

small tonnages. There is money to be made in such elements, provided they can be produced efficiently and with high quality, using modern technology.

Research and more research

The message we offer is quite clear. The general indications concerning future consumption of metal are not terribly encouraging but are by no means hopeless. Survival in the short run will depend on the application of research, science and technology, as well as good management, in controlling costs and improving product quality. But the most significant danger comes in the medium to longer term when other materials can be expected to be active competitors with metals in most of the important

applications. The only way to guarantee survival and success in those circumstances will be with major research and development investments now. This would be advanced by a move to more cooperative works, both within the industry, and with government and university laboratories. These must be in the development of downstream products, in specialty metals and, most importantly, in the creation of new, metal-based materials, produced with new solidification and forming techniques.

The mining industry does not yet do enough research, and what it does is very understandably aimed at the short term needs. We suggest that it now must do much more of the kind and the amount of research and development that will be essential to long term success. □

Institutions without forms

A case of baskets

The Helsinki legacy

by David Pepper

The unsuccessful conclusions of the Ottawa Meeting of Experts on Human Rights, the Budapest Cultural Forum, and the Bern Human Contacts Meeting symbolize the current state of the Conference on Security and Cooperation in Europe (CSCE). Although the meetings ended in so-called stalemates, with the participants failing to agree upon a final document of any type, the end of the CSCE process is not in sight. The process has now evolved into a structure which is stable, predictable, and becoming more institutionalized.

Whereas a number of non-governmental groups have called for the withdrawal of Western support for the Helsinki process, this is not a likely prospect in the near future. In all probability, there will again be these calls questioning the usefulness of the CSCE at the third Review Meeting which has now begun its work in Vienna. This work will build on the results of all CSCE activities since September 1983. There will be many obstacles, including those created by the failures of the three recent meetings.

In 1985, the tenth anniversary year of the signing of the Helsinki Accords, some signatory states questioned the continuing usefulness of the CSCE process. From the polarity of the two superpowers, it may appear sterile, ineffective and unproductive. This can not be the only approach though, for the Helsinki process is renowned for the fact that it gathers thirty-five independent countries, each with an effective veto through consensus, to discuss fundamental security problems facing Europe. This means that the concerns and attitudes of all participating countries must be considered. In general, the smaller participants find the process, though slow and unproductive in ap-

pearance, to be a useful forum for a wide range of issues.

The dilemma, of course, is that if change is to be brought about in any of the participating states, it ought to be in the "spirit of Helsinki." This spirit is represented both in the Final Act and in the Belgrade Concluding Document in the calling for the continuation of multilateral contacts. This implies that the signatories should, while carrying out their own self-determined domestic policies, be amenable to contributions from other participating states with the confidence that it does not interfere with the internal affairs of the country. A lack of "Helsinki spirit" dominated the first ten years of the CSCE, and if another decade is to pass with a viable CSCE, new attitudes and changes must be forthcoming from the previously intransigent participants.

Ten years of what?

The numerous CSCE meetings that have taken place since the signing of the Final Act over ten years ago can be seen as the institutionalizing feature of the Helsinki process (see box). Although the signatories maintain a fiction that the CSCE is uninstitutionalized, this in fact is not the case. Their argument is that while every meeting of the CSCE is mandated by one of the major review conferences, the logistics of these meetings are never specified, and left up to the actors in each meeting. Thus, the Vienna meeting,

David Pepper is a student of Soviet and East European Affairs. He worked as a liaison officer at the Ottawa Meeting of Experts in 1985 and is currently employed by a Member of Parliament.