



## General Assembly

Distr.  
GENERAL

A/41/185  
5 March 1986  
ENGLISH  
ORIGINAL: RUSSIAN

Forty-first session  
Items 56, 57, 59, 60, 61, 63, 65, 68,  
71 and 82 of the preliminary list\*

PREVENTION OF AN ARMS RACE IN OUTER SPACE  
IMPLEMENTATION OF GENERAL ASSEMBLY RESOLUTION 40/88 ON THE IMMEDIATE  
CESSATION AND PROHIBITION OF NUCLEAR-WEAPON TESTS  
PROHIBITION OF THE DEVELOPMENT AND MANUFACTURE OF NEW TYPES OF  
WEAPONS OF MASS DESTRUCTION AND NEW SYSTEMS OF SUCH WEAPONS  
REDUCTION OF MILITARY BUDGETS  
CHEMICAL AND BACTERIOLOGICAL (BIOLOGICAL) WEAPONS  
GENERAL AND COMPLETE DISARMAMENT  
REVIEW OF THE IMPLEMENTATION OF THE RECOMMENDATIONS AND  
DECISIONS ADOPTED BY THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY AT ITS TENTH  
SPECIAL SESSION  
RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN DISARMAMENT AND DEVELOPMENT  
REVIEW OF THE IMPLEMENTATION OF THE DECLARATION ON THE  
STRENGTHENING OF INTERNATIONAL SECURITY  
DEVELOPMENT AND INTERNATIONAL ECONOMIC CO-OPERATION

Letter dated 3 March 1986 from the Acting Permanent Representative  
of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics to the United Nations  
addressed to the Secretary-General

I have the honour to transmit to you herewith the section entitled "Basic aims and directions of the Party's foreign-policy strategy" of the political report of the Central Committee of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union (CPSU) to the Twenty-seventh Congress of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union, presented on 25 February 1986 by M. S. Gorbachev, General Secretary of the CPSU Central Committee.

\* A/41/50.

I request you to have this text distributed as an official document of the General Assembly under items 56, 57, 59, 60, 61, 63, 65, 68, 71 and 82 of the preliminary list.

V. S. SAFRONCHUK  
Acting Permanent Representative of  
the USSR to the United Nations  
Ambassador Extraordinary and  
Plenipotentiary

## ANNEX

### Basic aims and directions of the Party's foreign-policy strategy

The goals underlying the country's economic and social development also determine the international strategy of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union (CPSU). Its main aim is crystal clear: to ensure for the Soviet people the possibility of working under conditions of lasting peace and freedom. Such, in essence, is the Party's primary requirement for our foreign policy. To fulfil it in the present situation means, above all, to terminate the material preparations for a nuclear war.

Having weighed all the aspects of the situation, CPSU has put forward a coherent programme for the total abolition of weapons of mass destruction before the end of this century, a programme that is historic in its dimensions and significance. Its implementation would open up for mankind a fundamentally new period of development and the opportunity to concentrate entirely on constructive labour.

As you know, we have addressed our proposals not only through the traditional diplomatic channel but also directly to world public opinion, to the world's peoples. The time has come to have a thorough understanding of the harsh realities of our day: nuclear weapons harbour a hidden force capable of sweeping the human race from the face of the earth. Our address further underscores the open, honest, Leninist character of the foreign-policy strategy of CPSU.

Socialism unconditionally rejects war as a means of resolving inter-State political and economic contradictions and settling ideological disputes. Our ideal is a world without weapons and violence, a world in which each people freely chooses its path of development, its way of life. This is an expression of the humanism of communist ideology, of its moral values. That is why, for the future as well, the struggle against the nuclear threat and the arms race and for the preservation and strengthening of universal peace remains the fundamental direction of the Party's activities on the international scene.

There is no alternative to such a policy. This is all the more true in periods of tension in international affairs. I would say that never in the decades since the Second World War has the situation in the world been so explosive, and thus so complex and unfavourable, as in the first half of the 1980s. The right-wing group that came to power in the United States, and its main NATO fellow-travellers, have turned sharply away from détente in favour of a policy of military force. They have armed themselves with doctrines that reject good-neighbourly relations and co-operation as principles of world development and as a political philosophy of international relations. The Administration in Washington has remained deaf to our calls for an end to the arms race and an improvement of the situation.

Perhaps it is not worth digging up the past, especially today, when in Soviet-American relations there seem to be signs of changes for the better, and

/...

realistic trends are beginning to resurface in the actions and attitudes of the leadership of certain NATO countries. We feel that it is indeed worthwhile, for the sharp freeze in the international climate in the first half of the 1980s was a further reminder that nothing comes of itself; peace has to be fought for, and this has to be a persevering and meaningful fight. We have to look for, find and use even the smallest opportunity in order - while it is still possible - to halt the trend towards an escalation of the threat of war. Appreciating this, the Central Committee of CPSU at its April plenary session once again analysed the nature and dimensions of the nuclear threat and defined the practical steps that could lead to an improvement in the situation. We were guided by the following considerations of principle.

First. The character of present-day weaponry leaves no State with any hope of defending itself solely with military and technical means - for example, by building up a defence, even the most powerful. To ensure security is seen increasingly as a political problem, and it can only be solved by political means. In order to progress along the road of disarmament, what is needed above all is the will. Security cannot be built permanently on fear of retaliation, in other words, on the doctrines of "containment" or "deterrence". Apart from the absurdity and amorality of a situation in which the whole world becomes a nuclear hostage, these doctrines encourage an arms race that may sooner or later go out of control.

Second. In the context of relations between the USSR and the United States, security can only be mutual, and if international relations are viewed as a whole, it can only be universal. The highest wisdom does not lie in caring solely about oneself, especially if this is to the detriment of the other side. It is vital that all should feel equally secure, for the fears and anxieties of the nuclear age generate uncertainty in political affairs and in concrete actions. It is becoming extremely important to take into account the critical significance of the time factor. The appearance of new systems of weapons of mass destruction steadily shortens the time, and narrows down the possibilities, for adopting political decisions on questions of war and peace in crisis situations.

Third. The military-industrial machine in the United States remains the driving force of militarism, which so far has no intention of slowing down. This, of course, has to be taken into consideration. But we are well aware that the interests and aims of the military-industrial complex are not at all the same as the interests and aims of the American people, as the genuine national interests of that great country.

Naturally, the world is much larger than the United States and its occupation bases on foreign soil; in world politics one cannot confine oneself to relations with any single, even a very important, country. As we know from experience, this only fosters the arrogance of strength. Needless to say, we attach considerable importance to the state and character of the relations between the Soviet Union and the United States. Our countries have quite a few points of coincidence, and there is a genuine need to live in peace with each other and to co-operate on the basis of equality and mutual benefit and only on that basis.

/...

Fourth. The world is in the process of rapid change, and it is not within anyone's power to maintain a perpetual status quo in it. It consists of many scores of countries, each having interests that are perfectly legitimate. All without exception face a task of fundamental importance: without being blind to social, political and ideological differences, all have to master the science and art of restraint and circumspection on the international scene, to live in a civilized manner. In other words, in conditions of proper international intercourse and co-operation. But to give this co-operation wide scope there has to be an all-embracing system of international economic security that would equally protect every State against discrimination, sanctions, and other attributes of imperialist, neo-colonialist policy. Together with disarmament, such a system can become a dependable pillar of international security generally.

In short, the modern world has become too small and fragile for wars and a policy of force. It cannot be saved and preserved unless the thinking and actions built up over the centuries, based on the acceptability and permissibility of wars and armed conflicts, are shed once and for all.

This means the realization that it is no longer possible to win an arms race, or indeed a nuclear war. The continuation of this race on earth, let alone its extension into outer space, will accelerate the already critically high rate of stockpiling and perfecting nuclear weapons. The situation in the world may become such that it will no longer depend upon the intelligence or will of political leaders. It may become captive to technology, to technocratic military logic. Consequently, not only nuclear war itself but also the preparation for it, in other words, the arms race, the aspiration to achieve military superiority can, objectively speaking, bring no political gain to anyone.

Further, this means understanding that the present level of the balance of the nuclear capabilities of the opposing sides is much too high. For the time being this ensures equal danger to each of them - but only for the time being. Continuation of the nuclear-arms race will inevitably heighten this equal danger and may bring it to a point where even parity will cease to be a factor for politico-military deterrence. Consequently, it is vital, in the first place, to reduce dramatically the level of military confrontation. In our age, genuine equal security is guaranteed not by an excessively high but by the lowest possible level of strategic parity, from which nuclear and other types of weapons of mass destruction must be totally excluded.

Lastly, this means realizing that in the present situation there is no alternative to co-operation and interaction among all States. Thus, the objective - I emphasize, objective - conditions have taken shape in which confrontation between capitalism and socialism can proceed only and exclusively in forms of peaceful competition and peaceful rivalry.

For us peaceful coexistence is a political course which the USSR intends to go on following unswervingly. In ensuring the continuity of its foreign-policy strategy, CPSU will pursue a vigorous international policy stemming from the realities of the world we live in. Of course, the problems of international security cannot be solved by one of two - even if very intensive - peace offensives. Success can only be brought about by consistent, methodical and persevering effort.

Continuity in foreign policy has nothing in common with the simple repetition of what has been done, especially in tackling the problems that have accumulated. What is wanted is a high degree of accuracy in assessing one's own possibilities, restraint, and an eminently high sense of responsibility when taking decisions. What is needed is firmness in upholding principles and positions, tactical flexibility, a readiness for mutually acceptable compromises, and an orientation towards dialogue and mutual understanding rather than towards confrontation.

As you know, we have taken a series of unilateral steps: we have put a moratorium on the deployment of intermediate-range missiles in Europe, cut back their number, and stopped all nuclear tests. In Moscow and abroad there have been talks with the leaders and members of the Governments of many States. The Soviet-Indian, the Soviet-French and the Soviet-American summit meetings were necessary and useful steps.

The Soviet Union has made energetic efforts to give a fresh impetus to the negotiations in Geneva, Stockholm and Vienna, the purpose of which is to scale down the arms race and build up confidence among States. Negotiations are always a delicate and complex matter. It is of cardinal importance here to lead up to a mutually acceptable balance of interests. To turn weapons of mass destruction into an object of political scheming is, to say the least, immoral, while in political terms it is irresponsible.

Lastly, there is our statement of 15 January of this year. Taken as a whole, our programme is essentially an amalgam that combines the philosophy of shaping a safe world in the nuclear and space age with a platform of concrete actions. The Soviet Union offers to approach the problems of disarmament in their totality, for in terms of security they are linked with one another. I am not speaking of rigid linkages or attempts to "back down" in one direction in order to erect barricades in another. What I am talking about is a plan of specific actions strictly scheduled over time. The USSR intends to work perseveringly for its realization, regarding it as the primary direction of our foreign policy for the coming years.

Soviet military doctrine is also entirely in keeping with the letter and spirit of the initiatives we have put forward. Its orientation is unequivocally defensive. In the military sphere we intend to continue acting in such a way as to give no one grounds for fear, even imagined, about their security. But equally we and our allies want to be rid of the feeling that we are threatened. The USSR has assumed the obligation not to be the first to use nuclear weapons and it will abide strictly by that obligation. But it is no secret that scenarios for a nuclear strike against us exist. We have no right to overlook this. The Soviet Union is a staunch adversary of nuclear war in any form. Our country is in favour of removing weapons of mass destruction from use and of limiting the military capability to reasonable adequacy. But the character and level of this ceiling continue to be limited by the attitudes and actions of the United States and its bloc partners. Under these conditions we repeat again and again: the Soviet Union lays no claim to more security, but it will not settle for less.

I should like to draw attention to the problem of verification, to which we attach special importance. We have declared on several occasions that the USSR is

open to verification and that we are interested in it as much as anyone else. All-embracing, strictest verification is perhaps the key element of the disarmament process. The essence of the matter, in our thinking, is that there can be no disarmament without verification, and verification without disarmament makes no sense.

There is another matter of principle. We have explained our attitude towards "star wars" at some length. The United States has already drawn many of its allies into this programme. There is the danger that it may become irreversible. Before it is too late, it is imperative to find a realistic solution guaranteeing that the arms race does not spread to outer space. The "star wars" programme cannot be permitted to be used as a stimulus for a further arms race or as a road-block to far-reaching disarmament. Tangible progress towards a drastic reduction of nuclear capabilities can be of much help in surmounting this obstacle. For that reason the Soviet Union is prepared to take a substantial step in that direction, resolving the question of intermediate-range missiles in the European zone separately, without a direct link to problems related to strategic armaments and outer space.

The Soviet programme has touched the hearts of millions of people, and among political leaders and public figures, interest in it continues to grow. The times we live in are such that it is hard to brush it aside. The attempts to cast doubt on the Soviet Union's constructive commitment to accelerate and to tackle in a practical manner this pressing problem of our day - the destruction of nuclear weapons - are becoming less and less convincing. Nuclear disarmament should not be the exclusive domain of political leaders. The whole world is pondering this, for it is a question of life itself.

But it is also necessary to take into account the reaction of the centres of power that hold the keys to the success or failure of disarmament negotiations. Of course, the ruling class in the United States - to be more exact, its most egotistical groups linked to the military-industrial complex - have other aims that are clearly opposed to ours. For them, disarmament spells a loss of profits and a political risk; for us, it is a blessing in all respects - economically, politically and morally.

We know our principal opponents and we have accumulated thorough and extensive experience in our relations and talks with them. The day before yesterday we received President Reagan's reply to our statement of 15 January. The American side began to set forth its observations in greater detail at the talks in Geneva. To be sure, we shall closely examine everything the Americans have to say on these matters. However, since the reply was received literally on the eve of the Congress, the United States Administration apparently expects - at least that is how we see it - our attitude towards the United States position to be made known to the world from this rostrum.

What I can say right away is that the President's letter does not give grounds for amending the assessments of the international situation set forth in the report before the reply had been received. It says that the elimination of nuclear arms is the goal all the nuclear Powers should strive to attain. In this letter the President agrees in general with some of the Soviet proposals and intentions with regard to disarmament and security. In other words, the reply seems to contain some reassuring opinions and positions.

/...

However, these positive pronouncements are swamped by various reservations, "linkages" and "conditions" which in fact block the solution of fundamental problems of disarmament. Reduction in strategic nuclear arsenals is made conditional on our consent to the "star wars" programme and to reductions - unilateral, by the way - in Soviet conventional arms. Linked to this are also the problems of regional conflicts and bilateral relations. The elimination of nuclear weapons in Europe is blocked by references to the stand taken by the United Kingdom and France, and by the demand to weaken our defences in the eastern part of the country, while the United States military forces in that region would be maintained. The refusal to stop nuclear tests is justified by arguments to the effect that nuclear weapons serve as a "deterrent". This is in direct contradiction to the purpose reaffirmed in the letter - the need to destroy nuclear weapons. The reluctance of the United States and its ruling circles to embark on the path of nuclear disarmament manifests itself most clearly with reference to nuclear explosions, the termination of which is demanded by the whole world.

In a word, without going into detail, it is hard to detect in the letter we have just received any serious readiness on the part of the American leadership to get down to solving the cardinal problems of eliminating the nuclear threat. It looks as if the people in Washington - and elsewhere, for that matter - have got used to living side by side with nuclear weapons, linking them with their plans in the international arena. However, whether they like it or not, Western politicians will have to answer the question: are they prepared to part with nuclear weapons at all?

In accordance with an understanding reached in Geneva there will be another meeting with the American President. The significance we attach to it is that it ought to produce practical results in key areas of limiting and reducing armaments. There are at least two matters on which an understanding could be reached: the cessation of nuclear tests and the abolition of United States and Soviet intermediate-range missiles in the European zone. And then, what is more, if there is readiness to seek agreement, the question of the time of the meeting will be resolved by itself: we will accept any suggestion on that count. But there is no sense in holding empty talks. We shall not remain indifferent if the Soviet-American dialogue that has started - inspiring some not unfounded hopes of a possibility for changes for the better - is used as a means of continuing the arms race and the material preparations for war. The Soviet Union is of a firm mind to justify the hopes of the peoples of our two countries and of the whole world, who are expecting practical steps, concrete actions and tangible agreements on the part of the leaders of the USSR and the United States on how to block the arms race. We are prepared for this.

Naturally, like any other country, we attach considerable importance to the security of our frontiers, both on land and at sea. Our neighbours are many and varied. We have no territorial claims against any of them. We threaten none of them. But as experience has shown time and again, there are quite a few persons who, in disregard of the national interests of either our country or those States which are our neighbours, are endeavouring to aggravate the situation on the frontiers of the Soviet Union.



For instance, counter-revolution and imperialism have turned Afghanistan into a bleeding wound. The USSR supports that country's efforts to defend its sovereignty. We should like, in the nearest future, to bring home the Soviet troops stationed in Afghanistan at the request of its Government. Moreover, we have agreed with the Afghan side on the timetable for their phased withdrawal as soon as a political settlement is reached that ensures an actual cessation, and reliably guarantees the non-resumption, of foreign armed intervention in the internal affairs of the Democratic Republic of Afghanistan. It is in our vital, national interest that the USSR should always have good and peaceful relations with all its neighbours. This is a key objective of our foreign policy.

CPSU regards the European aspect as one of the main directions of its international activities. Europe's historic opportunity and its future lie in peaceful co-operation among the nations of that continent. And it is important, while preserving the capital already accumulated, to move further forward - from the initial phase to a more lasting phase of détente, to mature détente, and then to the building of dependable security based on the Helsinki process and on a radical reduction of nuclear and conventional weapons.

The significance of the Asian and Pacific aspect is growing. In that vast region there is a tangled web of contradictions and, furthermore, the political situation in some places is unstable. Here it is necessary, without any postponement, to find the relevant solutions and paths. Evidently, this has to begin with the co-ordination and then the pooling of efforts in the interests of a political settlement of painful problems so as, in parallel, on that basis, to at least take the edge off the military confrontation in various parts of Asia and stabilize the situation there.

This is made all the more urgent by the fact that in Asia and in other continents the embers of military danger are not dying down. We are in favour of initiating a joint search for ways to defuse conflict situations in the Middle East, Central America, South Africa - in all the turbulent spots around the globe. This is urgently demanded by the interests of general security.

Crises and conflicts are fertile soil also for international terrorism. Undeclared wars, the export of counter-revolution in all forms, political assassinations, the taking of hostages, the hijacking of aircraft, and bomb attacks in streets, airports and railway stations - such is the hideous face of terrorism, which its instigators try to mask with various cynical fabrications. The USSR rejects terrorism in principle and is ready to co-operate actively with other States in order to uproot it. The Soviet Union will resolutely protect its citizens from acts of violence and do everything to defend their lives, honour and dignity.

Looking back over the past year one will see that, by all the evidence, the prerequisites for a change for the better in the international situation are beginning to emerge. But the prerequisites for such a change are not the change itself. The arms race continues and the threat of nuclear war remains. However, international reactionary forces are by no means omnipotent. The development of the world revolutionary process and the rise of mass democratic and anti-war

movements have significantly enlarged and strengthened the huge potential for peace, reason and good will. This is a powerful counter-balance to the aggressive policy of imperialism.

The destinies of peace and social progress are now linked more closely than ever before with the dynamism that characterizes the economic and political development of the world system of socialism. The need for this dynamism is dictated by concern for the peoples' welfare. But for the socialist world it is necessary also in order to counteract the danger of war. Lastly, this demonstrates the potentialities of the socialist way of life. We are watched by both friends and foes. We are watched by the huge and heterogeneous world of developing countries. It is looking for the right choice, for the path to take, and this choice will depend to a large extent on the successes of socialism, on the credibility of its answers to the challenges of our time.

We are convinced that socialism can resolve the most difficult problems confronting it. Of vital importance for this is an increasingly vigorous interaction which has the effect of not merely adding but rather of multiplying our potentials and which serves as a stimulus for common advancement. This is mirrored also in joint documents of the countries of the socialist community.

Interaction among the governing communist parties remains the heart and soul of political co-operation among these countries. During the past year there has been virtually no fraternal country with whose leadership we have not had meetings and detailed talks. The forms of such co-operation are themselves being updated. A new and perhaps key element, the multilateral working meetings of leaders of fraternal countries, is being institutionalized. These allow for flexible and friendly consultations on the entire spectrum of problems of socialist construction, covering both its internal and its external aspects.

In the difficult international situation the extension of the Warsaw Treaty by a unanimous decision of its signatories was of great significance. This Treaty has seen its second birth, so to speak, and today it is hard to picture world politics as a whole without it. Take the Sophia Conference of the Political Consultative Committee established under the Treaty: it was a kind of threshold of the Geneva dialogue.

In the economic sphere we now have the Comprehensive Programme of Scientific and Technological Progress. Its importance lies in the transition of the countries of the Council for Mutual Economic Co-operation (CMEA) to a co-ordinated policy in science and technology. In our view, changes are also required in the work of the headquarters of socialist integration - the Council itself. But the main thing is that in carrying out this programme there should be less bureaucratic administration and fewer committees and commissions of all sorts; more attention should be given to economic levers, initiative and socialist enterprise, and work collectives should be drawn into this process. This would indeed be the deeply committed Party approach needed for such an extraordinary undertaking.

Vitality, efficiency and initiative - all these qualities meet the imperatives of the times, and we shall strive to spread them throughout the system of relations

among fraternal parties. CPSU attaches growing significance to live, broad communication among the citizens of socialist countries, among people of different professions and different generations. This is a source of mutual intellectual enrichment, a channel for exchanges of views, ideas, and the experience of socialist construction. Today it is especially important to analyse the character of the socialist way of life and to understand the processes of perfecting democracy, management methods and personnel policy on the basis of the development of several countries rather than of one country. A considerate and respectful attitude to each other's experience and the employment of this experience in practice constitute a huge potential in the socialist world.

Generally speaking, one of the advantages of socialism is its ability to learn: to learn to solve the problems posed by life; to learn to forestall the crisis situations that our class adversary tries to create and utilize; to learn to counter the attempts to divide the socialist world and play off some countries against others; to learn to prevent collisions between the interests of different socialist countries, harmonize them by mutual effort, and find mutually acceptable solutions even to the most intricate problems.

It seems to us that it is worth taking a close look also at the relations within the socialist world as a whole. We do not see the community as being separated by any barriers from other socialist countries. CPSU stands for honest, open relations with all communist parties and all countries of the world socialist system, for comradely exchanges of opinion among them. Above all, we endeavour to see what unites the socialist world. For that reason the Soviet communists are gladdened by every step towards closer relations among all socialist States, by every positive advance in these relations.

One can say with gratification that there has been a measure of improvement in the Soviet Union's relations with its great neighbour - socialist China. The differing attitudes, in particular, towards a number of international problems remain; but we also note something else - that in many cases we can work jointly, co-operate on an equal basis of principle, without prejudice to third countries.

There is no need to explain the significance of this. The Chinese communists termed the victory of the USSR and of the forces of progress in the Second World War a prologue to the victory of the people's revolution in China. In turn, the establishment of people's China helped to reinforce the positions of socialism in the world and to disrupt many of the designs and actions of imperialism in the arduous post-war years. In thinking of the future, it may be said that the potential for co-operation between the USSR and China is enormous. This is because such co-operation is in line with the interests of both countries; because what is dearest to our peoples - socialism and peace - is indivisible.

CPSU is an inseparable part of the international communist movement. We, the Soviet communists, are well aware that every advance we make in building socialism is an advance for the entire movement. For that reason, CPSU sees its primary internationalist duty in ensuring our country's successful progress along the road that was open and blazed by the October Revolution.

The communist movement in the non-socialist part of the world remains the principal target of political pressure and harassment by the reactionary circles of the bourgeoisie. All the fraternal parties are constantly under fire from anti-communist propaganda, which does not refrain from the most despicable means and methods. Many parties operate underground, in a situation of unmitigated persecution and repression. Not a single step can the communists take without struggle and personal courage. Permit me, comrades, on behalf of the Twenty-seventh Congress, on behalf of the Soviet communists, to express sincere admiration for the dedicated struggle of our comrades and profound fraternal solidarity with them.

In recent years the communist movement has come face to face with many new realities, tasks and problems. All the indications are that it has entered a qualitatively new phase of development. The international conditions of the work of communists are changing rapidly and profoundly. A substantial restructuring is taking place in the social pattern of bourgeois society, including the composition of the working class. The problems confronting our friends in the new independent States are not simple. The scientific and technological revolution is exercising a contradictory influence on the material situation and the consciousness of working people in the non-socialist world. All this requires the ability to do a lot of rethinking, and demands a bold and creative approach to the new realities on the basis of the immortal teachings of Marx, Engels and Lenin. CPSU knows this well from its own experience.

The communist movement's immense diversity and the tasks facing it are likewise a reality. In some cases this leads to disagreements and divergencies. CPSU is not dramatizing the fact that complete unanimity among communist parties does not exist at all times and in everything. Obviously there cannot be a total identity of views on all issues without exception. The communist movement came into being when the working class entered the international arena as an independent and powerful political force. The parties that comprise it have grown on national soil and pursue a common final objective - peace and socialism. This is precisely the main determining factor that unites them.

We do not see the diversity of our movement as a synonym for disunity, just as unity has nothing in common with uniformity, hierarchy, interference by some parties in the affairs of others, or the striving of any party to have a monopoly of truth. The communist movement can and should be strong by virtue of its class solidarity, by virtue of equal co-operation among all the fraternal parties in the struggle to achieve common aims. This is how CPSU understands unity and intends to do everything to foster it.

The trend towards strengthening the potential for peace, reason and good will is enduring and, in principle, irreversible. Behind it is the aspiration of people, of all nations, to live in an atmosphere of concord and co-operation. However, one should look at things realistically: the interplay of forces in the struggle against war is taking shape in the course of an acute and dynamic confrontation between progress and reaction. An immutable factor is the solidarity of CPSU with the forces of national liberation and social emancipation and our course towards close interaction with socialist-oriented countries,

/...

revolutionary-democratic parties and the Non-Aligned Movement. The Soviet public is prepared to go on developing links with non-communist movements and organizations, including religious organizations that oppose war.

This is also the angle from which CPSU regards its relations with the social democratic movement. It goes without saying that the ideological differences between the communists and the social democrats are deep, and that their experience and achievements are dissimilar and non-equivalent. However, an unbiased look at the positions and views of each other is unquestionably useful to both the communists and the social democrats - useful in the first place for furthering the struggle for peace and international security.

We are living in a world of realities and are building our international policy in keeping with the specific features of the present phase of international development. Our creative analysis of this phase and our vision of prospects have led us to a conclusion that is highly significant. Today, as never before, it is important to find ways for closer and more productive co-operation with governments, parties and mass organizations and movements that are truly concerned about the future of peace on earth, with all peoples, in order to build an all-embracing system of international security.

The fundamental principles of such a system would be the following:

1. The military sphere

- Renunciation by the nuclear Powers of war, both nuclear and conventional, against each other or against third States;
- Prevention of an arms race in outer space, cessation of all nuclear-weapon tests and the total destruction of such weapons, a ban on and the destruction of chemical weapons, and renunciation of the development of other means of mass annihilation;
- A strictly supervised lowering of the levels of military capabilities of States to limits of reasonable adequacy;
- Disbandment of military alliances, and as a stage towards this, renunciation of their enlargement and of the formation of new ones;
- Proportional and commensurate reduction of military budgets.

2. The political sphere

- Unconditional respect in international practice for the sovereign right of each people to choose the ways and forms of its development;
- The just political settlement of international crises and regional conflicts;

- Elaboration of a set of measures aimed at building confidence among States, and the creation of effective guarantees of protection against external attack and of the inviolability of their frontiers;

- Elaboration of effective methods of averting international terrorism, including methods of ensuring the safety of international land, air and sea communications.

### 3. The economic sphere

- Exclusion of all forms of discrimination from international practice, and renunciation of the policy of economic blockades and sanctions, if this is not directly provided for in the recommendations of the world community;

- The joint search for ways to achieve a just settlement of the problem of indebtedness;

- Establishment of a new international economic order guaranteeing the equal economic security of all States;

- The elaboration of principles for utilizing part of the funds released as a result of a reduction of military budgets for the good of the world community, and especially the developing countries;

- The pooling of efforts in the exploration and peaceful use of outer space and in solving global problems on which the destiny of civilization depends.

### 4. The humanitarian sphere

- Co-operation in the dissemination of the ideas of peace, disarmament and international security; greater flow of general objective information and greater opportunities for peoples to acquaint themselves with each other's way of life; reinforcement of the spirit of mutual understanding and concord in relations between them;

- Eradication of genocide, apartheid, advocacy of fascism and every other form of racial, national or religious exclusiveness, and also of discrimination against individuals on these grounds;

- The extension, while respecting the laws of each country, of international co-operation in the realization of political, social and individual human rights;

- The solving in a humane and positive spirit of questions related to the reunification of families, marriage, and the promotion of contacts between individuals and between organizations;

- The strengthening of and the search for new forms of co-operation in culture, art, science, education and medicine.

These principles follow logically from the provisions of the Programme of CPSU. They are fully in keeping with our practical foreign-policy initiatives. Guided by them, it would be possible to make peaceful coexistence the highest universal principle of inter-State relations. In our view, these principles could become the point of departure and a sort of guideline for a direct and systematic dialogue between leaders of countries of the world community, both bilateral and multilateral.

Since, moreover, this concerns the fate of peace, such a dialogue is particularly important among the permanent members of the Security Council - the five nuclear Powers. They bear the primary burden of responsibility for the destiny of humanity. I emphasize: it is not a privilege, not a foundation for claims to "leadership" in world affairs, but a responsibility, and nobody has the right to forget this. Why then should their leaders not gather at a round table and discuss what could and should be done to promote peace?

In our view, the entire existing mechanism of arms-limitation talks should also start to function at top productivity. Can one really "grow accustomed" to the fact that for years these talks have been proceeding on a parallel course with a simultaneous build-up of armaments?

The USSR is giving considerable attention in international forums, as well as within the framework of the Helsinki process, to the problems and prospects of the world economy, the interdependence between disarmament and development, and the expansion of trade and scientific and technological co-operation. We feel that in the future it would be important to convene a world congress on problems of economic security, at which it would be possible to discuss in a package everything that encumbers world economic relations.

We are prepared to consider seriously any other proposals aimed in the same direction.

In the battle to prevent war it is vital to strive for success. This would be an epoch-making victory for the whole of humanity, for every person on earth. CPSU sees active participation in this battle as the essence of its foreign-policy strategy.

-----