



CANADA

STATEMENTS AND SPEECHES

INFORMATION DIVISION

DEPARTMENT OF EXTERNAL AFFAIRS

OTTAWA - CANADA

No. 65/16

INTERDEPENDENCE IN THE MODERN WORLD

Address by the Honourable Paul Martin, Secretary of State for External Affairs, to the Canadian Federation of Mayors and Municipalities, Windsor, Ontario, May 18, 1965.

...Some of our Canadian communities are more populous than a number of sovereign states in the world today. Many of them are also a good deal more affluent. All our communities are facing problems that are not too different from the problems that are being faced by sovereign states today -- the problem of carrying forward social and economic programmes that will ensure progress and partnership on the broadest possible basis.

I am sure we have also found that there is no such thing as self-sufficiency in the conditions of the present day. There is no way in which we can insulate our communities -- whatever their size or structure -- from what is happening on the outside. These are the realities of interdependence. They have been brought home to us by the contraction of physical distances, by the impact of modern science and technology, by the vast expansion of our knowledge about the world around us, by the facts of power and enlightened self-interest.

And so, what is happening in the world today is inevitably of concern to all of us -- as individuals, as citizens, and as governments. We are involved, each and everyone of us, in the course of events. It is important, therefore, that we should be aware of the options before us.

It used to be possible, at one time, to think of peace and war as options. But in this nuclear age of ours it is no longer possible to think in that way. War can no longer be regarded as an instrument of policy -- even in the last resort. The only option we have is peace, and all our policies must be predicated on that irreversible fact.

But to say that is not, of course, to discount the existence of tension and conflict in the world. On the contrary, the pace of change in our generation has been such that it would be surprising if it had not brought new ferment and new friction in its wake. The task before us, as I see it, is to direct change along peaceful channels and to devise methods and means by which we can bring situations of conflict, where they arise, within the ambit of peaceful solutions.

We have tried to do that through the United Nations and in other ways. We have not been entirely unsuccessful. But, as we look around the world, we can hardly be complacent about the results. The need to perfect the instruments of peace is as vital today as it has ever been.

Within the last fortnight, I was able to witness at first hand the great contribution to peace which the United Nations is making in Cyprus. It was a memorable experience. On that island, some 6,000 United Nations soldier-ambassadors are effectively keeping the peace. They are playing an indispensable part. By their presence and by helping to resolve causes of local friction, they are preventing the recurrence of fighting. They are helping to establish law and order. They are doing what they can towards the gradual restoration of normal conditions of life on the island. They are holding the fort while the groundwork is being laid for political negotiations looking towards a peaceful solution of the dispute. They are doing a magnificent job. They are doing honour and credit to the nine countries which placed those peace-keeping forces at the disposal of the United Nations.

I have come away from Cyprus with a much more vivid impression of what the United Nations has done there. I was particularly pleased that United Nations forces now have much greater authority and freedom of movement than they had in the earlier phases of their mission. I want to pay particular tribute to General Thimayya, the distinguished Indian soldier, who is in command of United Nations forces on the island and who has contributed so much to the success of this operation. It is probably the most effective operation the United Nations has ever conducted in the cause of peace.

I am proud to report to you this evening on the key role that our own Canadian forces have been playing in Cyprus. They have set a very high standard of performance. They and their predecessors have established an enviable reputation for themselves. That was the unanimous judgment of all concerned on the island, including the President of Cyprus, Archbishop Makarios, the Vice-President, Dr. Kuchuk, and General Thimayya. It has certainly confirmed our belief that training for peace enhances the effectiveness of Canadian forces called upon to serve under the blue and white banner of the United Nations.

This particular operation has had to be conducted against very great odds. The mandate of the operation runs for only three months at a time. The funds to finance it have to come from voluntary contributions. I need hardly say that these continuing uncertainties surrounding the operation have created serious problems of planning and execution. It is, in my view, far from being an ideal pattern for future operations of this kind and I should hope that, out of the discussions now in progress in a Special Committee of the General Assembly, will come some formula that will give the United Nations a more assured capacity to respond to future situations of emergency.

I am glad to say that Canada was able to play a crucial part in the establishment of the peace-keeping operation in Cyprus. If we had not acted as and when we did and pledged our support for the operation, there was a real possibility of armed conflict being resumed on the island, with all the attendant risks of a military confrontation between Greece and Turkey. In the

intervening 14 months, Canada has maintained what is now the largest contingent in Cyprus. And we have shouldered the full financial burden of keeping our forces there.

The end of the operation is not yet in sight, and I hope that more countries will see their way clear to assuming some share of responsibility for its continuance. As far as Canada is concerned, we intend, for the present, to maintain our commitment in Cyprus. At the same time, we look to a long-term settlement of the present crisis which will make the continued presence of a United Nations force on the island unnecessary.

As a member of that force, it would not, in my view, be appropriate for Canada to advocate any particular views with regard to the nature of such a long-term settlement. That is essentially the task of the parties concerned and of the United Nations, which has been entrusted with the task of mediation. The United Nations mediator has now submitted his report. While there have been differences of view between the parties with regard to that report, I believe, nevertheless, that the stage has been reached when negotiations between them need to be started. I should hope that that would be done in a positive and constructive spirit.

The situation on the island is complex. Two communities -- Greek and Turkish -- have long been established there. Both represent cultures and civilization which have made an immense contribution to the Eastern Mediterranean area and beyond. There has been a breakdown of mutual confidence between these communities, and there is very deep bitterness and suspicion between them. The Greek community represents a majority on the island and I think we can all appreciate, in such a situation, the problems encountered in the search for a framework that will give assurance to all the inhabitants and harness their energies and their loyalties in the best interests of the new state.

Inevitably, the interests of Greece and Turkey are engaged in the course of events in Cyprus. Both are our partners in NATO and the strain in their relations arising from their differences over Cyprus has been a matter of grave concern to the Alliance. On the basis of my conversations with the Greek and Turkish Foreign Ministers at the NATO meetings last week, I can say that both countries are aware of their responsibilities in this situation and that they are prepared to play their part in facilitating a long-term solution of the problem in Cyprus.

It is my own firm belief that the time has now come for all interested parties to get the process of negotiation under way. I put this view as forcefully as I could to those concerned with the situation in the course of my visit to Cyprus and subsequently at the NATO meetings in London. I thought it right to make a particular point of emphasizing the urgency of moving forward. I can only say that I am encouraged by the response I encountered on all sides and by some of the positive steps which are already being taken in that direction.

The fundamental problem of peaceful and co-operative coexistence is primarily for the two communities on the island to resolve with the good offices of the United Nations. But I am sure it is also important that parallel discussions be continued between the Governments of Greece and Turkey to improve their relations and to explore the respective contributions they might be able to make to a durable

solution of the Cyprus problem. And, when I speak of a durable solution, I mean, of course, a solution that is capable of commanding the agreement of all the parties. Given the necessary spirit of compromise and accommodation, I believe that such a solution is not beyond reach. I would certainly hope that all concerned will do all they can to bring it within their grasp.

If I am moderately encouraged by the recent trend of developments in Cyprus, I can see no prospect of early improvement in the situation in Vietnam.

In that part of the world, too, there has been an international presence. In this case, it took the form of a commission of which Canada, India and Poland are members. The task assigned to that commission was to supervise the implementation of a cease-fire agreement. It was hoped, at the time the agreement was concluded in 1954, that peace would be restored to the area. In the event, that has not proved to be the case. On the contrary, the situation in Vietnam today is probably more serious than it has been at any time in the past 11 years.

We have watched this situation evolve at first hand. We have tried to assess it objectively and impartially. We have never claimed that there have not been breaches of the cease-fire agreement on both sides. But, when all is said and done, there is one central fact that stands out in this situation and it is this: what we are faced with in Vietnam is a case of covert aggression being conducted by the North against the South. And the ultimate aim of that aggression is nothing less than the overthrow of the government and administration of South Vietnam.

The justification being given to that aggression by the authorities in Hanoi and Peking is that it represents a "war of national liberation". This is a claim which we cannot and do not accept.

Of course, there are many situations all over the world where people are looking for change -- political, economic and social change. No doubt, elements of such a desire for change are present in the situation in South Vietnam. This is part of the process of transformation of a traditional into a modern society which it is in our interest to encourage and support.

We cannot expect that process to be accomplished without some measure of unrest and instability. And when we see one government succeeding another in the South, we should not throw up our hands in despair. We should recognize that after centuries of mandarin authority, after 100 years of colonial administration, and after ten years of attempts at self-rule, a new political pattern is in the process of working itself out in Saigon. And that is happening in the most difficult circumstances of aggression abetted and directed from without.

We were confronted with very similar circumstances in Europe in the years immediately following the Second World War. We were then able to bring aggression under control by making it clear that we were determined to protect and preserve the right of nations to order their own affairs. That is one of the major achievements of the North Atlantic Alliance. And may I say

here, having just come back from attending a meeting of NATO ministers in London, that a strong and viable Alliance seems to me just as relevant to the circumstances of today as it was in the days of its inception 16 years ago.

If this covert aggression is not met -- if it is not shown to be unprofitable -- in Vietnam, then there is no doubt in my mind that it will have to be met elsewhere. At the same time, I am aware of the very serious risk of escalation and wider involvement if the conflict in Vietnam were to be prolonged. To minimize that risk, we have repeatedly appealed to all concerned for the exercise of restraint. The fact remains that the situation carries a real threat to world peace and that it must be brought under early and effective control.

We do not believe there is any alternative to a peaceful, negotiated solution to the conflict that is being waged in Vietnam. That is why we have welcomed the readiness of the United States, as expressed by President Johnson on April 7 and reiterated on a number of occasions since then, to enter into negotiations without preconditions. I deeply regret that there has been no positive response to that declaration from the other side so far.

The first priority now is to bring the two sides to the negotiating table. We and others have made suggestions with the object of facilitating progress towards a negotiation. I am bound to say, however, that all these suggestions are predicated on a willingness on both sides to contemplate the possibility of a negotiated solution. And of that there is, as yet, no evidence on the part of the authorities in either Hanoi or Peking.

I speak of a negotiation because it now seems obvious that a new solution will have to be found in that area. While one may return to the principles of the original cease-fire agreement of 1954, there will have to be some form of negotiation to work out a formulation of those principles which can be applied in present circumstances. And there will certainly have to be some credible arrangements to guarantee the right of all peoples in the area to live at peace under governments of their own choice and free from outside interference or fear of aggression. That is why we have expressed the view that it would probably be desirable, when the time comes, to build some form of international mechanism into the terms of any ultimate settlement.

The element of free choice seems to me an indispensable part of any such settlement. It is inherent in "the principle of equal rights and self-determination of peoples", to which we have subscribed in the United Nations Charter. A negotiation cannot simply be used to cover up the take-over of one part of Vietnam by the other. That would not be a negotiation. It would be a capitulation. And it is wholly unrealistic to think that either side would accept such a conclusion to the present conflict.

The situation in Vietnam is one of the most serious we have faced since the end of the Second World War. I have already referred to the direct risks which a continuation of that situation could involve. I am glad to say that there is some evidence on both sides that these risks are appreciated. But developments in Vietnam are also having their effect on the practical efforts we have been making in a number of directions to lessen world tensions and widen the area of understanding.

It has been a matter of regret to us that, in this situation, the United Nations has not been able to exert its influence for peace. We have established the United Nations as an instrument of peace and good order in the world. We cannot, of course, expect it to be an effective instrument in circumstances where governments are not prepared to settle their disputes by peaceful means. But if there is such a thing as a collective will to peace in the world, then the United Nations is the best framework we have been able to devise to bring it into focus and to channel it into situations of conflict. Above all, we must continue to make sure that the instrument itself does not become blunt through inaction or indifference.

s/c