Mr. Edward FENECH-ADAMI (Prime Minister of Malta): Mr. Chairman, Excellencies, Distinguished Guests, Ladies and Gentlemen,

A meeting of Heads of State or Government of the States participating in the Conference on Security and Co-operation in Europe is a rather rare event. So too is its purpose. If I interpret it rightly it is nothing less than the official declaration of a new Pax Europea, and the solemn laying of the foundation stones of the appropriate international institutions it calls for.

This act of inauguration can now be carried out because, last year, 1989, is in all likelihood, the year which historians will recognise as the real end of World War Two; the end of the War's forty-four year long second phase, what seemed like the interminable "cold" phase, with Europe sundered in two parts frozen in hostile postures. The ice was so hard that the unfreezing process itself, winding from Helsinki to Paris, has taken no less than fifteen years.

On the one hand, the Yalta settlement between the great powers and its bisecting of Europe into discrete halves can now be seen to have been not just the preparation for the end of the "hot" phase of World War Two. It was also the official declaration of the opening of the "cold" phase of the War of an ideological and economic conflict, backed by an arms race and by the establishment of the other institutions proper to "cold war": from military pacts and political blocs to the Berlin Wall and the diffusion by us of mythical images of each other in the archaic forms of the Enemy. On the other hand, today, the Final Act of the Conference on Security and Co-operation in Europe, drawn up in Helsinki in 1975, can be seen as a masterpiece of peacemaking which really began the process of the end of World War Two. In particular, it brought out the combinatory nature of the military and the political (including the economic and cultural) aspects of security. It did this by focusing on the twin topics of armaments and human rights.

It is perhaps not sufficiently remembered that the first Declaration of Human Rights, associated with the French Revolution, coincided

historically with the change in military theory and practice, represented by the new institution of conscription, the compulsory enrolment of all able-bodied males in the armed forces.

The Final Act of Helsinki reflected, in some ways, the development of human rights doctrine from the purely individualistic political and cultural rights recognized in the first declarations, to the more recent adjunction of social and environmental rights; it also pointed the way to a correlative change in military concepts - a change which still needs to be brought to full fruition.

Helsinki was, however, only the first step towards the conclusion of the political ice-age of Europe. The Conference on Security and Co-operation in Europe began its course still firmly embedded in the throes of the Cold War.

It was still a matter of collective bargaining between two sides, with the realistic acknowledgement, through their participation, of the major role played by the United States of America and the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics in European affairs. It was this fact, paradoxically, which gave those who were outside the military alliances the opportunity to exercise their bridge-building role.

It was only in December 1989, in a storm-tossed Malta harbour that without any great flurry of words, with an almost silent but eloquently informal gesture, that the successors of the two main protagonists of Yalta openly declared the termination of the Cold War and sealed the deed which allowed the final dismantling of the apparatus that went with it.

I am happy that I personally had the privilege not only of providing the venue for this meeting, but also of being one of the first to walk in Berlin across the dividing line then still marked by the residues of the Wall and of the Western allies' rights over parts of the city. I was also gratified that Malta was the first foreign State to be officially visited by the President of the unbound Germany, released from the last fetters of the World War. The great cloud which overshadowed our recent past had been finally dispersed.

Now the task before us is new: to begin to build the institutions which can be the foundations of a new peaceful order in Europe, not just in one portion of our continent, but in the whole of Europe, however uncertain we may still be of its boundaries.

Mr. Chairman, in this context, there are three remarks which I wish to make. The first is this. The close link established in the Helsinki Act between the military and the political aspects of security needs obviously to be maintained, but with the emphasis increasingly shifting to the building up of peace through co-operation.

The pursuit of alternative defence policies for the whole of Europe must go on with an increasingly proactive commitment to the careful construction of co-operative mechanisms.

Economics is not the sole determinant of the shape of our existence, but perhaps the space in which democracy needs yet to grow apace is in the sphere of economic relations.

This is true, in the first instance, within each of our respective countries. Economic exchanges between States, as we know from experience, are not always necessarily means of reciprocal enrichment. They can easily become means of subordination, if they are not carried out between compatible systems.

The chances of the development of pan-European trading networks which will operate in symbolic and equitable, non-inegalitarian terms will clearly be much better if our national economic systems become more democratic.

I am stressing this point because it is plain from recent history the turns for the better or for the worse in international co-operation are as much conditioned by the internal dynamics of national economies as these are in turn conditioned by international conjunctures.

The most promising feature of the present State of Europe from the point of view of the establishment of new co-operative mechanisms is the

growing convergence among all European countries upon the choice of a mixed economic system, combining market forces within social strategy, in which production is for human, personal and community growth, rather than for the aggrandizement of State or Capital.

My second point, Mr. Chairman, concerns the concept of security. In its wider sense, I assume that security means a fair assurance that change within a community occurs largely because of indigenous factors, rather than by external imposition, and consequently is evolutionary, rather than cataclysmic.

Inevitably, this implies that security will have a military aspect, as long as the possibility of an outside threat exists. However, it does not imply that the military doctrine in application until now must continue to be applied as in the past phase of European history, with only a change of level of armament.

Security can be compatible with a change of system, for instance through a preference for defensive, non-provocative, rather than retaliatory, weapons. The kind of weapons chosen normally corresponds to the kind of image that is held of the potential enemy; their level to that of the potential objects of conflict.

However, our objective must be to avoid as far as possible all resort to force or the threat of use of force, whether explicit or implicit. It is difficult to envisage how this objective can be attained unless we agree to an acceptable system for the peaceful settlement of disputes. Yet two meetings on this topic, in Montreux in 1978 and in Athens in 1984, failed to register any significant progress.

A third opportunity will present itself in January next year, in Malta. A third failure would be quite inconsistent with the direction of events in Europe on which we are setting our seal here in Paris.

Another aspect of security that any acceptable system has to cater for is that of small States, inevitably more vulnerable because they

cannot rely on strong, national armed forces. The aggressive action by Iraq is an eye-opener to the essential need for small States to receive special consideration in devising a realistic system of security, possibly able to anticipate threats and certainly respond quickly to them.

The third point I wish to make concerns the Mediterranean. The recognition in the Final Act of Helsinki that security and co-operation in Europe is linked to security and co-operation in the Mediterranean remains as valid today as all its other provisions.

Proposals have been made to constitute specific fora to deal with the Mediterranean. The difficulties in the way of their constitution are not yet overcome. Until such fora materalize, the CSCE cannot afford to ignore the troubles affecting the littoral States of the sea washing the southern shores of Europe.

In this connection, Malta has several times made proposals for the setting up of a network of functional institutions which can constitute a basis for co-operation despite all the existing differences. At any rate, the CSCE process will not be complete until there is security also in the Mediterranean.

Mr. Chairman, I need hardly add that Malta intends to continue to participate fully in the CSCE, as it does in other international organizations. Small though we are in size and modest in resources, we recognize the need to contribute in every appropriate way to meeting the operational demands of such organizations.

As a result of the Paris meeting, these demands will forseeably increase. Given our belief that building up the new peace order in Eucpe implies shared commitments, we will not shirk added responsibilities.

Our seeking of full membership in the European Community in no way diminishes our attachment to Europe as a whole, the Europe of the CSCE, the Europe of its peoples. We believe that the success of the CSCE at Helsinki was essentially due to the fact that it reflected the deep aspirations of the people of Europe.

In order to be faithful to that initial thrust, the building of "Europa Major" cannot take place according to the obsolete code of nineteenth century nation building.

It cannot be a merely intergovernmental matter. It must involve the opening up of multiple communications through all kinds of channels between all our peoples.

Only when that happens can we be truly confident that Europe will cease to be a more than generally dangerous place to live in, as it has unfortunately been through most of its history, and when that happens, it will add an even greater lustre to our gratitude to the French Government and the authorities of Paris, for the organization they were able to set up to deal with the tidal flow of inputs to this Meeting, and for the generous hospitality they have shown us; a fitting combination of the resources of heart and mind, such as can serve to symbolize the spirit of the new Pax Europea we have gathered here to declare.