

terms of the turbulence and fragility of the conditions of underdevelopment and conflict indigenous to the regions in question. I call for a look backward to those contemporaries of Hammarskjold who saw in non-alignment an opportunity for developing countries to concentrate on the problems before them without the threat of interference in their affairs from more powerful countries intent on subverting their assets to their own purposes. I say that true non-alignment is not only consistent with interdependence, but more necessary because of it.

Is it possible that in the last 20 years the nature of East-West tension has changed because the Soviet Union is today a military superpower with a capability of intervention which ranges far and wide? This capability can constitute a threat to world peace as well as to the non-alignment of countries as long as it is the instrument — in Afghanistan, as well as in Kampuchea — of cynical "realpolitik". Let us recognize that if the strategic interests of great powers are now in fact interdependent with events in the Third World, then it calls above all for great restraint on all our parts.

Call for more  
meaningful UN

All these circumstances in 1981 call for a UN which is more meaningful and more relevant to global concerns and events, not less. As the challenges to all of us increase in complexity and urgency, the need for more sophisticated, agile and responsive instruments to meet them grows apace. The problems of the rest of the century and beyond englobe the ecology and use of our land, our space, and our seas, as well as the security of peoples and their rising expectations in a world more concentrated through technology — for instance, the military applications of nuclear technology. For example, in 1961, most countries here were consoled by progress being made in negotiating a nuclear test-ban treaty. It looked then as if we were headed towards a halt in the arms race. It was a brief illusion. Today, it is one of the most unequivocally disturbing features of international life, and indeed of our interdependence, that the dangers of nuclear war are now even greater. Nuclear proliferation threatens on two axes — the horizontal spread of nuclear weapons to previously non-nuclear-weapons states, and the vertical amassing of even greater numbers of weapons by the superpowers. I urge in the name of all sanity that this danger be recognized and resisted.

We must enable the institutions of the UN to be more productive, not less, and we must encourage all countries to participate actively in the pursuit of solutions in these institutions. In doing so, we can demonstrate that we wish to make them relevant and productive for the general benefit, adapted to the shape of the world today. Many of my remaining remarks are directed to prospects for development in countries which were still colonies 20 years ago and this reflects the interdependence of our interests and purposes today. But the political and economic problems of the world intersect and interact. It is important that our organization adapt itself as well through the greater sharing in the exercise of power and responsibility. Can we not ask ourselves if some of the notions of Dag Hammarskjold with regard to a stronger UN in the interests of world peace and security, cannot today be seen as more reasonable than they were 30 years ago? It is my view that they are certainly every bit as necessary.

Afghanistan

Surely, the continued occupation of Afghanistan by foreign military forces is an

---