

(Address given by the Rev. Theodore M. Hesburgh, C.S.C., President of the University of Notre Dame, at the Pacem in Terris III Conference, Washington, D.C. Tuesday, October 9, 1973)

Pacem in Terris -- peace on earth -- may now seem more likely than it did eleven years ago when Pope John XXIII began his far-sighted encyclical with these words. Peace on earth is more visible today, at least among countries of the developed areas of the world, those discussed by Mr. Warnke and Professor Shulman. And, if we are indeed entering a time when there is less chance of a cataclysmic nuclear war -- mankind's final war -- then all men will benefit, in rich and poor countries alike. All men must welcome this time of detente and work to build on the hope of peace among the world's great nations.

Yet the prospect of a time that is no longer dominated by the spectre of nuclear destruction -- or by the same recurring crises and fears -- also enjoins us to shape our world in ways that will meet the needs of all its people, not just the affluent minority, living in the industrial countries. It will profit us little to pass beyond the Cold War, if we then witness a more stealthy and insidious erosion of mankind's well-being, because we refused to deal with new challenges and take advantage of new opportunities.

Today, we still focus on relations among the great developed countries of the world, whether they are allies or adversaries. We pay little attention to the needs, the interests, the wishes, and the humanity of the vast bulk of mankind: the fully two and a half billion people who live in countries we call "poor". For many years, the demands of our own security lent some credence to this view, and we put the

problems of most of mankind in second place behind the problem of preserving the world itself.

Now, however, we can no longer ignore what is happening in the more than 100 developing countries. Simple self-interest tells us that any view of the world that includes only our rich neighbors, whether friend or potential foe, is no view at all. Whether we focus primarily on the triangle of great military powers, on the triangle of great economic powers, or on a pentagon, we cannot develop a coherent and rational view of the world and of our place in it without including our relations with the "have nots", the "left outs" of the past.

Nor am I appealing to a vision of the Cold War: that countries in the Third World which were not for us would surely be against us. Indeed, the fading of that central conflict has led many people in the developed world to banish the developing countries from their sight altogether, since they are no longer necessary to a battle for hearts and minds that is presumed to be finished.

Yet a continuing neglect of developing countries, a neglect I would call malignant rather than benign, is now impossible. If anything, many of them are far more important to us than they were before, when concerns about our military security prevented other matters from coming to the fore. Today, we are increasingly concerned with issues that go beyond military security, to include freedom from disruptive shocks to the international economy. And in our search for international economic security, many developing countries are vitally involved.

There is a mass of evidence to support this view. In this country, for example, we are now becoming aware of the dimensions of our dependence on others for the petroleum that fuels our economy, and that helps us to enjoy our high standard of living. We are now starting to import vast quantities of oil and natural gas from abroad, virtually all of it from the developing world.

By 1980, more than half of all the oil we consume must come from these countries. Suddenly, our relations with them are becoming vitally important. Can we any longer pretend that the major decisions affecting our economic well-being are ours to make alone? Can we any longer exclude the oil-producing states of the developing world from the great councils of the world economy? The answer to both questions is an obvious "No". Just as we have learned that our military security is inextricably bound up with the military security of the Soviet Union, so we must learn that our economic security, in energy, depends on awareness of the needs and the role in the outside world of these oil-producing states.

Energy is the most obvious example of our growing dependence on developing countries for our own future. Yet there are other examples, just over the horizon, that will soon compel our attention. By the middle of the next decade, we expect to depend on the outside world for the major part of at least ten of our fifteen most important strategic raw materials, from aluminum to zinc. Many of these must come from developing countries. And by the year 2000 -- the second

millennium -- that number may include all but one of these commodities. Surely, that is not a world in which we can continue to ignore what is happening beyond the narrow confines of rich and developed nations.

This is not just a matter for the distant future. During the past few years, we have seen that the strength and performance of our economy can be vitally affected by events taking place elsewhere. The "almighty dollar" has fallen, and with it the illusion that we could shelter behind an economic Fortress America while storms of economic trouble raged beyond our shores. American jobs are increasingly affected by goods produced elsewhere -- even leading large parts of American labor to turn against liberal trade. American investment is no longer as welcome as it once was, thus affecting American business adversely. American dollars no longer buy as much abroad, affecting all of us adversely.

To be sure, most of these problems center on our relations with other developed countries. It is to them we must look first in trying to buttress or replace the tottering institutions of international monetary relations. It is they who must be our essential partners in negotiations to promote trade among nations.

Yet many of the world's developing countries are now emerging from the wings to play a more important role. For example, it is possible that developing countries, working together, would retard an orderly transition to new, agreed rules of international monetary behavior, unless the rules were acceptable to them. The challenge to

American investment has increased in tempo in many developing countries, in a variety of industries. And the strength of our trading position, and of our ability to work towards an effective system of international trade, depends increasingly on developing countries, which take one-third of our exports: as many United States exports as the expanded European Community and Japan take together.

The success of the system set in motion at Bretton Woods was founded on mutual benefit, on mutual common interest, and on the general acceptance of a code of conduct. Can we repeat that success today and in the future if many countries are left out, to retreat into bitterness and to work what mischief they can? Surely there is a better way. And surely we should try that better way, the way of negotiations and accommodation with a broad spectrum of nations, both rich and poor, or we risk failure in the effort to help put together international economic institutions soundly based upon a sense of mutual advantage. It is becoming clear that, for these institutions to work well for us in the United States, they must work well for a far greater number of nations and peoples than ever before. This is no time for a new isolationism, not even in our interest.

There are other areas in which our position in the world, and our domestic well-being, are becoming more intertwined with developing countries. We need many of them for cooperation in meeting the long-range problem of global over-population: since population

run-away growth takes place mainly in the developing nations. One-half of the net annual growth comes from India, China, Pakistan, and Indonesia. We need the cooperation of a long list of developing countries in sharing the resources of the seas. Next year, at the Law of The Sea Conference, we will come face to face with poor country demands as we try to secure help in meeting our own ocean interests. And, especially, we may require the cooperation of developing countries in dealing with pollution that knows no national boundaries. Even to stop the rise of food prices in American supermarkets, we must increasingly turn to developing countries to feed themselves and others, as potentially the world's best source of low-cost food in the future. This would be helpful to the developing countries, too, since agriculture is labor intensive there, and they are plagued by chronic unemployment, as well as small reserves of foreign currency.

We must also be aware of the developing world as we Americans consider the remaining problems of our military security itself -- and as men everywhere continue to pursue the goal of Pacem in Terris. We cannot be unmindful of developing countries that are now fully able to build their own nuclear weapons, in a world that is too small and too interdependent to tolerate the use of this destructive power even in the most remote corners of the globe. We cannot be unmindful of conflicts among developing nations, born of the frustrations of misery and deprivation.

It is tempting today to speak of great power interests in isolating local conflicts. And as we have learned in Southeast Asia,

there are many conflicts in the developing world in which we have no interest, where our own involvement can only add to the toll of human suffering. From these conflicts the great nations of the world should properly remain aloof.

Yet we cannot ignore our shared responsibilities with other great nations to help solve conflicts among nations, where our efforts are welcome and can be productive, especially if the alternative would be a proliferation of nuclear weapons. Nor can we ignore our responsibilities to help relieve those circumstances of poverty and deprivation, where these help to promote armed conflict among peoples of the developing world.

There is no cause here for retreating to a discredited spirit of intervention; yet there is cause for not making conflict in the developing world more likely, through the reflexive and uncontrolled transfer of arms, by whatever means. And there is cause for watchfulness and concern, so that we may play what part we can in trying to change the conditions that make conflict and suffering more likely. Here, too, we must understand our interdependence with nations beyond the rich and powerful.

As Martin Buber wrote:

We cannot avoid
Using power,
Cannot escape the compulsion
To afflict the world,
So let us, cautious in diction
And mighty in contradiction,
Love powerfully.

By citing these examples of the growing interdependence between ourselves and many developing countries, I do not mean to imply that they will become our rivals in overall political or economic power. If economic issues come to a showdown between rich countries on the one hand, and developing countries on the other, it is certain that we would "win". Yet in the process all could lose, if it became impossible to establish agreed rules of international economic behavior that would have the willing allegiance of the great majority of nations. Nor do I wish to suggest that an attitude of cooperation will eliminate all economic and political conflict in our relations with developing countries; or to pretend that the developing world is one entity, implying one set of policies or acts for us to follow in meeting the challenge of our increasing interdependence. But it is critical, I believe, for us first to understand the basic trends of our relations with so many countries beyond the rich and the powerful. Once we understand these trends, we must insure that our view of the outside world and of our place in it includes due regard for nations and peoples outside the simple and insufficient patterns of overlapping triangles of great powers. We need to integrate these triangles, or any other rich-country geometry, with our interests in the developing world, as well.

We should also remember that narrow self-interest is not alone in determining our relations with the developing world, at least not a self-interest that is divorced from awareness of an

encompassing, global interest: an interest in humankind. The moral basis of American concern for people less well off than we are is as valid and important today as it ever was. As we have found so often, it is not possible for Americans to create foreign policies that are based on narrow self-interest alone, or that indulge in Machiavellian manipulation of power for its own sake. At times, this factor of moral concern in the American character has brought us and others to grief, through a misplaced missionary zeal. Yet most of the time, we have been able to combine a moral view of the world and of our place in it with a sense of self-restraint and genuine respect for the needs and views of others.

It would be tragic if we let the excesses and moral bankruptcy of the recent past, particularly in Southeast Asia, cause us to abandon moral concerns altogether, and retreat from all responsibility for what happens to others. It would be wrong for us to believe that we can attend to problems of poverty at home, while ignoring those abroad. We must attend to poverty, insofar as we can, wherever it is. Our concern for others can know no borders. Indeed, being able to show compassion abroad may be a necessary condition of being able to show it at home.

It should not be beyond our insights and our abilities to help meet the great common problems of mankind, problems of disease, illiteracy, overpopulation, famine, and of poverty itself. Nor should it be beyond our insights and abilities to tailor our involvements in developing countries to meet their needs, as they see them. We have

no monopoly of wisdom, and no mission to convert other peoples to our cultural values or form of government. In this, we are helped by our new and growing interdependence with China and Russia. Relations based on complementary interests are less likely to be paternalistic and demeaning. Relations not based on "giving" alone are less likely to produce a desire for "taking" that creates servants rather than equals. Relations based on a common interest in a workable system of international economics are less likely to produce bitterness and estrangement.

For some countries, of course, like those in the West African Sahel today, moral interest is not buttressed by self-interest, in motivating us to be concerned about their problems. Countries such as these can do little for us, and little to us. But here, too, a change in attitudes towards other, more important, developing countries can help us to recast relations on a basis of mutual respect and understanding, even where there can never be an equality of interests or benefits.

We are fortunate this year in having before us a new approach to foreign economic aid, just one of the many tools for demonstrating our commitment to development and to productive mutual relations with poor countries. The aid legislation (~~pending before~~) (~~passed by~~) Congress focuses squarely on a critical problem, the problem of greater social justice within countries as well as between *and among* them. It emphasizes three areas: first, agriculture, rural development,

and nutrition; second, population and health; and third, education and human resource development. These are areas directly related to the problems of the worst off people in the worst off countries, the 40% of the developing world's people who are the "poorest of the poor". In providing assistance to them, we (~~would be~~) (are) making a wise investment in the future of development, in relations among states, and in progress towards the goal of social justice among men, wherever they may live.

Beyond these concerns is a larger issue: the issue of equity among nations on planet earth. Today, we in the United States are the heirs of a bountiful heritage, both in material wealth and in the character of our people. Yet in our amassing of physical abundance, we are now creating problems for the rest of the world -- and for our own future. With 6% of the world's people, we consume more than a third of the world's energy and nearly 40% of its other raw materials. We are using up the world's storehouse of riches faster than any other nation, more wastefully and with more pollution. In times past, this was our concern alone: what was ours, was ours, and was part of a supposedly inexhaustible supply.

Now we know the supply is not inexhaustible, nor are we depleting only those resources within our own borders. Along with other rich countries, we reach out for raw materials and energy in other lands, essentially poor lands, and reduce what is left for them to consume, either now or in the lives of their children.

If we talk in terms of power, political, military, and economic power, then there is little to stop the wealthy few from continuing the pursuit of a monopoly on the earth's resources. It can be done, at risk of undermining that cooperation with developing countries that is now so important to us. But it is not beyond our ken to see that each addition to our own swollen consumption of limited resources denies them to others, and can rob others of the chance to walk even a short way on the road to better lives. We may indeed make fair exchange for many of the resources we consume, as in energy. The oil-producing states are receiving a growing share of the revenues from their precious resources. But this "fair trade" neglects billions of other people, in the resource-poor countries of the world, who gain no benefit from increasing oil revenues and who, in fact, must now pay higher prices for oil because of our rising consumption. Sustaining our affluence is costing them their development.

It would be fruitless and self-defeating for me to urge that the development of the United States, or of other rich countries, be drastically retarded in the interests of the world's developing countries. Yet with a vision of the world that is larger than ourselves and our concerns of the moment, we can see that isolated lives of abundance would be mocked by indifference to the needs and desires of the vast majority of the human family. No nation, conceived and dedicated as this one was, could long endure as a community of moral individuals, while ignoring what is happening outside its borders, while ignoring its own role in perpetuating misery. Nor could we hope

to secure the interests we have in developing countries if we did not also respond to their needs as well. In this, there is a happy coincidence of our self-interest as Americans, and our moral interest as part of the human family.

We should be guided by the fourth century insight of St.

Ambrose of Milan:

"You are not making a gift of your possessions to the poor person. You are handing over to him what is his. For what has been given in common for the use of all, you have arrogated to yourself. The world is given to all, not only to the rich".

Our philosophical need as a nation, therefore, is to change our vision of the world and of our place in it, so that we can extend the moral basis on which this country was founded and has grown, extend it not only to include all Americans, but also people elsewhere whose physical and spiritual futures are bound up with our own. In that way, we will be better able to adapt the details of new foreign policies, and to create a basis for relations with other countries, both rich and poor, that have a chance of rewarding us all, and creating a world that can benefit us well, because it also benefits others. This is the way we must seek that distant goal of Pacem in Terris. Or as another Latin saying has it: Opus justitiae, pax. Peace is the work of justice.