

orbit in 1957 and a dozen years later sent men to the moon and back. How could we hope to deal effectively with the gap between rich and poor nations when science was clearly running away from us all?

If governments exhibit in the next 25 years the same indifference they have shown in the past, science will either destroy man or enslave him. It is sheer fantasy that science, inevitably, is in man's service. Today's man's ability to continue to control his own destiny is far less certain than it appeared in 1945.

Without suggesting for a moment that we should seek to stifle the scientific mind, I believe we must find ways of putting science and technology to work for the good of man for the improvement, not the impairment, of the human condition.

We do this within our national boundaries by re-examining existing arrangements or by devising new means, whichever way provides the most effective results. We must, with the same foresight and vigour, do so in the international sphere to check the bad effects of the relentless pursuit of science, to direct its powerful force for good into co-operative action for the benefit of us all.

The United Nations is not unaware of this need. It has begun to act in fields such as communications, transportation, outer space, the environment and the peaceful uses of the seabed.

A third big factor that feeds dissatisfaction is that the United Nations has often appeared to be rudely bypassed, or shamelessly to stand aside, while major world events were unfolding, while grave crises were erupting, particularly in the field of peace and security. Berlin, Vietnam, Czechoslovakia leap to the mind, but they are only the most obvious examples. Other critics have found it incredible that this organization can claim any standing in today's world when it has excluded for decades representatives of nations forming very substantial segments of the world's population.

Finally, I suggest that some of the aims, interests and values which in 1945 had very great appeal and support in this organization are no longer the ones that dominate here, or those that motivate nations and individuals now.

The preoccupations of the United Nations, once those of a membership predominantly white and of European origin, have shifted radically and rapidly with the organization's changing racial and regional composition. Yesterday we celebrated the tenth anniversary of the United Nations Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and People. This year marks the beginning of the Second Development Decade. Our attention has been shifting too -- perhaps not quickly enough -- to meet new demands and expectations in a rapidly-evolving world situation. All these changes are bound to be unsettling.

We have to adjust to them, as an organization, as individual member states, as nations. We may not have developed fully the reflexes of mind and mechanism needed for quick change. That we are learning I have no doubt, but whether fast enough one cannot be so sure. I ask you: How much time do we have?

I have sought to launch our discussion on a course that is positive and constructive, away from the temptations of self-congratulation, mutual recrimination and, above all, of apathetic indifference.