

and that the role of this organization is central to the promotion of a better life for all the world's inhabitants. But even if we were not, we would still wish this organization to be effective in dealing with the problems which are within its mandate and in changing to cope with threats in the world today.

Dag Hammarskjold died in 1961, along with other devoted members of the UN Secretariat to whom I pay homage, in an attempt to assist the progress of decolonization in Africa, to preserve the territorial integrity of a newly-independent state, and to resist the designs of countries and interests from there and elsewhere who, for reasons of self-interest or nostalgia, meant to subvert the changes which were taking place. I think that Hammarskjold died with a vision of the UN's peacemaking and peacekeeping capability which was resisted then and which has been resisted since. But at least the process of political decolonization which seized our attention in those years has now been virtually completed. And while I ask myself how many newly-independent states enjoy today the sort of economic and political security and opportunity which they so bravely expected at the outset of their struggle for independence, it is perhaps illusory to tie their development to the notion of national independence. Self-determination, yes; but in 1981, we are much more deeply conscious of our global interdependence: the interdependence of states, of economies, of peoples, and of dangers.

Need for global negotiating process

Economically, our interdependence is more authentically reciprocal. Twenty years ago, the economic relationships between North and South were much more those of the classical form of colonial dependency. The idea that most industrialized countries of the world would by now be purchasing 30 and 40 per cent of their imported manufactured goods in developing countries would have seemed far-fetched in 1961. Indeed, this interdependence in trade is an increasingly important feature of our view of international economic affairs. Its reflection in international decision-making is necessary. This, as well as our concern for equity in opportunity, helps to explain why Canada is a strong supporter of the need for a global negotiating process.

There has been remarkable progress in the economic development of many developing countries since 1961. But for many in the world, the basic conditions of life are just as impoverished now as they were then. The apparent inability to aid these people in the dimensions required is an indictment we must accept. But, sadly, we must also accept that the economic expectations many held for the world in 1961, and for the industrialized countries in particular, were exaggerated. Were these years of unprecedented boom an aberration? Do we need to live now with diminished expectations for growth in the future? If so, it is our obligation to find ways to deal with world problems within the limits of a more stringent environment now than in 1961 and to redouble our efforts, with discipline and dedication, to direct our attentions to where they are really vitally needed.

True non-alignment

Interdependence and its relationship to self-determination is a global political, as well as economic, reality. We are all neighbours, and strategically so. Twenty years ago, the East-West strategic focus was mainly on Europe. Today, the risk of confrontation between the superpowers in areas normally considered to be part of the Third World is also enhanced. There is a risk of aggravating problems already anguishing enough in