
and be credible in our own eyes and in those of others. Experience over the past five years has shown the fragility of the *détente* as a basis for East/West relations. But I believe that the events in the coming months and years will determine what will be the next phase of the East/West relations. I think that all the countries involved recognize that we all have a stake in stabilizing those relations, particularly the southern nations which ought to be kept clear of the tensions between the eastern and the western worlds. But the U.S.S.R. is a super-power which claims the right to be heard on the same terms as its rival on the problems which affect any region of the world. The Russians claim that right for reasons of national interest but also, obviously, for reasons of an ideological nature. Consequently there is a potential element of rivalry among the super-powers in every troubled area of the developing nations.

One of the shortcomings of *détente* is, paradoxically, that it was conceived in a relatively balanced and stable European context. Even though this concept was firmly implanted in Europe, its value had never been fully tested outside the continent. Now it has become obvious that this concept is even harder to implement outside Europe. More serious still, the tensions arising from the failure of *détente* in Third World countries have had an impact on the main scene of the action between East and West, namely Europe. It has become clear that East/West relations cannot follow certain rules in some areas of the world and totally different rules elsewhere.

Is there no way out? There are some conditions more conducive to improved East/West relations that come to mind. The role of super-powers cannot be denied, but it must not be exclusive. To survive, *détente* must be recognized as indivisible, yet it is a fact that it is interpreted differently in the western and in the eastern allied countries, as well as the developing and non-aligned countries, which, of course, has been a constant source of misunderstanding. The policy to be followed is to refuse to involve developing countries in the military rivalry between East and West, as this would only aggravate tensions in this no-win situation in which neither North nor South would win.

It is in the best interests of the Third World that developing countries not become involved in the competition between East and West. That is exactly what Tito and Nehru were trying to achieve through non-alignment, and we can only hope that the movement of non-aligned countries will return to its basic philosophy. Western countries must re-examine their relations with the U.S.S.R. in order to promote stability throughout the world. A strong military alliance is essential to the achievement of this goal.

Basic
compatibility
of interests

We must also recognize that a good *sine qua non* condition of stability would be a basic agreement between the super-powers. In this respect, the super-powers must reactivate the best arrangements between the United States and the U.S.S.R. of the early '70s, when the "red phones" were installed and when the world could rely on a basic compatibility of interests between the two countries.

We will also witness an increased number of crises which, should the worst come to the worst, could degenerate into an all-out confrontation between the super-powers.
