

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 toward 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 U.N. 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 U.N. 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.

Surely, the continued occupation of Afghanistan by foreign military forces is an example of precisely the sort of threat to world peace and security which the U.N. was meant to prevent. The courage and determination of the resistance is an ennobling assertion of the human spirit against the machinery of military oppression, but the tragic facts reflect a basic fault in the notion of collective security: when a powerful country wishes to ignore U.N. decisions, it will feel free to do so unless its actions remain the object of continued international attention. The continued presence of Soviet troops in Afghanistan is an affront to the principles of this organization.