

actually restrict the extent of co-operation by setting arbitrary limits on what can be done.) For example, enterprises, firms and banks, as well as individual businessmen, are named in the sub-chapter on commercial exchanges as interested parties in intensifying economic co-operation. Members of religious faiths are mentioned in the sub-chapter on human contacts as being able to have religious contacts and exchange religious information. Individual journalists are by the Final Act allowed to have contacts with their sources of information. Authors are allowed to contact publishers. And so on.

In our perception, the necessary development of co-operation at the grass-roots — the democratization of co-operation, if you like — can in many cases best be effected by states refraining from practices which tend to inhibit the person or persons who would otherwise participate or even take initiatives.

Examples of such practises are travel restrictions, discouragement by officials of certain types of contact between persons of different participating states, the interruption of the flow of communications, the insistence on certain centralized liaison channels, and so on. Many of these practices — and no country or system has a total monopoly on them — reflect a past characterized by deep mutual hostility and distrust between systems. But at Helsinki we felt confident enough to agree that *détente* in Europe had advanced sufficiently to begin actively promoting a more normal, healthy relationship between participating states through co-operation in many fields and on all levels. This means that past attitudes and practices have to be re-examined and, if necessary, modified — and, to the largest extent possible, the individual should be the beneficiary.

For, Mr. Chairman, my delegation has repeated many times that one of its overriding concerns in the development of *détente* is to ensure that, step by step, we achieve a situation among us where the private group and the individual benefit from the co-operative process, and fully participate in it alongside their governments. This is what we would call normality in interstate affairs, and we believe it can be achieved between states of different social and political systems given good will and a willingness to take fresh approaches.

This is also the kind of normality I was speaking of in connection with the Seventh Principle, on human rights and fundamental freedoms, when I emphasized the importance of individual citizens being able to engage their governments in a dialogue concerning the implementation of the Final Act, and not be penalized for it. Far from treating citizens or groups with such an aim as outcasts or criminals, it would surely be better, as clearly called for in the Ninth Principle, to allow them to play a full role in the practical implementation of the co-operative aspects of the Final Act. The desire of