

---

The mandate that has been given to us is limited. But the fact that it is limited does not absolve us from looking beyond it. The Final Act, in the end, finds its place in the wider conspectus of *détente*. And, if *détente* is a matter of increasing confidence, it is ultimately inconceivable that we can manage to increase confidence in the political realm while the arms race continues unabated. Political *détente* and a deceleration in the arms race must go hand in hand. The confidence created by each has a mutually-reinforcing impact on the other. Insecurity, like security, is indivisible.

We are not here to deal with matters of disarmament. That is the responsibility of other organs of the international system. But in our deliberations here we cannot afford to leave out of account the effect that a mounting build-up of military forces and armaments, going beyond the apprehended needs of defence, will have on stability and on confidence. We cannot leave out of account the disappointing progress that is being made in curbing the arms race in negotiations in Europe and elsewhere. We are at the end of the road of peripheral measures. We have come to the heart of the disarmament matter, which is actually to begin to disarm. No one pretends that the next steps will be easy. But we cannot expect to move forward along the disarmament road simply by making declarations of good faith or by trying to legislate intentions. We have only one option, and it is the hard option of dealing with capabilities, of limiting the capacity to wage war.

That is not, as I say, on the agenda of our meeting. But we should not delude ourselves into thinking that, unless we are serious about that larger dimension of security, we can indefinitely sustain the support of our public opinions for the structure of co-operation that we put in place at Helsinki.

Much of the co-operation envisaged at Helsinki lies in the economic realm. Here, too, we believe that the language of the Final Act is indicative of a conception that carries us beyond the provisions we have come here to review.

The systems by which we manage our economies differ in many important respects. We have no illusion about those differences and it is not the purpose of the Final Act either to arbitrate or to bridge them. But we should be wrong, in our view, if we saw our task here or beyond Belgrade to be merely that of recording the agreements we have concluded or the projects in which we are jointly engaged. We should be wrong if we made the creation of new structures or the impact of our endeavours on relations between us the sole focus of our concern.

We cannot, after all, be unmindful that our economies, taken together, represent the core of what is called the industrial world. The way in which we organize and conduct our economies, the way in which we muster our respective economic strengths, has an impact that is acknowledged to be world-wide. A good part of the world will be following our deliberations here closely. They are aware that the countries that have signed the Final Act include virtually the entire industrialized world. They accept, as we do, that closer co-operation among us can lead to a more rational allocation of resources, with resulting benefit, in the first instance, for the peoples of Europe and North America. But it will also occur to them that, the more we as industrialized

---