

European Communities

EUROPEAN PARLIAMENT

Working Documents

1980 - 1981

8 October 1980

DOCUMENT 1-445/80

Report

drawn up on behalf of the Political Affairs Committee

on the meeting to be held in Madrid in November 1980, as provided for in the Concluding Document of the Belgrade Meeting, within the framework of the follow-up to the Conference on Security and Cooperation in Europe

Rapporteur: Mr M. RUMOR

At its meeting of 10 July 1980 the enlarged Bureau authorized the Political Affairs Committee to draw up a report on the meeting at Madrid in November 1980 to follow-up the Final Act of the Conference on Security and Cooperation in Europe (CSCE) and on its priority objectives.

At its constituent meeting on 6 September 1979 the Political Affairs Committee had decided that the report would be based on the outcome of a public hearing on the CSCE to be held during 1980.

The hearing was held in Brussels on 23 and 24 June 1980.

At its meeting of 8 July 1980 the committee appointed Mr M. Rumor, chairman, rapporteur.

The Political Affairs Committee considered the motion for a resolution at its meeting of 22, 23 and 24 September 1980 and adopted it by 22 votes to 4 with 12 abstentions.

Present : Mr Rumor, chairman and rapporteur; Mr Estier, Lord Bethell and Mr Haagerup, vice-chairmen; Mr Antoniozzi, Mrs Baduel Glorioso (deputizing for Mr Berlinguer), Mr Bettiza, Mr Beyer de Ryke (deputizing for Mr Damseaux), Mr Blumenfeld, Mr Cariglia, Mrs Cassanmagnago Cerretti, Mr Diligent, Lord Douro (deputizing for Sir John Stewart-Clark), Lady Elles, Mr M. Faure, Mr Fergusson, Mrs Gaiotti de Biase (deputizing for Mr Penders), Mr Galluzzi (deputizing for Mr Ansart), Mrs Gredal, Mr Habsburg, Mr Hänsch, Mr von Hassel, Mrs van den Heuvel, Mr Israel (deputizing for Mr Lalor), Mr Jackson, Mr Kepsch, Mrs Lizin (deputizing for Mr B. Friedrich), Mr Lomas, Mr de la Malène, Mr van Minnen (deputizing for Mr van Miert), Mr Radoux (deputizing for Mr Schieler), Mr Romualdi, Mr Schall (deputizing for Mr Seitlinger), M. Scott-Hopkins, Mr Seefeld (deputizing for Mr Brandt), Mr Segre, Mr Tindemans and Mr Zagari.

C O N T E N T S

	<u>Page</u>
A. MOTION FOR A RESOLUTION	5
B. EXPLANATORY STATEMENT	12

The Political Affairs Committee hereby submits to the European Parliament the following motion for a resolution together with explanatory statement:

MOTION FOR A RESOLUTION

on the Meeting to be held in Madrid in November 1980, as provided for in the Concluding Document of the Belgrade Meeting, within the framework of the follow-up to the Conference on Security and Cooperation in Europe

The European Parliament,

- whereas the Final Act of the Conference on Security and Cooperation in Europe, formally signed in Helsinki on 1 August 1975, by initiating a complex multilateral process signified the start of a new phase in the policy of cooperation and détente,
- whereas this multilateral process was continued in the Belgrade Meeting held from 4 October 1977 to 9 March 1978, and which, although its results were admittedly limited, is to be followed up in November 1980 in Madrid,
- whereas the Meetings of Experts during the period from July 1978 to March 1980 helped to further this process,
- having regard to the progress, however modest, achieved in some sectors following the signing of the Helsinki Final Act,
- welcoming the political alignment shown by the nine Governments of the European Community at all stages of the CSCE negotiations, an alignment which found expression in the definition of common approaches and positions on the most important subjects of the negotiations,
- drawing attention to the public hearing held by the Political Affairs Committee in Brussels on 23 and 24 June 1980 on the forthcoming meeting in Madrid,
- drawing attention to its five previous resolutions of principle¹,
- having regard to the report of the Political Affairs Committee (Doc. 1-445/80),

¹ Doc. 485/74, OJ No. C 95, 28.4.1975, p. 28
Doc. 89/77, OJ No. C 133, 6.6.1977, p. 30
Doc. 90/77, OJ No. C 133, 6.6.1977, p. 32
Doc. 424/77, OJ No. C 36, 13.2.1978, p. 26
Doc. 76-78, OJ No. C 131, 5.6.1978, p. 47

1. Expresses the conviction that :

- détente, which is indivisible and at the same time regional and global in character :
 - is incompatible with the idea that there are spheres of influence in the world where other principles apply and where infringements of its fundamental principles are justified,
 - can only be pursued successfully when equal concessions and equal efforts are made by all participating States towards the implementation of the Helsinki Agreement,
 - there is a close correlation between peace and security within Europe and outside Europe, as expressly confirmed in the Final Act, particularly in its second principle,
 - the present state of tension in international relations gives rise to deep concern and demands measures capable of bringing about a solution to the crisis triggered by Soviet intervention in Afghanistan and by the aggravation or prolongation of the crisis in the Middle East, in South East Asia and in southern Africa,
 - the unitary character of the Final Act requires all the principles and provisions contained in it to be applied without exception,
 - in consequence, the only realistic basis for détente is a balance in the military strength of the parties, as this balance is a precondition for concerted action by East and West towards a mutual and balanced reduction in the armed forces and armament systems in Europe and outside Europe,
-
- respect for human rights and fundamental liberties by all states is one of the bases for a profound, material improvement in their mutual relations and in international cooperation at all levels, that is, not only between states but also between individuals, as was explicitly recognized, thanks to the firm and united stance of the Western countries, in the Concluding Report of the Scientific Forum in Hamburg of March 1980,
 - true respect for these rights is incompatible with the alarming increase in the exercise of ideological control over individuals by some East European countries, in particular the Soviet Union, proof of which is furnished by :
 - (a) the repressive measures adopted against those who call for human rights and fundamental liberties to be respected;

- (b) the treatment of individuals and groups who seek proper enforcement of the principles and provisions of the Final Act; the Sacharov case, which is the episode best known to the international public at large, is only the most recent of these;
- (c) the very many cases of infringements of human rights and fundamental liberties, even though these differ in scale and degree, recorded extensively in the East European countries;
- (d) the jamming of outside broadcasts to the Soviet Union during the recent events in Poland,

- it is sophistry to claim that all reports of infringements of the principles of human rights are 'intervention in internal affairs': neither the text itself nor a proper interpretation of the text of the VIth Principle of the Final Act form a basis for any such claim,
- it is the inalienable right of each of the signatory States to the Final Act to require its co-signatories to respect the undertakings given in the Final Act,
- it is, at all events, vital that everyone of the 35 signatory States of the ECSC should act in such a way as to allow the restoration of a climate of trust, which is indispensable if concrete results are to be achieved at the Madrid Meeting,

2. therefore requests that the Governments of the Nine Member States and the Commission of the European Community should :

1. Make every effort to further the ECSC process, in line with the desire stated in the Concluding Document of the Belgrade meeting in which all the participating States 'stressed the political importance of the Conference on Security and Cooperation in Europe and reaffirmed the resolve of their Governments, to implement fully, unilaterally, bilaterally and multilaterally, all the provisions of the Final Act';
2. Ensure that, in the developments which it is hoped will ensue, a balance is maintained between all the elements contained in the Final Act;

3. Propose, at the Madrid Conference, that a procedure be laid down to enable the hearing of certain non-governmental organizations that have dedicated themselves to 'monitoring the implementation of the Helsinki Final Act';
4. Consider proposing that, between the meetings provided for under the procedures laid down in Helsinki, a committee be convened with the specific task of evaluating the progress made in the field of human rights by each signatory State to the Final Act;

in respect of the Declaration on the principles governing relations between participating States :

5. State the absolute necessity for all the participating States to maintain strict respect for all the 'Principles' contained in the Final Act, both in their relations with one another and in their relations with all other States;
6. Condemn as unacceptable and contrary to the Helsinki Final Act any recourse to the threat or the use of force and declare solemnly that the violation of the national sovereignty of a signatory State to the Helsinki Final Act by another State - under whatever pretext - would be considered as a flagrant violation of the spirit of this Act and would therefore represent a danger to peace;
7. Stress the extreme importance of the enjoyment of human rights and fundamental liberties, including freedom of thought, conscience, religion or belief, for the development, while protecting the individual, of all societies and States, and for maintaining and promoting peace between nations;
8. In this context, make it unequivocally clear that a definite commitment by the participating States to the respect for human rights and fundamental liberties is not only an essential aspect of détente but is indispensable if the CSCE process is to be continued to good purpose;

as regards military security and confidence-building measures :

9. Continue to proceed in conformity with the guidelines contained in the statements published following the Meeting of the EEC Foreign Ministers of 20 November 1979;
10. Develop new, precise and detailed confidence-building measures by taking significant steps at a military level which can be monitored and are applicable to the whole continent of Europe;

as regards economic questions :

11. Continue, on the basis of a concerted Community policy, to make genuine and practical improvements as regards the numerous administrative and technical provisions of the 2nd Basket, especially in respect of exchanges of economic and commercial information and the facilitation of business contracts;
12. Examine whether the policy of security and cooperation may through common action be widened into a coordinated policy of protection and preservation of the natural environment;
13. Stress, in this context, the need for new agreements between the participating States to help businessmen, especially those running small and medium-sized undertakings, to pursue their economic and commercial activities, taking into account the differences between the various economic systems;
14. Reaffirms the interest in the development of cooperation and in the study of suitable projects, particularly in the energy field;
15. Adopt the measures necessary to ensure that :
 - the benefits deriving from economic cooperation between the signatory States of the CSCE are mutual and balanced;
 - particular attention is given to the question of the coordination of the credit policies of the Nine and the amount of Western credits intended to facilitate imports by the East European countries and to the solution of the problems created by the practice of dumping by these countries on Community markets, and by the imposition of linked trade arrangements;
16. Raise their aid to the developing countries as rapidly as possible to the target of 0.7% of GNP fixed by the UN;
17. Invite the East European countries also to make a significant increase in their aid to the developing countries so that the industrialized countries at last share equitably the responsibility for the development of these countries;
18. Do everything to ensure that the Commission participate and that the role of the European Parliament be taken into account in all negotiations on matters for which responsibility has been transferred by the Member States to the Community;

in respect of questions relating to Security and Cooperation in the Mediterranean :

19. Point out that the signatory States to the Final Act have recognized both the close connection between security in Europe and security in the Mediterranean area and the importance of their economic relations with the other Mediterranean States which did not sign the Final Act, and therefore their common interest in developing further cooperation;
20. Continue, in consequence, to urge all 35 signatory States to abide consistently by the undertakings given in respect of the Mediterranean area, in the light of what is said in the Belgrade Concluding Document and taking into account the results of the Meeting of Experts at Valletta;

in respect of cooperation in humanitarian fields :

21. Stress that the credibility of the whole CSCE process will be judged on the basis of the progress made by all the participating States in implementing more fully in this fundamentally important area the relevant provisions of the Final Act;
22. Continue to emphasize that the provisions in the Third Basket of the Final Act which commit the signatory States to guarantee the right of free movement of persons in every sense of the term, free access to information of all kinds, the improvement and extension of cooperation and exchanges in the field of culture and education as expressly provided for by the Final Act are fundamental for understanding between nations and therefore for the strengthening of peace;
23. Attempt, as part of an endeavour to bring about a genuine improvement in the working conditions of journalists, to put an immediate end to the restrictions imposed on journalists by certain East European countries;

in respect of the follow-up to the Conference :

24. Declare themselves in favour of continuing the CSCE if the results in Madrid justify it;
25. Take the most appropriate measures as regards organizational forms and levels in order to ensure that genuine progress is made in the follow-up to the Conference on Security and Cooperation in Europe, particularly as regards armaments control and disarmament;

o
o o

3. Instructs its President to forward this resolution to the Foreign Ministers of the Member States of the Community meeting in political cooperation, the Council and the Commission of the European Community.

EXPLANATORY STATEMENT

At its meeting of 22 to 24 September the Political Affairs Committee adopted the motion for a resolution - for submission to the plenary assembly of the European Parliament - on the meeting to be held in Madrid in November 1980 as provided for in the concluding document of the Belgrade meeting, within the framework of the follow-up to the Conference on Security and Cooperation in Europe.

The meeting of the Political Affairs Committee in September was preceded by a public hearing on 23-24 June 1980 during which the committee heard the explanations and replies of experts to questions on the subject of the so-called three 'baskets' of the Helsinki Final Act.

The motion for a resolution which has just been submitted to Parliament takes account of these.

But it also took particular account of the numerous debates and resolutions in which, prior to the beginning of the CSCE process, the European Parliament had expressed its views, made suggestions and extended invitations to the Ministers of Foreign Affairs of the Nine meeting in political cooperation as regards the statements made in, interpretation of and follow-up to the Helsinki Final Act and on failure to comply with and particularly serious violations of the Act.

Points of reference: the Final Act and the Belgrade Meeting

The motion for a resolution has two points of reference: the Helsinki Final Act and the Belgrade Meeting, together with the subsequent meetings of experts held in Bonn, Montreux and Valletta and the Forum in Hamburg.

The Final Act, which was signed by 35 Heads of State and Government in Europe and North America, gave rise to hopes, doubts and controversy.

It was not clear whether it was intended - at least by some of the signatories - to be a notarial record of the status quo in Europe or a code of conduct destined to remain a dead letter or a gesture that would pave the way for a new quality of life and a new relationship not only between states but between individuals in Europe.

The five years that have elapsed since the signing of the Final Act, its consequences, the way in which it has or has not been complied with, show that it combines concepts that stem from two different basic historical and political premises. For some countries it was to lead to a formal sanctioning of the political and territorial status quo, confirming the concept of peaceful co-existence understood in a static way as regards a relative balance in matters of security, although even that has become fairly fluid; to others it was to mark the beginning of a new, dynamic movement towards detente and to promote in each state and between different states, populations and citizens greater knowledge of each other in a system of greater political and military trust, increased cooperation and an increasingly open-minded humanitarian approach.

No one was under the illusion that Helsinki would automatically change the internal and external behaviour of states or their relations with each other. Everyone was aware that it was nevertheless the result of difficult mediation between different concepts and practices.

The implementation of and follow-up to the Helsinki Act was assessed for the first time at the Belgrade Conference which had been provided for in the Act itself and was held from 4 October 1977 to 9 March 1978. Its task was to check whether the undertakings given had in fact been fulfilled and to propose measures and agreements under which each state and all the signatory states were to implement and give added impetus to the intentions that had inspired all the provisions of the Act.

The European Parliament's assessment of the Belgrade Conference is given in the resolution adopted on 10 May 1978 (Doc. 76/78).

Special mention is made in the resolution of the agreement reached in assessing the vital role of implementation of the Act in furthering the process of detente; of the determination to implement fully, unilaterally, bilaterally and multilaterally its provisions; and of the commitment to further the CSCE process by organizing the Madrid Meeting and meetings of experts.

But on the other hand it was stressed that at the meeting the humanitarian aspects brought up by the countries of the Community were not given the support they deserved and that no agreement was reached on measures other than those provided for in the concluding document of the meeting.

Meetings of experts

The meetings of experts on specific topics mentioned above set general objectives for each topic, but did not lead to any concretely valid results of importance. One exception is the Scientific Forum in Hamburg, to which I shall return shortly.

At the meeting in Montreux devoted to the search for a generally acceptable method for a peaceful settlement of disputes that would supplement existing systems, the different approach by East and West European countries to problems of such great importance and complexity made it impossible to do more than make a series of suggestions and confirm in principle the resolve to continue the negotiations, even though a decision on the subject was postponed until the Madrid Meeting.

At Valletta, despite the absence of all the Mediterranean states, including Egypt and Israel, that did not sign the Act, agreement was reached on proposals that, if implemented, would provide possible openings for economic cooperation without taking the place of or duplicating existing initiatives or prejudicing cooperation outside the CSCE.

The Scientific Forum in Hamburg in March 1980 deserves particular attention. It took place in a climate of considerable unease as a result of serious incidents such as the invasion of Afghanistan and the deportation of Sakharov. On the other hand the high scientific level of the participants meant that the discussion of the living and working conditions of scientists was of an equally high level and provided an exceptional opportunity for reasserting the need for scientific liberty and its connection with fundamental liberties and human rights.

The VIIth Principle of the Final Act was referred to in explicit, autonomous and direct terms and all the relative conclusions were drawn as regards the possibility of communication and contact between scientists.

Bonn, Montreux, Valletta and Hamburg were thus experiments that produced different results - partly because of the diverse nature of the topics discussed - that should be used as the starting point, whether positive or negative, for more detailed discussion of topics, that even if related to specific sectors, are nevertheless of general interest.

The Madrid Meeting

Having summarized the course of the CSCE process so far, we are now on the eve of the Madrid Meeting.

It is impossible to ignore the deteriorated climate at international level and in the relations between the signatories of the Final Act in which the Madrid Meeting is to be convened. Initiatives and behaviour that conflict with the spirit and the letter of the Act brought about this deterioration in the climate.

Soviet intervention in Afghanistan violates the principles clearly set forth in the preamble to the Final Act which recognises 'the close links between peace and security in Europe and in the world as a whole';

the second principle lays down that the participating states should refrain from the threat or use of force not only in their mutual relations but also 'in their international relations in general'.

The climate has further deteriorated as a result of the alarming increase in the exercise of ideological control over individuals by some East European countries, in particular the Soviet Union, proof of which is furnished by: (a) the repressive measures adopted against those who call for human rights to be respected; (b) those who seek proper enforcement of the Final Act (the Sakharov case is only the most recent and best known such episode); (c) general infringements of human rights that differ in scale and degree in the East European countries. Nor should it be forgotten that there was a resumption of the jamming of broadcasts during the recent events in Poland.

The European Parliament has repeatedly adopted a precise and energetic position.

It is impossible to ignore the continuing crisis in the Middle East, which has been particularly aggravated by the armed conflict that has broken out between Iran and Irak, the crisis and recurring conflicts in South East Asia, or the present state of tension in Southern Africa and many other trouble spots.

This state of tension in international relations drives home the fact that the process triggered off in Helsinki should not be interrupted.

It is in fact the only European political forum of importance in the framework of East-West relations.

The Final Act is a basic point of reference for detente. At this precarious time of international tension, the Madrid Meeting provides a further opportunity to verify the extent to which its provisions have been implemented, to develop the East-West dialogue and to revive a concrete and genuine process of detente.

The countries of the Community must prepare for this meeting in a determined, homogenous and united fashion and do everything in their power to ensure that the values and convictions that they and all the Western European countries hold form the point of reference for their behaviour.

The motion for a resolution expresses some of the convictions to this end.

The first is that detente, which is indivisible by nature, is at the same time of a regional and global nature. This is clearly reflected in the unified inspiration underlining the Final Act and all its baskets.

Likewise, in the Community view, the concept of indivisibility does not indicate merely a territorial dimension but also a qualitative one.

In other words, it is difficult to achieve detente and effective and full cooperation between countries that are embroiled in the general context of tension, violation of the independence of peoples and the use of force for which signatory countries are responsible, as in the case of Afghanistan.

But detente is also indivisible in all the reciprocal undertakings that give it concrete form. It is therefore unacceptable to distinguish between detente at political, military, or humanitarian level. It is impossible to pursue one or other of the various aspects separately at different times. Detente cannot be considered as genuine unless it provides benefits, not to one or more countries, but to all in full measure.

All the principles must therefore be respected without distortions convenient to one or the other party; for instance, to cite two basic themes, the balance in the military strength of the parties is a precondition for a mutual and balanced reduction in the armed forces and armaments systems in Europe and outside Europe; and attention should be given to all the aspects of the Final Act and thus to the humanitarian aspects of the CSCE process. This in fact is the basis for respect for human rights and fundamental liberties by all the signatory states and at all levels, i.e. not only by states but also by individuals.

The unitary nature of the Helsinki Act must therefore be confirmed at Madrid as an essential element of detente.

Each of the 35 participating states will bear equal responsibility at the Madrid Meeting for willing and coherent behaviour, either by vigilantly ensuring that the undertakings given are fulfilled or by striving for constructive and fair results.

The Final Act is quite explicit. The follow-up to the CSCE is defined even at the end to be to take stock of 'the implementation of the provisions of the Final Act and of the tasks defined by the Conference'.

Such a provision would have no sense unless it allowed each participant to monitor any failure to respect or violation of the Final Act by one or other of the signatories in order to stimulate progress rather than regression, taking realistic account of course of the differences in political, economic and social systems to prevent the discussion from descending to unproductive polemics and with the undertakings given in the Final Act as the permanent point of reference.

It is in this spirit and in this perspective that the motion for a resolution - bearing in mind the serious risks and the difficulties under which the meeting is being held and in line with the resolve declared in the concluding document of the Belgrade Meeting - invites the governments of the nine Member States and the Commission of the European Communities to do everything in their power to continue the CSCE process; and to ensure

that as developments occur, a balance is maintained between all the elements contained in the Final Act and to make suggestions for the purpose of providing the Madrid Meeting with a maximum of information and constantly evaluating the progress made, especially in the field of human rights, in the intervals between meetings.

Hence the request for respect for all the principles mentioned; condemnation as contrary to the Final Act of any recourse to the threat or the use of force; of any violation of the national sovereignty of a signatory state to the Act by another country, under whatever pretext, as a flagrant violation of the spirit of the Act and therefore a danger to peace; the extreme importance attributed to the enjoyment of human rights and fundamental liberties, including freedom of thought, conscience, religion or belief.

Developments in the three 'baskets'

On this basis - in order to achieve balanced progress - there will have to be a detailed examination of the three baskets, whose provisions are intended to implement in detailed form the general principles set out in the Final Act.

Of particular importance currently are the measures to build confidence, improve security and create the conditions for harmonized and balanced disarmament.

The Madrid meeting will be faced in this field with a number of varied proposals which have been put forward recently.

The motion for a resolution pays particular attention to the French proposal for a conference on disarmament in Europe (CDE) which was supported by the governments of the Nine, as is clear from the declaration of Brussels of 20 November 1979.

The central point of the declaration is that in Madrid a precise mandate should be negotiated to be included in the final document of the meeting.

This mandate should include specific, new, detailed measures designed to make military activities in Europe more widely known, thus reducing the risk of surprise attacks, and which should be applicable to the whole continent of Europe, be open to verification and possibly be compulsory. There will thus be a qualitative difference between these provisions and the traditional CBMs laid down in the Final Act, which were politically important but not as effective from a technical and military point of view.

It will of course be possible to compare this proposal with proposals put forward by other parties. But the Community must insist that the mandate lays down the conditions for negotiations in the way described above, that is to say in a way which will allow a subsequent control process and a real reduction of arms in this geographical area.

However, the Madrid meeting cannot take as its sole aim - however important that may be - the preparation for a conference on military security. This would run counter to our view of the need for balance between the various components of the CSCE.

It is in the light of this balance that the subject matter of the second basket, which concerns economic cooperation, should be assessed.

Consideration should be given to the shortcomings and distortions which have appeared since the initial commitment, and consideration should be given to defining possible remedies and ways of making progress.

Much consideration was given in Belgrade to problems such as helping small and medium-sized undertakings, the treatment of representatives of commercial companies, the arbitrary fixation of price policy, the scarcity, indeed in some cases the total absence, of economic and statistical information and discrimination in the matter of transport.

However no practical results were achieved. In Madrid these subjects should be taken up again.

On a matter of particular importance, where progress is possible, it is to be hoped that in the field of administrative and technical provisions, particularly as regards exchange of economic and commercial information, business contacts will be facilitated.

These are sectors in which progress can be made easily in the short term with great benefit to operators - particularly small and medium-sized businesses - while taking into account the particular system in eastern Europe. Helping in this way the activities of individual operators - while taking into account the profound differences between the various economic systems - is one way of meeting the need to protect the interests of individuals and not just of states.

It should also be stressed that an essential condition for the stable involvement of all countries in the development of economic cooperation is the mutual and balanced benefits to be achieved in terms of equality through concrete negotiations and properly conducted mutual relations rather than through abstract declarations.

With these facts and these objectives in mind, particular attention should be given to the coordination of the credit policies of the Nine and the extent of western credits to facilitate imports to Eastern Europe, and the problems created on Community markets by dumping practices and the imposition of linked trade arrangements.

Two further subjects will be drawn to the attention of the participants in the Madrid meeting, different in nature but both equally pressing.

One, which has been highlighted by the extremely worrying economic situation, but which remains nevertheless a permanent problem, is that of energy supplies.

The other concerns the problems involved in the protection of the natural environment, whose influence on the quality of life is becoming increasingly clear.

We would also bear a heavy burden of responsibility if we did not - on the basis of the reaffirmation of the growing economic interdependence recalled in the Final Act - ask vigorously all the participating countries in the CSCE to bear their fair share of the burden of development aid for the developing countries.

The Community countries have a particular duty to face up to this problem, the dramatic nature of which was underlined with particular force and at some length in the recent debate in this Parliament.

We must thus stress the need to keep faith with the intention so often expressed to provide the developing countries with aid at the levels indicated by the United Nations.

In this context the countries of Eastern Europe should also be asked to increase significantly their aid to developing countries, to bear their fair share of the responsibility incumbent upon all the industrialized countries in order to achieve this fundamental precondition for the balanced, peaceful economic development of the human community.

In the context of the problems of economic cooperation it would appear particularly important for subjects responsibility for which has been transferred from the Member States to the Community, to be negotiated with the active participation of the Commission of the Community and for account to be taken of the role of the European Parliament.

The growing importance assumed by the Mediterranean in the world balance makes it essential for the Madrid meeting to stress questions of security and cooperation in the Mediterranean basin.

The existence of a specific chapter on this subject demonstrates the awareness that balance and security are not matters for central Europe alone. There is a recognition of the strict link between security in Europe and security in the Mediterranean area.

This area - in which are to be formed various alliances, non-aligned countries, and sharply differing degrees of development, could cause serious obstacles to the process of detente unless efforts are made to reduce tension and confrontation there.

In Madrid therefore steps will have to be taken to implement more fully the conclusions and recommendations of the meeting of experts in Valletta on economic, scientific and cultural cooperation.

As regards in particular security in the Mediterranean, it should be noted that the final document of Belgrade postponed discussion to the Madrid meeting.

Undoubtedly the different status of signatory and non-signatory countries side by side in this basin makes the problem of dealing with these subjects a particularly complex and delicate one.

The difficulties are aggravated by the anxieties, fears, rapid developments and the conflicts latent in this area but its importance in the process of finding a broad-based detente make it necessary to look for appropriate solutions to the problems of the Mediterranean countries in terms of cooperation and security.

o

o o

We come then to the third basket.

The Community countries, and our Parliament which has repeatedly given close consideration to the subject, must stress vigorously the essential importance which we attribute to the humanitarian component of the CSCE.

Our countries must do so - and Parliament can exercise its particularly important role here - on the basis of their profound conviction which - and we must not forget this - has always been at the root of our participation and our contribution to the CSCE process.

This humanitarian dimension contains the very essence of our democracies, the basis of our social co-existence, the inalienable foundation of our ideological and political outlook.

The humanitarian dimension of detente is specifically sanctioned in the VIIth Principle, but in the third basket the measures and practical undertakings necessary for its implementation are set out.

There are many reasons why we must be firm in our desire to give greater force and reality to our undertakings in this sector:

- a) the conviction that the almost palpable credibility of the whole CSCE process as far as our fellow citizens are concerned will be measured by the efforts made to make the implementation of the provisions of this chapter more complete and clearly visible;
- b) the widespread and growing fear at the breaches and violations committed in this sector in a number of countries from the beginning;
- c) the widespread regrets at the persistent lack of significant progress in implementing the Helsinki provisions;
- d) the alarming awareness that in a number of respects the situation has actually grown worse in spite of the unequivocal nature of the undertakings entered into.

It is true that the picture is not all black; some progress, however limited, has been made in a number of sectors. And indeed some substantial and important innovations - although opinions differ as to how closely these are connected with the CSCE - have been achieved in one signatory European country: Poland.

We hope that this progress will be made concrete in solutions based on wisdom and firmness and mutual understanding, in keeping with the high level of civilization and deeply rooted sense of democracy of the Polish people.

However, on the whole as regards implementation in the countries of Eastern Europe, the net result of progress on the third basket is disappointing compared with what could legitimately be expected from the Final Act.

This was unfortunately confirmed by the lack of practical results, following the detailed assessment at Belgrade of the failure to fulfil obligations as regards free movement of persons in every sense of the term, access to information, distribution of the press and the mass media, the improvement and extension of cooperation and exchanges in the cultural and educational field.

The affirmation - which is specifically set out in the Final Act - that these aspects of cooperation in the humanitarian field are fundamental for the mutual understanding of peoples and individuals and the strengthening of political coexistence has not yet produced the hoped for effect.

Greater stress will have to be laid in Madrid on the overriding need to improve this situation, with requests for practical implementation of the undertakings entered into.

We cannot accept the suggestion that these subjects are 'internal matters' subject to the VIth Principle on 'non-intervention in internal affairs'. This is a distorted interpretation which should be rejected. Just as we should reject the idea that the third basket is only a matter for bilateral agreements. This is not a matter for bargaining. It is a direct commitment which is binding in itself and binds all parties.

For this reason the motion for a resolution refers to the demands of our deepest convictions, and the expectations of public opinion, which we ourselves raised.

We must therefore make it perfectly clear, without a shadow of a doubt, that the respect of all human rights, individual contacts, mutual information, cooperation in culture and education are an integral part of any true and organic détente and that peace and cooperation

between peoples can grow in strength only if these conditions, essential to the constructive development of the CSCE process, are met.

Final considerations

The motion for a resolution which the Political Affairs Committee submits to this Parliament is inspired by the hope and the desire that in Madrid the Community will help to dispel the fears that the Final Act will be reduced to a mere flood of fine phrases disregarded in practice and devoid of any real content or practical commitment.

It will not be such if goodwill and proper mutual relations win the day. It contains a unified, practical and indeed detailed, programme. It should be implemented with a sense of realism, with patience, gradually but with a perseverance and tenacity to match the intentions of those who saw and see in it an instrument for more open and helpful relations between men, societies and states.

This is a historic process in which we must weigh up the difficulties and obstacles arising from existing circumstances, from often radically different or conflicting viewpoints, from the distortion of the nature and value of the commitments entered into, from the possibility of attempts to stop progress when certain aims have been achieved without paying the price - on both sides - of detente in the truest, most authentic sense.

We must be realistic but we must not be defeatist or laxist on essential points.

In Madrid therefore we must make it our clear aim in all areas of the Final Act to overcome the stalemate which marked the Belgrade Conference.

Our nature as a Parliament which directly expresses the will of the peoples of the Community makes it our responsibility to be present and active in the preparation of and conduct of the conference and therefore to call upon the governments of the nine countries to take practical steps to achieve the desired results.

This hope should be supported by a rational realism and a determined optimism.

