

which the Final Act, adopted in Helsinki, is an expression.

It may appear that the Western view of human rights, and especially the American "campaign", could be considered a time-bomb under the Soviet system. It is, after all, only possible to liberalize up to a certain point a system based upon control; otherwise the system will crumble. The Soviet Union of to-day, however, is different from that of Stalin, and *détente* is a process that demands patience. It should also be borne in mind that *détente* has economic and social aspects. In these, we of the West are open to – and accept – criticism.

I do not, however, want to go into a discussion of the relative weight of economic liberties and political rights. It may be dangerous to mix the two sets of values and to subject views of morality to tactical considerations. The realization of both will to a large extent depend on circumstances, the level of development and the form of government and society.

The style and tenets of democracy as we know it are not possible all over the world – at least in the short run. Yet, in attempting to relate to others our own kind of democracy, we should not sacrifice the qualities of freedom and openness that are its hallmark. With the adoption of the Final Act, we have an obligation to express our views. Yet many Westerners have become so afraid of calling problems by their real names that they risk dying in agony. They avoid calling a spade a spade in order not to embarrass. Our comprehension and understanding of the view of other countries should never develop into a mere desire to please, nor become a mere reflection of commercial motives. After all, a country may be measured by what it accepts or tolerates.

The United Nations exists because it was created in harmony with the values treasured by the West. These values are not the primary concern of the present majority, which has its own interpretation of the goals of the organization. We have, in my view, reached a point where a kind of "regional United Nations" and interest groupings of different kinds under the umbrella of the Charter seem, if not formally then factually, to represent a new way of collaboration.

Regional economic UN organizations exist already – as, for instance, the Economic Commission for Europe – and it may be worth while to revitalize them, if only for the sake of trade co-operation between East and West. In any event, both politically and economically the United Nations might fruitfully set up regional

groupings to prepare the further work of the organization. In accordance with the principle of universality, such groupings should discuss only and elaborate regional matters and in this way complement, and not substitute for, the United Nations.

This does not mean that it is crucial how the UN machinery is organized. The very essence will, for a long time to come, remain the policy and purpose of the member countries. But one must never lose sight of the goal of advancement. This is not to compromise one's ideals, but rather to seek to have them realized in a complicated world, according to existing political realities.

Much has been achieved through the little-publicized work done by the special organs of the UN system. The very existence of the United Nations influences the attitude of governments. Participation in the organization and its agencies affects political leaders and their officials and thus the process of decision; the United Nations exercises a softening role by making countries refrain from actions and manifestations or change them, because states take into consideration the expected international reaction at the United Nations.

Therefore, one should not judge the results achieved by the United Nations on the basis of the ideal situation. The organization is far from the last step in humanity's journey to the ideal state. No country is able to fulfil all its goals without interfering in the rights of others. Compromises are necessary. The increasing interdependence of the world and the polarization of ideologies render more important than ever the existence of an international organization such as the United Nations. We should not be discouraged or dispirited by obstacles, disappointments or frustrations.

There is no reason to be astonished if the UN itself is not the hearth for important economic and commercial solutions. The outstanding economic problem is the relation between North and South. Extensive economic assistance has been channelled through the UN to the developing countries without great inconvenience for the industrialized world. Basically, the purpose has been to secure political stability without sacrificing one's own privileges. However, the important thing cannot be the aid itself – although it is necessary in one form or another and should be at least 0.7 per cent of the gross national product at the end of this decade. The essential thing is that the developing countries become less economically dependent.