LAS VEGAS VOICE

ANDREW YOUNG'S FAREWELL ADDRESS

(Over the past weekend, the news was full of Andrew Young's last day as U.S. Ambassador to the U.N. Here is, in full, text of Youngs' personal statement to the United Nations Security Council, August 24th, 1979.)

May I take the liberty to speak for a few moments, not as the Representative of my Government but to speak in my capacity as a friend and colleague of all of you who are present. I take this liberty because it was not my design that I should be leaving this Council at a time when I was serving as its President. I hardly anticipated that this would occur as such. And yet I have no regrets for what has occurred; in fact, I see it as a part of a plan of the work of this Council, a part of the work of this Council which I intend to be associated with long after I have left you.

It's been indeed a pleasure, and many of you have referred to the fact that we have in many respects reversed our relationships with much of the rest of the world. That's certainly most obvious with Africa, the world. That's certainly most obvious with Africa, but it's probably just as true in terms of our relation-ships in the early days of my presence on this Council when the so called 'Gang of Five'' or the European and Western members of the Security Council worked together to begin to bring about a peaceful transition to majority rule for the Nation of Namibia. Our relationships with Latin America have certainly been improved, not so much as a result of my work but as a result of a national policy which began almost immediately in this Administration to negotiate an agreement with the Nation of Panama on the utilization and transfer of responsibility and authority on the question of the Panama Canal. And as a result of that our relations with Latin America have been greatly improved and we find ourselves in this hemisphere with a kind of respect and partnership in development that we have long sought and are very pleased to have been a part of. I would say that even our relationship with the Soviet Union in the past two and a half years has taken a very definite step forward as we have sought to negotiate Strategic Arms Limitation Treaties and to come to a new understanding of how we might work together in this world to fully realize the principles in which we share and also to avoid conflicts in areas where we might disagree. We've seen also improvement in our relationship with the People's Republic of China, and our involvement in Southeast Asia has emerged on a new and improved basis in spite of the tensions and problems which still exist there. Our relationships with the Arab world, I think, have made this kind of debate and dialogue possible. And the progress that we are making in these discussions around the Security Council table are part of a long period of conversations and negotiations which have gone on for many years and which I think are just beginning to bear fruit.

Most important, I think, is that we have been able to maintain our friendships and our responsibilities with our allies and with the Nation of Israel while expanding our communication and our involvement with new friends and partners in the search for peace and security and development in this world. I think the thing that I'm perhaps most proud of by my association with this Council and especially with my Government over the last two and a half years, is that for perhaps the longest time in my lifetime my Nation has gone about its business in the world, has advanced its interests, and none of our soldiers has had to kill anyone else, neither has any of our young people been called upon to die in the uniform of their country. I think that's a testimony to our desire to search for peace and to bring about peaceful solutions to problems; problems that we have been struggling with as nations for many many decades.

I must say that I have no quarrel with this Administration; in fact, I'm quite proud of it. I have no quarrel with the President or the White House. In spite of petty differences with the Department of State, there have been no differences with the Secretary of State and overwhelmingly, I would say, we basically share a sense of conviction and direction about the way things should move in today's world.

I don't think that I was set up by my Arab or Israeli friends. I think that whatever happened leading to my resignation was something that I entered into very much with my eyes open and comes not out of any quarrel with any person or any institution, but rather a fundamental disagreement with a policy, one that I sought to run from for two and a half years, for I never agreed with it. And yet when I found myself taking on the Presidency of the Security Council and being faced with an issue which required a certain level of communication and understanding, I thought that there was no particular risk involved in that communication beyond the risk of my job; and my job has never been particularly important to me. My responsibilities to my country, my responsibilities to as brothers and not as enemies bloodthirsty for the destruction of each other. And so there has to be a renunciation of violence on all sides and a beginning to communicate about the possibilities of peace in the region. One of our colleagues in the Secretariat who has been moving back and forth between Israel and the PLO in the situation in southern Lebanon made the matter of fact remark, "It's amazing how similar they are--the people around Weizman and the people around Arafat. If they could ever get together they would be a powerful combination." I think and hope that we will live to see that day, the day when people



NEW AMBASSADOR-President Carter and outgoing U.N. Ambassador Andrew Young congratulate Donald F. McHenry at White House after he was sworn in to replace Young.

the ideals and principles in which I believe are important to me. And so it was no great decision on my part to visit the home of my friend and to meet another friend.

I hope that in some small way it may have opened up a question to the American people that will call attention to some of the tragic history of our nation as a result of the refusal to communicate. It was a result of the refusal to communicate with the People's Republic of China and a denial of the existence of 800 million people for almost 20 years that led us into escalation and was in Korea. It led us into war with Vietnam. We could not end that war in Vietnam until we started talking and communicating with the People's Republic of China. We are not any weaker nor is the world in any worse place because we have opened up a dialogue in communication with the People's Republic of China. And perhaps there may have been 100,000 or more American men and women whose lives would have been saved by talking with the People's Republic of China in 1951, 1952.

The same might be said of the situation in the Middle East. And it was because I felt that not talking would contribute to violence and bloodshed that I thought the risks of talking to the PLO were nothing compared to the risk of the bloodshed, the violence the possible destruction and disruption of the relationships which we enjoy with many, many people in that region of the Middle East.

I've said that it's a ridiculous policy not to talk to the PLO, and I think it is a ridiculous policy. But if it is ridiculous not to talk to the PLO on the part of the United States and the Nation of Israel, it's also ridiculous for many of you around this table not to have good relations with the Nation of Israel. For ultimately if we are going to have peace in that region people have got to approach each other as friends and in the Middle East can recognize their common heritage of values whether it be from the Judeo-Christian side or the Christian-Moslem side, and somehow bring together those values and ideals which we share across cultures and faiths that make it possible for us to exist together in this organization.

