

UNST  
DPI  
ORAL  
HISTORY  
(02)/R767  
Eng.  
Cop.1

Pt. II

UN LIBRARY  
UN/SA COLLECTION

MAR 23 1994

UN INTERVIEW  
General Carlos P. Romulo  
Interviewer: William Powell

Table of Contents

America Liaison (Philippine Delegation)	3
Announcement of Soviet Nuclear Power	18
Article 76	21
Balkan Commission	21
Battlegrounds for Two Ideologies	19
Chairman Rotation	3,11
Charter (writing of UN)	
Conference at San Francisco	1
Evolving Process	20
Provisions for Review	7
Special Committee for Review	12,13
Stipulations to Avoid Failure	2
Commander Harold Stassen	3
Critical Issues at San Francisco	5
Dumbarton Oaks Conference	2
Economic and Social Council	6
International Court of Justice	15
Intervention in Korea	8
Manila Declaration	9
Media Expectations	5,16
Peacekeeping Organization	14
President of General Assembly	17
President of Security Council	19
Regional Organizations-ASEAN	6
Rockefeller, Nelson	10
Secretary Edward Stettinius	11
Site of Conference	10
Specialized Agencies	14
State of Israel	18
UN Force	15
UN Presence	9
Uniting for Peace	13
Veto Power	8

MASTER COPY

Powell: Good morning, Gen. Romulo.

Romulo: Good morning.

Powell: During our previous interview, we talked about many aspects of your involvement in the United Nations. Today we would like to focus on some of the issues that we were not able to cover in depth, starting if we may, with your participation in the UN Charter Conference in San Francisco in 1945. General, when you arrived in San Francisco, did you have the feeling that the superpowers had called the Conference together merely to ratify the proposals and decisions which had been taken at Dumbarton Oaks and Yalta, or did you feel that they were genuinely interested in seeking the views of the smaller nations as to how the draft proposals could be revised and improved?

Romulo: Well, I believe that the superpowers really wanted to have an organization, a world organization, that would help to organize peace and world security. I do think they had the idea of making of us, the small countries, robots that will only approve whatever they have decided. In fact, the Dumbarton Oaks meetings were only preliminary to establish the groundwork for what they believed would be the United Nations organization. Now, in the Dumbarton Oaks there were scholars who were there and I believe they knew in depth the reasons for the failure of the League of Nations and they wanted to avoid such gaps as caused the failure of the League of Nations. They were scholars and they were well-versed in what the government of the United States wanted to organize -- that was an organization of nations that could come together and think of having peace established after the World War.

Powell: You mentioned the League of Nations, sir, during the course of the San Francisco meetings, were the precedents, the procedures, the experience of the League of Nations taken into account in drafting the Charter?

/...

Romulo: In some phases of the Charter, yes. Ah, in many instances the words of Woodrow Wilson . . . words of Woodrow Wilson were taken into consideration and the failure of the . . . the failure of his efforts to make the United States join the League of Nations were considered quite in-depth.

Powell: As you were saying, General, about Woodrow Wilson and the League of Nations, this was very much on your mind and on the minds of the other delegations in San Francisco.

Romulo: Yes. All of us wanted to avoid the steps that caused the failure of the League of Nations. Now what we envisioned in San Francisco was an organization that would be universal. That was one of the outstanding characteristics that we wanted for the new organization to have, universality, and that was very well placed in the Charter, the universality of the organization.

Powell: You mentioned earlier the Dumbarton Oaks Conversations in which you participated, hence you came of the Conference relatively well-prepared and you had a close liaison with the US State Department. Did you feel that some of the smaller countries came less well-prepared?

Romulo: First of all, I must correct. I did not participate in the Dumbarton Oaks Conference. I was only an observer; I was there under sufferance because I had no business being there, but I was allowed to observe and listen. I never said a word. So let us not make that mistake. I did not participate in the Dumbarton Oaks. I was there as a by-stander, that is the correct word, as an on-looker, a by-stander. Now, I was interested in how the State Department was going to organize a world organization that would give the small nations the participation that I wanted the small nations to have. You see at that time we had the Asians voiceless. In several conferences before the organization of the United Nations, the Asians had no participation and so my interest was to listen and see what the intention was of the organizers of the world

organization regarding the role of the small nations and I found that they had that in mind, that the small nations had to participate. In fact, when I was appointed Chairman of the Philippine delegation by the President of the Philippines, the following day I went to see Secretary Stettinius in the State Department. I was fortunate to have been his friend for some time. So I told him that I had been appointed and that I wanted him to know that I was going to be in San Francisco, but that at the same time I wanted him also to tell me whether or not a small country like the Philippines would be outside the United Nations organization during the Conference or that I would be in. And he said, "How would you remedy that?" So I said, "Well, how about appointing a member of the American delegation as your liaison officer with the Philippine delegation?" He said, "We will do that." And that was done.

Powell: Was that Commander Stassen?

Romulo: No. It was somebody . . . I don't remember his name now. No, Commander was a member of the American delegation and he was the representative of the American delegation in the Trusteeship Council, or the Trusteeship Committee. There was no Council yet.

Powell: Tell me, at the beginning of the San Francisco Conference, what was the atmosphere like; was it cordial, co-operative, or was it strained?

Romulo: It was cordial, except when Molotov, at the first caucus of the Chief delegates, proposed that there be five rotating chairmen of the Conference [Editor's Note: Molotov actually proposed there be four.] and not as had been the international practice, (that) the Chairman of the host delegation should be the chairman of the entire Conference. He opposed that, as I said to you last time, and he won. So there were five rotating chairmen.

./...

Romulo: It does.

Powell: I thought it was in (the section on) Trusteeship system.

Romulo: Well yes, because that was the important thing. But we did not fight in the other one.

Powell: Oh, I see.

Romulo: Because we thought that was needed in the non-self-governing peoples (section); "independence" was the key-word and we won there.

Powell: Now, you have mentioned the Trusteeship system and you have mentioned the veto. Were there other crucial issues debated at the Conference?

Romulo: I think there were. I think there were, but those were the crucial issues. Yes, I do not remember now. If I think further, I can remember some.

Powell: We may come back to that then. Did you ever anticipate that the Conference might end in failure?

Romulo: No, although the Chicago Tribune practically every day wrote articles foreseeing the failure of the United Nations. The Chicago Tribune called the United Nations the tower of Babel and it said that these fighting nations will not be able to sign the Charter because they are a tower of Babel. The Chicago Tribune called us the tower of Babel. But after three months, we signed the Charter.

Powell: Yes. Now, I recall that the Philippine delegation was active concerning the Charter provisions for the Economic and Social Council. Why did you favour regional representation in the Council?

Romulo: Well, to begin with, from the very beginning, we believed that regional organizations would help make the United Nations more effective. And so there is a provision in the Charter which applies and approves regional organizations. For example now, if we did not have regional organizations in the United Nations, we would not be able to approve many of the questions that are submitted to the United Nations. Take our group, the ASEAN group, for example. Five nations together, we vote always as one, after we discuss the problem. The Latin American group also votes as one. Compare the United Nations to a crossword puzzle. When you have these puzzles together, it is easier to put them together instead of putting them separately one by one. So that is the advantage of having these regional organizations.

Powell: Now, as a follow-up to this matter of the Economic and Social Council, has it lived up to your expectation? Many people have criticized it as being swamped with paper and duplicating the work of the second and third committees of the Assembly.

Romulo: That is a misunderstanding of the work of the United Nations. The Americans always think that there is too much documentation, too much paper work. Well, without that paper work, we would not be intelligent enough or reasonable enough to know what is happening. Because there are so many questions in the United Nations. And we need paper work to study them. Without that paper work, we will be voting ignorantly of the questions involved. Now for example, they say -- and your paper always say that -- that this General Debate is useless, it is only for home consumption. Well, they say that because the New York Times always publishes only the speeches of the Secretary of the State of the United States and of the Foreign Minister of the Soviet Russia in full. They ignore the speeches of the small nations. But it is not true this is only for home consumption. It is only now with the United Nations that the small nations can lift their heads above the water and talk to the world. That was not possible before. Before, it was only Great Britain, Germany, France, United States, Soviet Russia who could speak to the world. Now the small nations have this forum where they can air their grievances,

speak of their ideals and aspirations, which was unknown before. And so, first, documentation is necessary to make us more knowledgeable about what is happening in the United Nations. Secondly, the United Nations is now the only forum. Where can you find a forum anywhere in the world of 157 nations together? When the general debate happens and all the foreign ministers are there, 157 foreign ministers from every corner of the globe speak to the world and they tell their grievances, their ambitions. Well of course, the New York Times and the other American papers are not interested in what these small nations say. But what they say is published in the small papers all over the world, you see, and that is quite the difference. The Americans think that they are only the ones who must be heard. Well of course, they are entitled to that; they are a superpower. But if we have universality in the United Nations and we have small nations there, these small nations are also entitled to be heard.\*

Powell: Now, one of the final paragraphs in the Charter, I think, General, has a provision for a periodic review of the Charter and, as we all know, no formal Charter Review Conference has ever been called because of the opposition of the superpowers.

Romulo: I was one of those.

Powell: Did the superpowers oppose the Charter review provision at San Francisco or hadn't they looked far enough down the road?

Romulo: Well, there has been initial opposition to that article in the Charter which about ten of us insisted that it should be there; that is ten years after signing the Charter there should be a general conference in order to find out what changes or suggestions can be made in accordance with the circumstances of the day to improve the Charter. Well, the United Nations superpowers have always opposed the holding of the Conference. So that article in the United Nations Charter is a deadletter. The superpowers are against. And they say, "What is the use

---

\* Technical Interruption

... ..

of opening Pandora's box?" Well, I said, "Pandora's box is full of holes anyway!" And I remember Foreign Minister Gromyko came to me one day and he said, "General, you are one of the fathers of the Charter and you want to kill the baby." I said, "No, what we want is to give the baby more vitamins so it will be stronger and live longer!" But that is their opposition to the conference. They do not want to have any conference that may endanger their veto power because they know, there is a feeling, overwhelming feeling in the United Nations that that veto power must be changed. I personally am not in favour of abolishing the veto power, but I believe it should be diluted in the sense that it cannot be used for trivial cases; that the veto power should only be used when the question involves peace or war. But as you know, Soviet Russia exercises the veto power more than two hundred times, for some of them, very trivial cases.

For example, how did we get the United Nations intervention in Korea without the veto of Soviet Russians? Well, that is a very good story. You know the strategy of the Communists, as it was the strategy of the Japanese during the war, was always to attack on a Saturday because they know that the Christian world is paralyzed on Sunday. Well, that happened in the case of Korea. So when Secretary -- I do not know whether this was Acheson or Dulles -- called me up and said, "We do not want America to be branded as a warmonger or as an aggressor but we believe that there should be intervention in Korea, and if we intervene alone, we will be branded as a war aggressor." So I said to him, "Well, let us have the United Nations intervene there." "But," he said, "it is impossible; the Russians will veto it." So I said, "It is Saturday today; tomorrow we can have a meeting of the Security Council." "Yes, we tried that. We cannot locate Tryve Lie, we do not know where he is." I said, "I know where he is. He is with Barnard Baruch. They are hunting in some place. And if you send an American plane, military plane, pick them up, and we can meet on Sunday." So they did that. They found Tryve Lie with Baruch. The meeting was Sunday; the Russians were not there. The intervention in Korea was decided. The United Nations took up the fight instead of America alone taking up the fight and there was no veto.



The Russians were not there. And that is how Korean intervention took place. Now, I ask you, since Truman was a President who was always deciding cases on the basis of is it moral, is it right -- if it is moral and right, we do it. Well, that was moral and righteous intervention in Korea. So he would have decided America to intervene there. But if America alone would have done it without using the cover of the United Nations, well the world would have said America is an aggressor, a warmonger. And that is one of the uses that the United Nations has made that is ignored by the Americans.

Powell: Right. Let us come back for a moment to this question of the Charter review. Recently, I think only yesterday, the Assembly adopted the Manila Declaration on the peaceful settlement of disputes. What is the significance of this Declaration and this development, General, in your view?

Romulo: You see now, before the Manila Declaration, the adversaries had a cease-fire. In the interregnum of the cease-fire, nothing is done by the United Nations. Now this Manila Declaration provides that there be a continuous discussion between the adversaries in order to come to a conclusion that may mean peace, and that is the importance of the Manila Declaration. There is no such provision in the Charter. So it is not only the cease-fire which is a cooling-off period, but a cease-fire cooling-off that is useful, because the adversaries must continue to talk and negotiate.

Powell: So in a sense, this is an extension of the Charter.

Romulo: It is a question of an extension of the Charter. Another extension of the Charter that is ignored is what Secretary General Hammarskjöld invented when he invented what is known as the United Nations presence, which has been very effective. That is not in the Charter, that is not in the Security Council decision, but the Secretary-General took the initiative of inventing that word "United Nations presence" and it has been very effective in many cases.

... ..

Powell: Now, looking back over 37 years to San Francisco, General, who was the leading personality or who were the leading personalities at the Conference?

Romulo: Oh, there were several of them. Ezequiel Padilla, the Foreign Minister of Mexico, took a very important role there. From behind, not a member in the delegation, but a very active force was Nelson Rockefeller. He was then the Assistant Secretary for Latin American affairs, but he had such friendly relations with the Latin Americans that every time their vote was needed, Nelson was there lobbying, one by one. Take for example, the site of the United Nations. I was for San Francisco. I felt that the future drama of the world would be in the Pacific. So I felt that San Francisco was the ideal site of the United Nations. So when I read the other day a column which said, "UN Go Home", well, it was the insistence of the Americans that we have the United Nations in New York. Nelson Rockefeller came to me 4 o'clock one afternoon in my hotel and said, "Now, General, you and other small nations are fighting for San Francisco. We have no objection (to) San Francisco, but we would like to have it in New York. I am flying tonight," he said, "to New York to convince my brothers to donate 2 or 20 million dollars -- I do not remember -- and our real estate there so that it will be in (New York). I called up Mayor Rolf\*, the Mayor of San Francisco. I said, "Mayor, Nelson Rockefeller is with me. He is offering New York to be the site. He is going to fly now to New York to convince his brothers to donate so much," I do not remember now, "and their real estate. Can you top that?" And Mayor Rolf\* said, "Well, I am afraid we cannot top that. Of course, I will consult my Council tomorrow, but I am afraid we cannot top that." So I said, "Your honour, if you cannot top that, I will give my word now to Nelson Rockefeller that I will change my position and vote for New York." So Mayor Rolf\* said, "That is your decision. Well, tomorrow morning, let me

know if your board can top the offer of New York. In which case, if you can top the offer, I will still be for New York." The following day, he told me, "No, the board cannot offer that." So that is how New York became the site of (the United Nations). It was American insistence that it should be in New York.

Powell: Speaking of personalities at San Francisco, was Secretary Stettinius quite active?

Romulo: Yes, he was active, but you see when they emasculated his position as chairman of that Conference, he was one of the five, instead of being the only one, as was the international practice -- that in any international conference, the chairman of the host delegation should be the chairman of the entire conference. Well, Molotov opposed that. So then, there were five chairmen, and every day, there was a different chairman. So the power of that office of Stettinius which could have been very influential, was emasculated by Molotov.

Powell: Was Anthony Eden active?

Romulo: Not very. He was present a few days and then left.\*

Powell: Just before we had to break for the film change, General, I believe you were saying that Anthony Eden, the leader of the British delegation did not play a particularly active role in the Conference. He was only there a short time . . .

Romulo: Well, openly in the Conference, on the floor, he did not participate very actively. Now, behind the scenes I do not know.

Powell: It was more Lord Cranborne?

---

\* Technical interruption.

. . . .

Romulo: Well, yes and others too of the British delegation. But Anthony Eden was not very active, on the floor anyway.

Powell: We have discussed earlier the Manila Declaration and the question of Charter review and revision. Where do we go from here, in your view?

Romulo: Well, there is a special committee in the United Nations which is for the strengthening of the role of the United Nations and that committee meets every year. In fact, originally, the superpowers were against the organization of that committee. So that now, every year it has to be reorganized. It has to have a new mandate every year; but because of the overwhelming majority in favour, we always, for the last five years (have) been able to have that committee continue. The work continues and as I said in my statement on the floor the other day, the Manila Declaration is only a beginning. It is not the arrival. Where we are going, it will depend on the United Nations Organization. But there are changes that we would like to make and changes that are fundamental. First of all, when we signed the Charter, none of us knew anything about the atom bomb. I don't think even Stettinius knew anything about the atom bomb. After we signed the Charter, then the atom bomb was exploded. Well, it is a pre-atomic Charter, and world has changed since the atom bomb was exploded. It is a new world. Now, we were fifty-four nations who signed the Charter. There are now 157 nations in the United Nations. Should we not give a chance to the balance between 54 and 157 to have their views expressed on the Charter? For them to tell us what they think of the Charter? Why should we forbid them or prevent them from making their views heard on the Charter?

Powell: You have anticipated my very next question, General. I was going to say how would you evaluate the Charter in the light of the vast changes which have taken place since 1945. If at San Francisco you could have foreseen the growth in membership, the threat of the nuclear bomb, just to take two examples, how would you have drafted the Charter differently?

Romulo: The Special Committee is now studying the changes that should be made in the Charter. We have to be very careful. We do not want to say that we want to "revise" the Charter, because that will panic the superpowers. So what we say is we are going to "re-study" the Charter, and in re-studying the Charter make such suggestions as are necessary to make the Charter more in keeping with the present times. Now, how far we can succeed, we do not know. Because the danger is, we may make the changes that we want, then the Security Council will veto it. So it is a dead end. Now, we hope, however, that the world opinion will be such that the changes we suggest will be supported by world opinion.

Powell: Two minutes ago, you were mentioning a former US Secretary of State, Dean Acheson, and I believe that in the autumn of 1950, it was the UN initiative or the Acheson initiative to introduce the "Uniting for Peace" resolution and that in a sense is an extension of the Charter. Do you think that that was a healthy development and how . . . .?

Romulo: Very healthy. Very healthy.

Powell: How is it . . . .

Romulo: That was the "Uniting for Peace" resolution presented by Acheson. (It) is one of the best improvements of the Charter without having to amend the Charter. Now, I remember, in the Political Committee, Foreign Minister Vyshinsky of Soviet Russia attacked that proposal for more than one hour. Acheson, I saw he was taking down notes. Immediately after Vyshinsky sat down, Acheson replied for another hour. He did it so well that for the first time in the Political Committee the members -- not the members of the Soviet orbit, but all the other members -- stood up to give Acheson a rousing ovation. And that was why the "Uniting for Peace" resolution was approved and now it is an important part of the United Nations Organization. And that is what made Acheson win my respect and my admiration. In fact, I believe he is one of the

. . . .

best Secretaries of State America had ever had. And once they asked me how do I compare John Foster Dulles, who was my friend, with Acheson. And I said, "Well, it is simple. Acheson was an architect. Dulles was a carpenter." That is the difference between one and the other.

Powell: General, what has been your greatest disappointment about the UN?

Romulo: Well, you see, there are two United Nations: the United Nations of the specialized agencies, which has been successful; the United Nations of the UNESCO, the ILO, the UNICEF, the Food and Agriculture and all these specialized agencies which have really been constructive in their work. That is the one United Nations. The other United Nations is for its peace-keeping operations that so far is not as successful as I would like it to be, and that is why we want changes in the Charter.

Powell: I take it then that you would think that the economic and social humanitarian work is the United Nations greatest achievement today.

Romulo: Yes, yes; it is, it is. But I believe, though, that if we are given the chance, we can so improve the Charter that will make the United Nations an effective world organization for peace.

Powell: You were mentioning peace-keeping a minute ago. I think that this is an area where the United Nations has been innovative; there is no provision as far as I am aware of peace-keeping forces envisaged in the Charter as they have evolved.

Romulo: Well, I want to tell you this. The peace-keeping operations have not been as effective as they (could) have been. Why? That is another change in the Charter that we would like to make. First,

if each Member State really wants peace, each Member State must be ready to have a number of its troops be together with others to compose the United Nations force. If we have any such organization -- a United Nations force composed of the elements of the army of each nation -- then at a given moment, we have power to enforce our decisions. As it is now we approve piles of resolutions and we have no power to enforce them, thus far. Second, we have an International Court of Justice that, according to the Charter, is only voluntary; that is, the nations are only allowed voluntary decisions whether they want to be under that International Court of Justice or not. Now if that is compulsory, then we have a court to decide these cases. Now, if one nation in a controversy between another nation does not want to go to the Court, that question does not go to the Court. It must be voluntary now, but the Charter should make it compulsory, so that whenever there are two nations in controversy, they should submit their question before the International Court of Justice and let the International Court of Justice decide. And if we have a United Nations force, then the United Nations can enforce its resolutions.

Powell: I take it that you are as firm a supporter of the United Nations today as you were 37 years ago at San Francisco.

Romulo: More so today than in San Francisco.

Powell: More so.

Romulo: Because I believe without the United Nations we will always have a world, as Secretary General de Cuellar said the other day, on the road to anarchy. As I told you, when will you have 157 nations together under one building, under one roof? You have the world there! Of course, some powerful nations do not like that. They cannot see 157 nations together. When they think that they are superpowers and that they have the power, these 157 nations or over 150 nations are not worth much. But let me tell you one thing. The United Nations has created a

... ..

world opinion. Now tell me, without that world opinion, can Cuba survive for one minute? Cuba has been a bone in the throat of the United States. Fidel Castro always, in vitriolics, attacks the United States every day. With America's atom bomb, how long do you think Cuba can stand? In ten minutes. But America dares not do that, because there is now a world opinion that America must reckon with. That is the United Nations.\*

Powell: A few minutes ago, General, you were remarking on world opinion. Do you think that in a sense, the United Nations has been the victim of unreal expectations by the people of the world regarding what it might have accomplished?

Romulo: No. You used the wrong word. The world did not have unreal expectations. The world believes that there must be peace. That is not an unreal expectation. But at the same time, the United Nations has been the victim of misrepresentation, of distortions. The United Nations has been presented in a counterfeit image to a great section of the world. Now, that must be corrected. That can be corrected by first, political will. The political leaders of the world must see to it that the United Nations is placed in the light in the eyes of the world where it should be in. Secondly, that the United Nations, which at times is also to blame, must so comport itself not to ruin the respect of the world. Now this second part, I say, when we present childish resolutions and approve them knowing that those resolutions cannot be enforced, that does not win the respect of the world. Or when we behave in such a way here in the United Nations that will justify the Chicago Tribune's slogan that we are a Tower of Babel, now, those things must be avoided. We must discuss questions here soberly, intelligently, without hysteria, without vitriolics and think not so much only of our national interest but world interest as a whole. We must also think that we owe the world a duty. And that is in our actions in the United Nations. We must show the world that we are responsible, that we are mature, that we are not

---

\* Technical Interruption.



children or, as the Chicago Tribune said, that we are not in a Tower of Babel. That is important for us to remember.

Now, we must also remember that the world has changed. It is no longer the world of 1950. There is a new world now. Which reminds me of the day when I was President of the General Assembly, the first time a small nation became the President of the General Assembly. And Mayor O'Dwyer invited us with President Truman present to Gracie Mansion. As we entered there were two flag poles, one for the United Nations flag and another for the American flag. And the loudspeaker announced that the United Nations flag will be hoisted by the President of the General Assembly who is from the Philippines and the other flag pole was for the American flag. And as President Truman and I marched towards the flagpoles, an elderly American lady stopped him and said, "Mr. President, why is the United Nations flag to be hoisted by a small nation like the Philippines? Why not by Great Britain or France?" President Truman stopped, bowed to her and said, "My dear lady, this is an era of change, the small nations are coming into their own. That is something that we must remember. The small nations are coming to their own."

Powell: You were President of the General Assembly at its 4th session, I believe, in 1949. Under what circumstances did you become President of the General Assembly?

Romulo: I was elected. (Laughter) I was just elected, that was all.

Powell: I did not know whether there was a group who was urging . . .

Romulo: No, no. What happened was that in the session in Paris, I was the Chairman of the Special Political Committee, which was an important committee, and the first time that a small nation was made to chair that Committee. Well, I think I did something that called the attention of the other nations, and at the succeeding General Assembly, I was elected President of the General Assembly. That was all.

. . .

Powell: What were some of the key issues before that Assembly, I believe they were discussing things like the internationalization of Jerusalem and the Greek question, and . . .

Romulo: No, the important question there was the second day that I was President, Foreign Minister Vyshinsky of Soviet Russia announced that the Russians had broken the American nuclear monopoly. That was a sensational announcement.

Powell: They had the bomb. Yes.

Romulo: That they had the bomb. Two weeks later, I made a speech in which I first made the proposal that nuclear power must be used for peaceful purposes. And several days later, President Eisenhower made a statement centred around that: that the nuclear power must be used for peaceful purposes. That was the one outstanding question that was discussed in the 4th session of the General Assembly in '49. But then much later came the question of Israel but that was not under my presidency; that was much later. The United Nations decided to create the State of Israel and so that is what I always say to the Arabs: "How can you ignore Israel when it is a creation of the United Nations?" It was the United Nations that created that new State of Israel. So you cannot just ignore it now." And I always said that.

Powell: Now tell me, as President, were you quite active behind the scenes in negotiations?

Romulo: That was one of the jobs-unseen of a President of the Assembly, you see. Now, for example, this President (for the 37th session, Mr. Imre Hollai) is negotiating behind the scenes on how to carry out the global negotiations. Well, that is one of his jobs: behind the scenes to see how nations can come together and before the matter is taken up before the General Assembly, there is a sort of consensus already agreed upon. That is one of the important tasks entrusted to a president -- to have behind the scenes consultations. Also in the Security Council, the

President of the Security Council must be in charge of the consultations before an important question is taken up.

Powell: Yes. And you have served four times, I believe, as President of the Security Council.

Romulo: I think, yes, I have been four times President of the Security Council.

Powell: What was your most memorable moment in connexion with your Presidency of the Security Council?

Romulo: I had several moments; I do not remember now. (Laughter)  
Yes, I do not remember now, so many.

Powell: I would like to come back to a couple of final questions, if I may, General. One, as the current Secretary-General said, the UN is often by-passed in efforts to find solutions to problems on international peace and security. How can we restore confidence in the authority of the UN?

Romulo: Well, that is a difficult question. Because to restore the confidence in the United Nations by the superpowers, there must first be, what I believe, a sort of a cease-fire, a sort of a vocal cease-fire between the superpowers. That is, I mean this: if the United Nations is going to be as effective as we want it to be, it must no longer be the battle ground of two ideologies. That is one of the weaknesses of the United Nations. It started being the battle ground of two ideologies. So from that moment on, it became a bi-polar world, and there is always that difference. Now, if and when this bi-polar world is changed into a multi-polar world, when it is no longer the battle ground of two ideologies, I think the United Nations can win the confidence of the world. But I am very optimistic about this.

Powell: You are optimistic about the future?

Romulo: I am optimistic about this, because if you review the history of the world, what were once heresies became accepted tools. For example, there was one time when the feudal system was approved, respected, sanctified.\* I am speaking of that immoral right of the lord which is known in Spanish as derecho de pernada which meant every marriage in his place, between his vassals, the first night of the bride must be with him. That was approved, nobody dared question that, but humanity evolves and that disappeared. Then came the battle of the Holy Crusades. When religion was the subject of the wars. Well, that has disappeared. Now we have what is known as ecumenism in which all religions must be under one umbrella. Then came "I am the state" monarchies, where the King of France said, "I am the State". Well, that was for many years approved, respected, sacrosanct. Humanity evolves and that disappeared. Then came imperialism, the right of a powerful nation to rule over the weak and get all the riches of that weak for itself. Well, that was respected; nobody dared question that. It was, in fact, sanctified. Humanity evolves and that disappeared.

Powell: In other words, we are still in an evolving process.

Romulo: Correct. Humanity evolves and I believe the time will come when the United Nations will no longer be considered a Tower of Babel, but an organization that is working effectively for world peace and security. That is the writing on the wall that I see in my optimism, and I hope that is a dream that will be carried out.

Powell: I said only two more questions but I just had one that I would like to ask you. Coming back to your term as President of the 4th Session of the General Assembly, you said that you were involved in a great many behind-the-scenes negotiations. Can you recall any particular ones that might be of interest?\*\*

---

\* Technical Interruption

\*\* Pause

Romulo: Yes, for example, the proposal to abolish the Balkan Commission, which was placed there in order to report to the world what was being done in Greece against the freedom of the peoples there. Well, that took a long time to settle and discuss and finally the free world (voted) that the Balkan Commission remain; and it continued to work and I think it was for the good of peace that the Balkan Commission remained to do its work there.

Powell: Now my final question, General. What do you consider the greatest achievement, whether inside or outside the UN that you have done throughout your life?

Romulo: Well, no, I have done nothing very important, but that I believe the fact that 157 nations as I have already said, . . . well, no! What we have done is to create the third world in the United Nations, the admission of all these nations that otherwise could not have been independent if we did not make that change in article 76 of the United Nations Charter. I think, as Dag Hammarskjöld said in one of his statements, "That the contribution of the Philippines is a constructive contribution to the peace of the world." And that I think is one of the great things that has been done . . .

Powell: And I think you are being too modest, General, because those words "or independence" would not have been there if it had not been for your efforts . . .

Romulo: For the Philippine delegation. And now I want to say this as the last word. What I have said of the beginnings of the United Nations, that took (place) 37 years ago, human imagination and human mentality at the age of 84, that I am now, cannot be very accurate. So, whatever I have said may have some weaknesses and faults because of the lapse of time, but I feel, however, that I tried to do my best today to recall as faithfully as I could what happened in the years that you had in

. . . .

mind when you asked me to be in this documentary.

Powell: General, we value your perspective and your experiences and your wisdom which you have shared with us this morning. Thank you very much.

Romulo: Thank you, too.



