to reducing strategic armaments stem from this paradox. It is also an indisputable fact that a shift in this

mutual balance, will threaten existing stability and peace.

But we must never accept a peace based on a balance of terror as the final and lasting solution.

A most convincing argument, although not the only one, in this connection is the need for releasing for more constructive purpose the enormous human and material resources tied up in the military field in a world where the majority of mankind has still to see their most basic needs fulfilled.

Mr. President,

My Government sees in the concept of the New International Economic Order an ambitious programme for global justice and solidarity. I want, however, first to focus on the important efforts for development already made by the developing countries themselves.

Developing countries as a whole are themselves, through their own savings, financing three fourths of their total investments. Foreign resources account for only one fourth of the capital raised for investment purposes.

Norway is also taking a favourable view of the strong mobilization of their own resources which developing countries are aiming at, through the launching of the

principle of "collective self-reliance". This has given international development co-operation a new dimension and will have the active support of my Government.

But, as we all know, in spite of the impressive efforts made by many developing countries, growth in the industrialized part of the world has been even higher. As a result the gap between poor and rich has increased over the recent years. This has logically led to a call for new ways to attack the problems, not as an alternative but as a supplement to the previous approach where the main efforts have been made by developing countries themselves, supported by the mobilization of outside assistance.

UNCTAD IV in Nairobi was a first serious attempt by the nations of the world to start the implementation of the New International Economic Order. We all know the outcome. It was characterized by such compromises as proved necessary to reach broad consensus.

Compromises usually fail to meet all expectations of any party to them. Thus we may all find ourselves in a position where we, for various reasons, feel disappointed at the concessions ^{that} had to ^{be} ~~make~~ in order to reach the Nairobi compromise. We do understand developing countries which regard the compromise limited in scope.

The Norwegian Government was committed to contri-

buting to a solution of the problems submitted to UNCTAD IV. We went to Nairobi ready to support the integrated programme for commodities not only politically, but also financially, by making our contribution to the Common Fund.

To my Government this follows naturally from the idea of solidarity, so fundamental to our form of Democratic Socialism. Norwegian policy at home has for years been aiming at eliminating social injustice and imbalances between groups of our people and regions of our country. It is logical to extend this solidarity also to the international field.

We consider the integrated programme for commodities as an important instrument for the support of commodity-producing countries, but also providing a more orderly functioning of a key sector in international economic relations. No country can nationally escape intervention with the free market forces. Neither can we internationally, if we want a more equitable world economic order.

I do agree with the critics of the integrated programme for commodities when they argue that all the components of the programme, including the Common Fund, are not yet fully examined and are not ready for an immediate implementation.

But I disagree with the same critics when they maintain that the preparatory work has to be fully concluded before the necessary political decisions can be

taken.

When I find it important to make this point months after in Nairobi, the reason is that I am afraid that the same arguments may surface again.

I want to state already at this stage that the arrangements for commodities which we will be invited to establish can not possibly be perfect already at the initial stage. Years may be required before they function perfectly - if ever. But this does not alter the fact that such arrangements, although imperfect, are fundamental to the relationship between the developing and the industrialized countries. They will be the decisive indication of whether rich countries take seriously their responsibility for attacking the underlying factors determining the present inequitable distribution of income between the countries of the world.

Mr. President,

The United Nations started as an expression of a devastated world's dream of a better future, characterized by justice, democracy, co-operation and peace.

The organization and the men and women which have served it faithfully, can look back on achievements of historical significance.

There is no alternative to the United Nations as the global forum for co-operation among all nations of the world.

But there is still a long way to go till we see materialized the ultimate goal of a world of justice, security for all, built on co-operation between free and equal people.

There is a need at all times to remind ourselves of the fact that there is only one proven method for making a long way shorter - that is to move forward.

I thank you, Mr. President.