

the Soviet Union to sign an Open Skies Treaty did not receive a positive response. Thirty five years later it is precisely, as has just been pointed out by our Turkish colleague, we find ourselves faced with this same project. I think the question we should ask ourselves is why is that those skies which could not be opened in 1955 can now be open in 1990.

I think that we all agree on the answer because we have wanted and known how to substitute confrontation for co-operation or, in other words, because we have ceased to consider ourselves incompatible and now want to compliment each other. This change, which is so encouraging and significant, a mode of power as old as the world and wiser than anyone, has triggered the rhythm of historic time. This power has been the unconstrainable pressure of nations whose own dynamism has allowed them to travel a much longer course in a few months, in terms of subsiding distress and decreasing threat between East and West than we negotiators and politicians have travelled in many, many years.

Europe no longer walks taking small steps, but long strides and is jumping over fences and overcoming obstacles practically every day. This is the here and now, Mr. President. This is our starting point and our challenge.

For years we have been negotiating a military balance which would make the world more hospitable and we have followed a double course, on the one hand, by articulating measures which would contribute to reduce the distrust level which started to prevail in Europe right after the second World War and, on the other hand, by restricting the qualitative and quantitative margins of armament that this distrust has lead us to accumulate.

All along we have always known that the confidence building measures and disarmament are not an end in themselves, but rather the means of achieving another goal which is much broader and much nobler, namely, to create a world which, as it feels more secure, may aspire to greater freedom and justice.

On this disarmament problem I would like to put forward three considerations. First of all, the need for disarmament negotiations to advance, at least, at the same rhythm as that of political events.

Until now, in Europe, our claim in the field of disarmament has been relatively modest. Europe is the continent with the biggest concentration of armament in the world. Until now we have not gone beyond a project of limitation of harm in a context of rivalry and distrust.

Disarmament must now come as a consequence of a new world situation and several of the statements which appeared before as the prime objectives are now minimal objectives and what appeared