

moments ago. They had in mind the very real interests of Summit countries in the economic health and well-being of developing countries — and also in the political stability of those countries in the interests of world peace and security. Of course, it remains true that for Summit countries there is an important humanitarian element in the contributions that they are prepared to make to the development of countries in the South, and this is as it should be, particularly with respect to the poorest developing countries.

Added to these issues, however, are a number of other difficult, and pressing, problems of a broadly political, or security nature.

East/West
issues

As was recognized even before the new U.S. Administration took office, the East/West situation has deteriorated markedly in the last 15 months or so, notably since the Soviet invasion of Afghanistan. The Polish problem does nothing to lessen the tensions. These factors themselves serve to highlight the change in the military situation between East and West brought about over a period of years, particularly by Soviet increase of its military capacity. The weakening of *détente* has also had its effects on the North/South equation: there is in some quarters today an inclination perhaps to focus less on problems of the South and more on the East/West issues; and to see Southern problems increasingly through an East/West prism. Both sets of issues in fact are important in their own right and would need attention whether the other set existed or not. Clearly, of course, there are many significant linkages between the two and Summits offer one place where a large view can be taken and the broad problems addressed.

Though it should be noted that the U.S.S.R.'s actions have not invariably helped it *vis-à-vis* the non-aligned, it is also clear that the developed Western countries are far from united on where they should be going or what they should be doing to get there. There are differences of view on strategy and tactics, as came out only too clearly last year over Afghanistan. One could say that there is need for the Western countries to go through something of the same kind of process in these areas as they did during the 1970s on economic subjects; defining the issues, working to develop better understandings and common approaches among them, perhaps even taking steps ultimately towards joint objectives and actions.

But how? These are delicate issues, touching national sovereignty, deeply held convictions and ancient traditions. What is the right group? Should the Economic Summits be broadened to include political issues, as suggested in the report of the four institutes I mentioned earlier? Given the political and economic ramifications today of most major issues confronting heads of state or government, whether in the East/West or North/South context, might one not question whether the distinction between "economic" and "political" issues in a Summit context is still valid or realistic?

Summits are
here to stay

At a minimum, looking ahead, I find it hard to imagine that Summits in some form are not here for the foreseeable future — despite the risks and *caveats* outlined at the beginning of my remarks. Indeed, if Summits did not exist they would probably have to be invented; if they ceased, they would need to be recommenced. Only Summit