



School of Law
UNIVERSITY OF GEORGIA

Digital Commons @ Georgia Law

Scholarly Works

Faculty Scholarship

3-1-1983

A Message of Hope

Dean Rusk

University of Georgia School of Law



Repository Citation

Dean Rusk, *A Message of Hope* (1983),

Available at: https://digitalcommons.law.uga.edu/fac_artchop/186

This Article is brought to you for free and open access by the Faculty Scholarship at Digital Commons @ Georgia Law. It has been accepted for inclusion in Scholarly Works by an authorized administrator of Digital Commons @ Georgia Law. [Please share how you have benefited from this access](#)
For more information, please contact tstriepe@uga.edu.

A MESSAGE OF HOPE

*Dean Rusk**

When one starts out among the dour people of Cherokee County at the beginning of this century, one finds it difficult to discuss those things about which one feels deeply. Just let me say a very simple word of thanks to the participants who, I hope, will extend their remarks for the record, to Morris Leibman, Bernie Ramundo, and Gabriel Wilner, and to all those students who have served above and beyond the call of duty. I use that expression because that is the expression we use when we give a medal to somebody and all of you deserve a medal. I am grateful for your extraordinary generosity and many of your personal remarks about me, but I promise not to inhale.

My favorite story out of all those years in Washington is about the Senator who took his wife to one of those big VIP parties at the White House. The top people from Congress, the Supreme Court, the Cabinet, big business, and labor were there. It was a tremendous party, and afterwards, as he was driving his wife home, the Senator said, "You know, dear, there are not many really great men in the world are there?" And very quietly she replied, "There's one less than you think, dear." So, I can assure you that with a little help at home, I can keep these matters in some perspective.

In August 1945, I was in the War Plans Division of the War Department General Staff in the Pentagon, and although my little section knew about the existence and purpose of the Manhattan Project, we were outside of those carrying operational responsibility. I remember when the flash message came in from the Pacific that the city of Hiroshima had been destroyed in a single blast; a regular Army colonel at the next desk exclaimed, "War has turned upon itself and is devouring its own tail. From this point forward it will not be possible for nations to settle their disputes by war." Unhappily, that instinctive perception has not yet been fulfilled. Throughout human history it has been possible for the human race

*Samuel H. Sibley Professor of International Law, University of Georgia School of Law.

to pick itself up out of the death and destruction of war and start over again. We shall not have that chance after World War III.

Last Thursday I expressed some optimism about the possibility of avoiding a full nuclear war, and that optimism was genuine. I do not believe that nuclear powers will sit down and make a deliberate and calculated decision to launch such a war. They all understand that to do so would be mutual suicide. But if a man or group of men and women are driven into a corner from which they see no escape, and they lose all stake in the future, they might elect to play the role of Sampson and pull the temple down around themselves and everyone else at the same time. That was one of the reasons why President Kennedy went to very special pains not to drive Mr. Khrushchev into that kind of corner during the Cuban missile crisis. In Burma, during the war, we at times found it very difficult to get Chinese forces to completely surround Japanese forces. They explained to us that it was ancient Chinese military doctrine that you must never completely surround an enemy; you must always leave him a route of escape, otherwise he will fight too hard. At that time we were both amused and frustrated by this notion. But I now have on my desk a copy of the Fourth Century B.C. Chinese treatise on the Art of War attributed to Sun Tzu, which says never surround an enemy and leave him no alternative to death. That Fourth Century B.C. doctrine becomes vitally important in a Twentieth Century nuclear world.

If I am relatively optimistic about the nuclear sides of things, I am not optimistic about any prospect that internal conflicts will diminish. During my eight years with President Kennedy and President Johnson, there were eighty-two coup d'états somewhere in the world — about ten or a dozen a year. In passing, I will tell you that the CIA did not cause a single one of those. If you count carefully, you can count some five hundred situations of violence since 1945 somewhere in the world. For those who think that we reach out to assume the role of the world's policeman, I would like to point out that the United States was involved in about seven of those.

The Global 2000 Report reminds us that by the year 2000 we can expect just a little below six and a half billion people on this planet. Unless some major things are done, which are not now being done, before these students get to be my age they will face the prospect of from twelve to fifteen billion people on this planet. One of the earliest causes of war in the history of the human race, the pressures of people upon resources, is being revived in a world

filled with nuclear weapons. I suggest that we cannot rely very much on Mr. Malthus and his truism — war, pestilence, and starvation — because communications are such that large numbers of people simply will not starve peacefully. I remember a long talk that Prime Minister Nehru gave me once about how easy it is to lead a revolution and how difficult it is to build a nation. Since many of these problems of pressures upon resources will be especially felt among the so-called developing countries, although we all face the prospect, the hounds of hell are snapping at the heels of these leaders because of the urgent needs of their own people. I see no way by which those needs can be met at the consumer level by the developed nations, although there are many, many things which we can do to help them to a better rather than a lesser fate.

So I think we are going to have the prospect of not diminishing, but increasing, internal violence for as long as I can see into the future. But I have just about come to the conclusion, in my own mind anyhow, that what we call internal conflicts are matters of genuine international concern. I think we can long since say that article 2(7) of the United Nations Charter no longer prevents serious, egregious violations of human rights from being taken up as matters of international concern. Ranging from the Universal Declaration of Human Rights all the way around to the Helsinki Accords, which Ambassador Kampelman so brilliantly discussed for us today, surely we must come to the point where we have to say that internal conflicts are matters of international concern despite article 2(7), because they are indeed a threat to peace.

I give you this background because my approach to our subject aims at the notion that we must do all we can to keep these internal conflicts from spreading into ever larger conflagrations. I suggest that priority be given to situations involving the use of force across international frontiers, and for the time being at least, situations not involving the use of force should be given secondary priority. One wishes that the wave of a wand would resolve such problems, but I have two rather modest suggestions to put before you. I am among those who believe that the United Nations General Assembly did something very important when it proclaimed the Declaration on Friendly Relations and the Definition of Aggression, because it gave flesh and bones to some of the sparse language of the Charter on matters affecting the possibility of maintaining international peace. You will remember that both of those documents are the result of work over a period of six or seven years by committees with more than thirty members who repre-

sented all political points of view and the major geographical areas in the world.

I wonder if it would be possible for us to think about a General Assembly Declaration on the Responsibility of States Regarding Internal Conflicts. I find the existing resolutions about non-intervention to be inadequate; it might be useful, even if we achieve no final and satisfactory result, to make the effort to talk together about which acts of intervention should be prohibited. We might take up that very interesting list of gradations of intervention that Louis Sohn talked to us about yesterday. I would have to say to my good friend Covey Oliver, who was so generous to me this morning, that at the moment I would concentrate on those things directly involving the use of force. I realize the strength of his concern about and interest in economic sanctions and pressures and denials, but there is an urgency about force that causes me to want to give it first priority.

I have in mind the kind of declaration which, in discussing the prohibition on the use of force with regard to internal conflict, that is, the use of force across national frontiers, would also throw some light on what kind of counter action would be lawful. In other words, just as the prohibited actions in the Declaration on Friendly Relations and in the Definition of Aggression almost certainly trigger the right of self-defense, a general agreement on which types of intervention are prohibited might also throw some light on which kinds of counter action would be permissible. It may be that John Norton Moore and his new Center for Law and National Security at the University of Virginia, with a little nudge from some of the rest of us, might try their hand at drafting a Declaration on the Responsibilities of States with Regard to Internal Conflict. In the process, we might be able to sort out some of those double standards which have greatly confused us in the post-war world.

In the early 1970's, President Nixon and Mr. Kissinger talked a good deal about *détente*. For most of that period, back in the Soviet Union the talk was about peaceful coexistence and they were saying to themselves that peaceful coexistence means the continuation of the struggle by all means short of war—which is hardly a synonym for *détente*. Finally the Soviets realized that there were good brownie points in using this word *détente*, so they picked it up and began to use it.

The concepts of decolonization and third world revolution have been successfully used by them under rubrics such as wars of liberation. Decolonization in its classical sense has just about run its

course and is almost disappearing from the scene—I emphasize, in its classical sense. But it leaves us with the principal colonial area in the world today located in Eastern Europe. It has not been possible to get world attention thinking about that situation in colonial terms because I suspect that there are not enough differences in the races involved, and secondly, there is no ocean between the Soviet Union and Eastern Europe.

A little postscript on Professor Rohlik's remarks about the Brezhnev Doctrine. In early October 1968, I made the principal speech for the United States at the United Nations General Assembly. This was just after the invasion of Czechoslovakia and the enunciation of the Brezhnev Doctrine. In that speech I addressed a series of questions to Mr. Gromyko, who was sitting there in front of me, about the impact of the Brezhnev Doctrine on such things as the independence of nations, the sovereignty of each member of the United Nations, and the right of self-determination of peoples. Afterwards, every delegation of Eastern Europe, except one, found a way to get a message to me saying, "Thank you for making our speech." I say, save one; I must say that because if this remark should get back to Moscow, each Eastern European country must be in a position to say, "We were that one."

If we try to focus upon and outlaw certain kinds of activity, there may be people in Washington who would object on the grounds that we must keep our own hand free to engage in some of that activity. I personally think that giving up such activities would be no concession at all on our part because we do not do them very well. In those two or three cases which have been cited over the years as great successes for clandestine types of operations, my impression, as I have examined them in some detail, is that the role of our own people has been greatly exaggerated and that we made too many claims for our little cloaks and daggers.

Now a second point. I have been concerned about what seems to be a rather steady erosion of the role of the United Nations Security Council as being primarily responsible for the maintenance of international peace and security. Today we know about the Falkland Islands problems which could erupt at any moment into a much larger scale of violence. For about a year and a half or a little more, Iraq and Iran have been engaged in an active war with each other. Soviet forces are in Afghanistan, and the situation in Lebanon is simply a hair trigger away from another round of major violence. I would suppose that under these circumstances the Security Council would be meeting every day, if necessary around the clock

at times, whether in public or private session, to wrestle with problems of this sort.

Over the years something called the prestige of the United Nations has appeared. This idea is that the United Nations must not act where it cannot succeed, because to do so would injure the prestige of the United Nations. There were times when, by counting noses in advance, we could not even count nine votes in the Security Council to bring Vietnam onto the agenda. I suggest that it is not the duty of the Security Council to protect the prestige of the United Nations; it is the duty of the Security Council to grapple with situations of violence and to try to bring more, rather than less, peace in the world. I would like to see any Secretary-General take the Charter as his Bible and fight for it regardless of the consequences, and not be driven into a standing attitude of timidity simply because his job is subject to the veto of any one of the five permanent members of the Security Council.

I would hope, and I say this with respect, that many of the smaller, newly independent countries would somehow leap beyond their picture of the globe as they see it and put their minds and efforts into the broader problems of bringing some peace to *homo sapiens*, the Family of Man, of which we are all members, because their preoccupation with other urgent questions tends to diminish their interest in problems of peace as a whole.

I wonder if there is not room for a Standing Commission on Internal Conflicts under the Security Council of the United Nations, a standing commission in the nature of a commission of inquiry. Its task would be to try to get information about situations of internal conflict, to try to determine whether they are genuinely internal, or whether there are those of us outside who are trying to play games with the situation. I think there is great strength in what Frank Newman meant this morning when he used that very happy phrase "the mobilization of shame." The first case before the Security Council, Azerbaidzhan, was resolved because it became possible to persuade the Soviets that it was no longer in their interest to try to keep their troops in that province of Iran. The same kinds of factors eventually operated to relieve the blockade of Berlin after a period of months.

Now I would suppose that no such standing commission could function if the commission itself were subject to veto. It should be free to make majority reports, minority reports, or even multiple reports. It may well be, and I add this because of what was said here this morning, that it should be ready to take full account of

the activities of other bodies such as the Organization of African Unity or the Organization of American States, but that it may find ways to deal with the problems without letting these matters grow.

I am a bit concerned by the notion that we should somehow be a little careful about putting too many restraints on intervention because, after all, there are some changes which need to be brought about. But when we talk about change by external force, I become very cautious. I am inclined to agree with Mr. Roger Clark that humanitarian intervention for the purpose of bringing about a different or better condition is something we had better leave to one side. I can see humanitarian intervention for the purpose of rescuing the hostages in Stanleyville, or in Entebbe, or in Mogadishu, where there is no government present, willing, and able to give the protection to those people who are directly involved. In the Declaration on Friendly Relations there is a very important section, highly relevant to the Falklands matter, which says that force shall not be used for the settlement of territorial disputes or frontier disputes, the notion being that whatever these problems are, they are not to be settled by force. Because of my concern about the capabilities of *homo sapiens* to survive, I suggest that we had better be very careful about the use of force to bring about an improvement in conditions, even though those conditions may appear to be pretty dreadful. Insofar as law is concerned, I do not see how we can avoid a bias in favor of existing and generally recognized governments, whether of the left or of the right, governments that we may not like or approve of, because if the law tries to weave its way among all the value judgments made about different regimes, then my guess is that law will simply wither away. Therefore, the country that is governed by a bunch of rascals must be accorded the protections of international law.

However, there is a difference between law and action. I would keep the law pretty simple on these matters. When you get to the state of action and who does what about what, then perhaps some differentiation can be made. I must confess to you that I, myself, did not believe that President Nyerere's invasion of Uganda was lawful. But I must say, I felt that we would not miss Idi Amin at all so I was not prepared to lift a finger to do very much about it. Maybe the occasional slippage from the law is about the best that we can do, but I would not try to complicate the law by drawing these value judgments.

I would like to make a concluding remark about human rights in these matters. I yield to no one in my concern about human rights,

foreign or domestic. I think that it is right that we proclaim our views of these basic political commitments that seem to us to stem from the very nature of man himself. I think it is right that we press for them in international forums, that we work persistently, and often quietly, but as effectively as we can, to help other nations to improve the human rights situation. I am ashamed as an American that our Senate has not yet given advice and consent to the Genocide Convention, which I personally presented to the Senate on behalf of President Truman in 1949. I would like to see us ratify the two United Nations Covenants subject to two simple reservations concerning any possible clash with the Constitution and the question of the legislation required to make them operational. But I would hope that however active we are, and I think we should be active in these many international efforts that we have been talking about at this meeting, that somehow we avoid desperately the elements of arrogance and sanctimony.

This week the State Department issued the latest volume in the world survey of human rights, which is called for by an act of Congress, and which comments on the human rights situation around the world, including New Zealand, the Netherlands and Denmark, Costa Rica, the United Kingdom, and all other countries. Up to this year there has never been a section about the United States. I have not seen the one that came out this week, but I hope they change that. It is pure arrogance for us to suppose that somehow we are the den mother of the world with regard to human rights.

And then sanctimony. Less than twenty years ago, which was less than yesterday, a black ambassador coming to your national capital to represent his country did not know where he could have lunch or dinner except at another embassy — private clubs would not receive him, restaurants and hotels were very chancey indeed. He had difficulty finding living space for himself and his colleagues, difficulty finding office space if he needed extra office space. He would drive his family down to a Maryland beach on a Saturday afternoon and be turned away. His wife asked a State Department wife to go to the supermarket with her because she was nervous about incidents. When the ambassador wanted to visit another part of the country, we had to send an advance officer to make arrangements to insure that he would not be embarrassed. A representative to the United Nations, on his way from south of the border, was on a plane which landed in Miami for refueling. While the other passengers on the plane went into the terminal dining room to have lunch, he was put on a folding canvas stool in the

corner of the terminal and given a sandwich wrapped in wax paper. Does it mean anything to you to have me say to you that one of these ambassadors sat in the office of your Secretary of State and said, "Mr. Secretary, where can I have a haircut?" And I could not tell him, except to say, "You can have one where I have mine, right here in my office, anytime, just drop by," because that was the only place that I personally knew that I could certify to him. There have been enormous changes since then, but we must be a little careful about how far we press our views of human rights at the expense of time to organize some peace in the world. To me the possibilities of survival, almost axiomatically, take first place, because if that is possible, then we may be able to deal more effectively with some of these other problems.

So I would hope, based upon the extraordinarily interesting discussion that we have had here during this Colloquium, that we try to follow it up a bit and not be too discouraged about the modesty of certain things that might be done, but see if we cannot find some way to encapsulate, surround, isolate these internal violence situations so that they do not contribute to those great struggles which could end us all.

Thank you very much.

LIST OF PARTICIPANTS

Milner S. Ball; University of Georgia School of Law
Dr. John J. Broderick; Campbell University School of Law
Roger Clark; Rutgers Law School
John Luis Antonio de Passalacqua; University of Puerto Rico
School of Law
Bart De Schutter; Vrije Universiteit Brussel
Col. G.I.A.D. Draper; Lewes, Sussex, England
Richard W. Edwards, Jr.; University of Toledo School of Law
Martin Feinrider; Nova University Law Center
Richard L. Fruchterman, Jr.; International Communication Agency
George D. Haimbaugh, Jr.; University of South Carolina School of
Law
Jack B. Hood; Cumberland School of Law
Calvin M. Howard; Cumberland School of Law
Dr. N.E.H. Hull; University of Georgia
Max Kampelman; Freid, Frank, Harris, Shriver & Kampelman
Nicholas N. Kittrie; American University
Mary Lee; ABA Standing Committee on Law and National
Security
Morris I. Leibman; ABA Standing Committee on Law and Na-
tional Security
Harold G. Maier; Vanderbilt Law School
Michael J. Matheson; United States Department of State
Thomas E. McCarthy; United Nations Division of Human Rights
Gale McGee; former Ambassador to the Organization of American
States
John McIntyre; Georgia Institute of Technology
Jewell Miller; Cumberland School of Law
John Norton Moore; University of Virginia School of Law
John F.T. Murray; St. Louis University
Frank C. Newman; Boalt Hall School of Law, University of
California
Covey T. Oliver; former President, American Society of Interna-
tional Law
O. Otunnu; Ambassador to the United Nations from Uganda
Jordan J. Paust; University of Houston Law Center
Lawrence Pezzullo; Department of State
The Honorable R.K. Ramphul; Ambassador to the United Nations
from Mauritius
Bernard A. Ramundo; ABA Standing Committee on Law and Na-
tional Security

Charles H. Randall, Jr.; University of South Carolina School of Law
Robert A. Riegert; Cumberland School of Law
Davis R. Robinson; United States Department of State
Josef Rohlik; St. Louis University School of Law
James Rowles; University of Pittsburg School of Law
Alan Swets; President BAEC
Louis B. Sohn; University of Georgia School of Law
Waldemar A. Solf; Washington College of Law
Allen Sultan; University of Dayton Law School
Paul C. Szasz; Office of Legal Affairs, United Nations
M/Gen. Larry Williams; ABA Standing Committee on Law and National Security
Gabriel M. Wilner; University of Georgia School of Law

COLLOQUIUM COMMITTEE

David Hegwood
Tom Herbelin
Diane McNamara
Kent Murphy
Michael Quilling
Thomas Scott

1982-1983
MANAGING BOARD

Editor in Chief
JONATHAN M. ENGRAM

Executive Editor
DAVID W. HULL

Managing Editor
VICKI A. BREMAN

Notes Editors
BETTY BENTLEY
WILLIAM A. GILLON
CHERIE TAYLOR

Resource Editor
JANET M. BOLT

Research Editors
KIM CLARKE
EDWARD P. GIBBONS

Articles Editors
MAIJA S. BLAUBERGS
JOHN A. HILL
DIANE E. MCNAMARA

Recent Developments Editors
ERIC T. JOHNSON
JACK LYLE
LALLA SHISHKEVISH

Special Projects Editor
DAVID HEGWOOD

EDITORIAL BOARD

FRED A. BADING
JAMES BASKIN
BIRNEY O'BRIAN BULL
JAMES COLE CARTLEDGE
DEIRDRE A. CODY
HENRY CYRUS
MICHAEL K. DENNARD
H. VINCENT DRAA III
JOSEPH M. GANNAM
S. RICHARD GARD, JR.
COLIN M. GROMLEY

EDWARD P. HUDSON
JAMES KING
EDWARD H. LINDSEY, JR.
MELANIE L. MARKS
KEVIN MASON
TODD E. NAUGLE
J. KENNARD NEAL
JOHN O'CONNOR
LEONARD C. PARKS, JR.
BENNO G. ROTHSCHILD, JR.

ROBB SALLEE
JEFFREY SMITH SHARP
BERNARD SNELL
W. SCOTT SORRELS
R. BRYAN STRUBLE, JR.
ALAN N. SUTIN
ELLEN THOMPSON
PHILLIP THOMPSON
ROBERT P. WILLIAMS II
TERESA WILLIAMS
DOUGLAS YARN

Executive Secretary
CHARLENE WILMOT

Faculty Advisors

DEAN RUSK
Sibley Professor International Law

GABRIEL M. WILNER
Professor of Law

