



General Assembly Security Council

Distr.
GENERAL

A/42/132
S/18701

18 February 1987
ENGLISH
ORIGINAL: RUSSIAN

GENERAL ASSEMBLY
Forty-second session
Items 50, 57, 58, 62, 67 and 74 of the
preliminary list*
CESSATION OF ALL NUCLEAR-TEST EXPLOSIONS
PREVENTION OF AN ARMS RACE IN OUTER SPACE
IMPLEMENTATION OF GENERAL ASSEMBLY
RESOLUTION 41/54 ON THE IMMEDIATE
CESSATION AND PROHIBITION OF
NUCLEAR-WEAPON TESTS
CHEMICAL AND BACTERIOLOGICAL
(BIOLOGICAL) WEAPONS
REVIEW OF THE IMPLEMENTATION OF THE
RECOMMENDATIONS AND DECISIONS
ADOPTED BY THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY AT ITS
TENTH SPECIAL SESSION
COMPREHENSIVE SYSTEM OF INTERNATIONAL
PEACE AND SECURITY

SECURITY COUNCIL
Forty-second year

Letter dated 17 February 1987 from the Permanent Representative
of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics to the United Nations
addressed to the Secretary-General

I have the honour to enclose the text of a speech given by the General Secretary of the Central Committee of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union, M. S. Corbachev, on 16 February 1987 at the International Forum in Moscow for a Nuclear-Free World and the Survival of Mankind.

I should be grateful if you would have the text circulated as an official document of the General Assembly, under items 50, 57, 58, 62, 67 and 74 of the preliminary list, and of the Security Council.

(Signed) A. BELONOGOV

* A/42/50.

ANNEX

Speech given by the General Secretary of the Central Committee
of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union on 16 February 1987
at the International Forum for a Nuclear-Free World and for
the Survival of Mankind

From the moment when man first began to give thought to tomorrow, the best minds of various countries and peoples have no doubt constantly turned to the question of the fate of the world and the future of mankind.

Up until not so very long ago, reflection on these and related issues was regarded as a mental exercise, as an occupation, remote from everyday human concerns, of philosophers, scholars and theologians. In recent decades, though, these problems have emerged onto a highly practical plane. The reasons for this are easy to understand.

The development of nuclear weapons and the delivery vehicles for them, and their subsequent stockpiling beyond all reasonable limits, have given mankind the technical capability of putting an end to its own existence. At the same time, the build-up of socially explosive situations in the world and the attempts to tackle the problems of a radically altered world by force, by methods inherited from the Stone Age, make catastrophe highly probable in political terms as well. The militarization of peoples' outlook and their way of life weakens, and even removes altogether, the moral inhibitions against nuclear suicide.

We have no right to forget that the first step in this direction has already been taken, and the first step is always the hardest. Nuclear weapons have been used against human beings, and used twice. There are dozens - I repeat, dozens - of documented and acknowledged cases in which the possibility of their use against other States was considered. I say this not by way of criticism or condemnation - although such plans more than deserve both - but in order to emphasize yet again how close mankind has come to the point of no return.

The First World War shocked its contemporaries by the unprecedented scale of the suffering and destruction it caused, by the brutality and technical impersonality of the process of annihilation. But appalling as the wounds it inflicted were, the Second World War surpassed its "records" many times over.

One strategic submarine today carries a destructive potential equivalent to several Second World Wars. There are dozens of such submarines, and their nuclear systems are far from being the only ones. The imagination is powerless to envisage the hell, the negation of the very idea of man, that would result if even the smallest part of the present nuclear arsenal is used.

After the Second World War (as, indeed, after the first), attempts were made to organize a world order which would prevent the wholesale slaughter of peoples. Although these attempts have not fully lived up to expectations, they have not

vanished without trace. The United Nations is a going concern. There are regional and other structures for contacts between States, and between societies, which did not exist before. In short, the political search for ways of saving the world community from the false "logic" that led to the world wars continues.

After a nuclear war, though, there would be no problems, and no one would be left to sit down for talks, not at the negotiating table, but at the negotiating tree stump or rock. There will be no Noah's Ark after a nuclear deluge. I think everyone understands this in theory. The crucial thing is to accept that the time for assuming things will "sort themselves out" is past. International relations and the conduct of Governments and States have to be brought without delay into line with the realities of the nuclear age.

This is how things stand: either political thinking is brought into line with the requirements of the times, or civilization and life itself on earth may perish.

In all human affairs, and especially in international politics, we must not for a moment forget the contradiction, which currently dominates the whole situation, between war and peace, between the existence and non-existence of mankind. And we must strive to resolve it in time, and in favour of peace.

To do this, we need to seek out, foster and share with each other all the best that history has produced, to look for new creative approaches to the chronic problems.

Not just the progress of the human race, but even quite simply its very survival, depend on whether or not we can find within ourselves the strength and courage to overcome the dangers with which the modern world is fraught.

I think there are grounds for expecting that we can. A notable feature of recent decades has been that, for the first time in its history, mankind as a whole, and not just individual representatives of it, is beginning to be aware of itself as a single entity, to perceive the global relationships between man, society and nature, and to assess the consequences of the scale of man's material activities.

And it is not only awareness that has come; a campaign to remove the nuclear threat is also under way, and has, undeniably, already become a great moral and political school in which the masses of the people and whole nations are learning the difficult but necessary art of living at peace with one another, of striking a balance between general and special interests, of looking boldly and honestly at the present and the future, understanding them and, from that understanding, drawing appropriate conclusions for action. Your Forum is one of the proofs that this is so.

Ladies and gentlemen, comrades,

Before going into the substance of all these problems in detail, I wish on behalf of the people and Government of the Soviet Union to extend cordial greetings

to all of you participants in the Moscow Forum - politicians and journalists, businessmen and scholars, doctors, practitioners of culture and the arts, writers and representatives of various churches.

We set great store by the very fact that such a Forum is being held, and that many famous and influential people have gathered for it from the four corners of the world. We appreciate that every one of you has duties and commitments. Nevertheless, you have set them aside and travelled the thousands of miles here to voice your concerns and your anxiety, to share your thoughts with people troubled by the same problems.

This alone is of itself very significant, for the participants in the Forum include representatives of various population groups, people from all continents and from dozens of countries.

The Forum is a true embodiment of world public opinion. .

The ideas of the Forum, the concerns and feelings which have brought you here, are close to the hearts of the Soviet people and meet with their understanding. It is in this spirit that I once again address to you words of greeting, and of gratitude for the work you have done in the past few days. And I think that the voice of this Forum, of each of you, will be heeded.

It is very important that the ideas and spirit of the Forum should reach broad sectors of the public and political circles, and, still more important, that they should be reflected in the work of those who are at the helm of States. This idea, I understand, has been put forward by all the participants in our meeting together here, in the Great Kremlin Palace. The Soviet Government, for its part, takes a very understanding attitude towards everything that has been said at the Forum. It could not be otherwise, for these ideas have a bearing on the most vital and most essential issue - how to save a future for mankind.

I have a few things to say on the matters discussed at the Forum, and I should like to set out for you the views of our Government. Before doing so, however, I wish to draw your attention to the following.

You have come to the Soviet Union at a time when changes which are in essence revolutionary are taking place here. They are of vast significance for our society, for socialism as a whole, and for the entire world. An understanding of their content, meaning and purpose is essential in order to assess our international policy properly. Before my own people, before you and before the whole world, I state frankly that our international policy is more than ever before determined by our domestic policy, our concern to concentrate on constructive endeavours to improve our country. Precisely because of this, we need lasting peace, predictability and a constructive approach in international relations.

References are often made - we still hear them today - to a threat allegedly emanating from the Soviet Union, a "Soviet threat" to peace and freedom.

Well now, the restructuring we have begun on such a scale, which is irreversible, shows everyone that this is where we want to direct our resources, this is where our thoughts are tending, these are our actual programmes and intentions, this is what we intend to focus the intellectual energy of our society on.

Our main idea is to bring out the potential of socialism by drawing on all the strength of the people. To do this, we need the full and free functioning of all public and State agencies and all production collectives and creative unions, as well as new forms of activity on the part of citizens and the revival of those which had been unjustly neglected. In short, we need a broad democratization of the whole life of society, for this is the principal guarantee of the irreversible nature of the processes that have been initiated. We want more socialism, and hence more democracy.

This, then, is how we are now continuing the cause of our great revolution, and our people have welcomed it enthusiastically.

To preclude any idle talk and speculation (and we hear a lot of it from the West), I wish to emphasize that we are going about our reforms in accordance with our own socialist choice, on the basis of our ideas concerning social values, guided by the criteria of the Soviet way of life. We measure our successes and our mistakes solely by Socialist yardsticks, and no others.

But we want to be understood, and we hope that the entire world community will at last acknowledge that our desire to make our country better will make things worse for no one, that the whole world will only stand to gain from it.

The restructuring, viewed in terms of its international aspects, is an invitation to socialism to compete peacefully with any other social system. And we will be able to demonstrate in practice that such competition is beneficial to universal progress and peace throughout the world. But for such competition to take place and evolve in civilized forms worthy of mankind in the twenty-first century, a new way of thinking is required, and the patterns of thought, stereotypes and dogmas inherited from a past which is behind us, never to return, must be outgrown.

It is not just since yesterday that our society and the Soviet leadership have been concerning themselves with this problem of a new way of thinking. We have given the matter a great deal of thought. We took a critical look at ourselves and others, and asked ourselves difficult, perplexing questions before we came to see the realities as they are and became convinced that in today's complex and contradictory world, standing as it does at a crossroads, new approaches and new ways of solving international problems are required.

We arrived at conclusions which led us to review something that had previously seemed axiomatic. For since Hiroshima and Nagasaki, world war has ceased to be the continuation of policy by other means. A nuclear war would incinerate the architects of such a policy as well.

We brought ourselves to the deep-seated recognition that with the accumulation of nuclear weapons and their increasing sophistication, the human race has lost its immortality, and only by destroying nuclear weapons can it be regained.

We did not accept that the Government of any country, be it the Soviet Union, the United States or any other, has the right to pass a death sentence on mankind. We are not judges, and the billions of people are not criminals to be punished. This is why the nuclear guillotine has to be smashed. The nuclear Powers must step aside from their nuclear shadow and enter a nuclear-free world, thus putting an end to the alienation of politics from general human standards of morality.

The nuclear whirlwind will sweep away socialists and capitalists, righteous men and sinners alike. Is this a morally acceptable situation? We Communists do not think it is.

You might say that we have come the hard way to the new mode of thinking, whose task it is to close the rift between political practice and universally accepted moral and ethical standards.

Last year at the Party Congress, the highest forum of Soviet society, we set forth our vision of the world, our philosophical conception of its present and future. But we did not confine ourselves to proclaiming a theoretical doctrine. On the basis of it, we formulated a definite political platform for a comprehensive system of international security. This is a system in the true sense of the word, based on the principle that one cannot build one's own security at the expense of that of others, and organically uniting the main spheres of security - military, political, economic and humanitarian.

In the military and political sphere, we came forward with a programme for the elimination of nuclear weapons by the year 2000. This was proclaimed in the name of the Soviet people 13 months ago, on 15 January 1986. We are convinced that this date will go down in the history of the struggle to keep civilization alive.

Even before that, we had come forward with an initiative for the cessation of all nuclear tests, and we more than once extended our unilateral moratorium. The idea of Reykjavik was ours, and we took there initiatives which, if the other side had responded, would have meant the cessation of the arms race and a radical change of course towards disarmament and the elimination of the nuclear threat. Together with our allies, we have taken bold and far-reaching steps in relation to confidence-building measures and the reduction of conventional weapons and armed forces in Europe. We have expressed our readiness for the complete elimination of chemical weapons.

In Vladivostok, we invited the countries of Asia and the Pacific to engage in a joint search for security for each and every one of them in that vast and rising region of the world, and in mutually advantageous and equitable co-operation.

We signed the Delhi declaration, which merges our philosophical and political approaches to the building of a nuclear-free and non-violent world with the

approaches of that great country India and the billions of people represented by the non-aligned movement.

As firm advocates of a new world economic order, we have formulated and proposed for world-wide consideration the concept of international economic security.

Lastly, our new approaches to the humanitarian problems contained in the "third Helsinki basket" are there for all to see. And I have to disappoint those that assume that these proposals and this position are the result of pressure on us from the West, that we want to win favour with somebody in pursuit of some ulterior motive. We do not. This is a result of the new way of thinking.

Thus, in all areas we are seeking to translate our philosophical view of the world into the language of practical politics, to move it to the plane of tangible action.

Naturally, the new edifice of international security can only be built on and cemented by trust. We understand that the road to it is not an easy one. And we are not the only ones who have to travel that road, although we, if you recall our history, have more cause for mistrust.

I will not indulge in polemics on that subject. I wish only to state that, along with a shortage of new thinking, everyone also feels that there is a shortage of trust. I am not going to go into the reasons for this in a wider context, although there is a good deal that could be said about it. What we need to do now is to look forward, not to remain captives of the past.

Trust needs to be created through experience in co-operation, through getting to know each other, through solving common problems. It is wrong in principle to pose the issue in the following way: first, trust, then all the rest - disarmament, co-operation, joint projects. The road to trust, its establishment, consolidation and development, lies through common endeavours. This is the rational approach.

And I repeat, everyone must begin with himself. It is not the pose of a self-appointed supreme judge of the whole world, but respect for others together with an objective and self-critical attitude to one's own society that is so acutely lacking today in international relations.

One of the most important consequences of the restructuring in the Soviet Union is the general and universal increase in trust in our society. And this strengthens our conviction that the necessary trust can be brought into being in the sphere of international relations as well.

The new mode of thinking still has difficulty in breaking through into international politics. Building trust is very hard work. It is precisely for this reason, I think, that the conviction is growing that the fate of the major cause of our time must not be left to politicians alone, that it is not just the

business of politicians. And we are witnessing the expansion and the rise of a vast social movement with the participation, everywhere in the world, of scientists, intellectuals in various fields, religious workers, women, young people, children - increasingly children - even former soldiers and generals who know full well what modern weapons are. And all this is because people are becoming more deeply aware of where the world stands, the point it has reached, how real the threat hanging over it is.

I believe that your Forum is a major step towards the development of a mass movement for a nuclear-free world and for the survival of mankind. I welcome the contribution made by the Moscow Forum.

I should like to refer specifically to Reykjavik. It was not a breakdown, but a breakthrough. This was not just another round of talks, but a moment of truth when we glimpsed the momentous prospect of setting out on the road to a nuclear-free world.

Reykjavik led to such a strong reaction throughout the world because we approached the problem of reducing nuclear arsenals in completely new conceptual terms, as a political and psychological rather than just a military and technical problem. And we almost found a solution. But what are we to do about this "almost" which prevented us from reaching the finishing line at Reykjavik?

I am not going to revert to polemics about why this happened. I hope you are all familiar with our views. Let me just draw your attention to the following fact: when the two sides at Reykjavik agreed on substantial cuts in their nuclear arsenals, followed by their elimination, that was tantamount to an acknowledgement that nuclear weapons can no longer effectively guarantee security.

What happened in Reykjavik irreversibly changed the nature and essence of the debate about the world's future. This is an important political judgement. The new opportunities frightened some people, and they are now drawing back. But however hard the past may tug, there is no returning to it. I am sure mankind can throw off the chains of nuclear weapons, and I hope it will begin to do so quite soon. But to do this we will need to fight, and fight hard.

The new political outlook sets out to raise civilization to a qualitatively new level. This alone serves to show that it is no one-off adjustment of position, but a methodology for the conduct of international affairs.

There is nobody in this hall, or probably elsewhere, who would consider nuclear weapons to be harmless. There are a few people, however, who sincerely believe that they are a necessary evil to prevent a greater evil - war. It is precisely this theory that underlies the doctrine of nuclear deterrence.

Let me say the following:

First. Even if this doctrine holds water, one must admit that the "nuclear safeguard" is not infallible and is not everlasting. It may at any time become a

death sentence on mankind. The larger the nuclear weapons, the less likelihood of their "obedience". Nuclear proliferation, the increasing complexity of nuclear-weapon systems, the transportation of such weapons on an increasing scale and the constant risk of technical error, human weakness or malice - all these together represent a large collection of chance factors on which the survival of mankind depends.

Second. If we look at the doctrine of deterrence from a different angle, we see that it is in fact a policy of intimidation. Each model of behaviour has its own internal logic. When a threat is an instrument of policy, it is naturally desired that in each case the threat should be taken seriously by everyone. For this, the threats must periodically be backed up by action. In this case, that means military force. The only conclusion that can be drawn is that the policy of deterrence, considered in a historical context, not only does not reduce but actually increases the risk of military conflict. Nevertheless, even after Reykjavik, they still cling to this doctrine.

And this doctrine is most frequently advocated by those who in confrontations with us are inclined to invoke morality. But how do they look from this viewpoint - from the viewpoint of normal contemporary morality? They are convinced, and make no secret of the fact, that the only language and attitude which they can adopt towards others are based on intimidation, force and the constant possibility of recourse to force. How would we react to such a person, if we chanced to meet him in the street? How can quite enlightened leaders still consider such standards, long ago recognized as being unsociable in relations between individuals, to be the natural norm in relations between States!

Third. In disarmament discussions, the theory is constantly heard that by nature man has a kind of "instinct for violence" or "instinct for war" and that this instinct is allegedly indestructible.

What does this mean? Is war an integral concomitant of human existence? And does this simply mean that the emergence, upgrading and stockpiling of increasingly sophisticated weapons of mass destruction are also inevitable?

Such thinking is unacceptable. It is reminiscent of times when more sophisticated weapons were invented and used to subjugate other peoples and to enslave and unceremoniously rob them. Such a past is not a reason or a model for the future. On the threshold of the twenty-first century, man knows and can do a very great deal. This is why he must realize the need to demilitarize the world. We are convinced that such a world is possible and we shall do everything to ensure the success of what may be the most important social undertaking of today's world.

The topic of nuclear deterrence has another aspect. In politics it is impossible to forget the problem of the rational and the irrational. This is particularly true in our complex world, where the very content of these concepts is under the strongest pressure from the specificity of the historical experience of peoples, of quite different political cultures, traditions and many other characteristics. It is very difficult to reduce all this to a common denominator

which would seem rational to all without exception. And so the irrefutable truth also remains: the more nuclear weapons there are, the greater the probability of a fatal malfunction.

Nevertheless, more powerful and sophisticated weapon types, cynically called exotic types, are still being developed.

The uniqueness - I might even say the drama - of the situation is emphasized by the danger of the arms race spreading into space. If this happens, the very idea of arms control will be compromised. Mistrust, mutual suspicion and the temptation to be the first to deploy newer and newer systems will increase tremendously. In my opinion, this is quite clear to the person most unfamiliar with military matters. Destabilization will become a reality and be fraught with crisis. The risk of accidental war will increase severalfold.

We regret that the continuation of United States testing put an end to our moratorium. But it was not in vain.

By our moratorium we showed that a nuclear-test ban is realistic, provided that the political will exists.

Speaking before such an authoritative audience, I should like to make this reply to Dr. Lown, who urged us to extend the moratorium: the Soviet Union will not abandon its goal of ending nuclear testing and achieving a major reduction of nuclear stockpiles and eventually their elimination.

In this connection, I should like to mention the passions which flared up recently over the deployment of a first phase of SDI. The advocates of deployment insist on "broader interpretation" of the ABM Treaty. However, while disputes on this issue are taking place in Washington itself and between NATO allies, the Administration has already officially suggested in Geneva that such an interpretation should be legitimized. And so the discussions in this case are not a means of sounding out public opinion. This is close to becoming actual policy, if it is not already actual policy. And this should make us all uneasy. In fact the issue is the scrapping of the ABM Treaty. You see - the political and, if you wish, the philosophical sense of the Treaty was from the very beginning to ensure stability through the absence of anti-missile defence and thus to end the eternal competition, particularly dangerous in the nuclear age, between the "shield" and the "sword". The ABM Treaty was the result of lengthy discussion over many years, in which the best minds capable of evaluating the situation participated. Then the United States recognized the rightness of the Treaty. But now it wants, through a broad interpretation of the Treaty, to remove this most important brake on the arms race.

With the destruction of the Treaty, the nuclear missile race will acquire new dimensions and be complemented by an arms race in outer space, with the inevitable consequences that I have just mentioned.

In November 1985, President Reagan and I made a pledge in Geneva: "To prevent

an arms race in space and to terminate it on earth, to limit and reduce nuclear arms and enhance strategic stability". This was signed in Geneva in the Joint Statement. By undermining the ABM Treaty, the Administration is scorning this pledge and the signature which the United States affixed to this treaty concluded 15 years ago for an indefinite period.

The situation requires that international law be more strictly observed and strengthened, rather than demolished and deprived of its key elements.

We are thinking here about another problem. Why do some other countries assume the right to invent and develop new weapon systems which, even if not deployed or used, threaten other peoples and States? This problem transcends the framework of national sovereignty. It is an international problem.

Here is another problem. At present the sovereignty of a particular State extends to the atmospheric space above the national territory. And the State has the indisputable right to defend that space from intrusion. Weapons in space, where they now want to put them, will create a far greater threat. These intentions represent an attempt to create a new instrument of blackmail against independent States. Is it not time to introduce into the international legal context the question of a ban on aiming space weapons at the heads of people in other countries?

Now allow me to speak of another major reality of our time. It also requires a new way of thinking. I refer to the unprecedented diversity but growing interdependence and integrity of the world. Our world is united not only by the internationalization of economic life and the powerful information and communications media, but also by the common danger of nuclear death, ecological catastrophe and global explosion of the contradictions between the poverty and the wealth of its different regions.

The world society today is a multitude of States, each with its unique history, traditions, customs and way of life. Each people and country has its own truth, its own national interests and its own aspirations. This is the most important reality of the contemporary world. It did not exist 30 to 40 years ago. This is a reality which emerged as a result of a choice made by the peoples themselves. They themselves chose their own path of national development.

But the speed of this process has clearly outstripped the ability of certain politicians to understand and interpret the irreversible changes. In the question of nuclear weapons too, they are living by old concepts.

The solution is also to reduce and bridge the gap between the fast pace of events and the realization of reality and understanding of what is going on and what its consequences may be. This must be done before it is too late.

Some people still view the world as their own private domain and arbitrarily declare areas of "vital interest". This also stimulates the arms race, because it derives from a reliance on force, without which there can be no possibility of

political and economic domination. These are stereotypes of past thinking, when it was considered "legitimate" to exploit other peoples, to dispose of their resources and arbitrarily to decide their fate.

Where do such views lead? To a growth of regional conflicts. Fires of hatred blaze. Such conflicts assume dangerous proportions, and directly or indirectly affect the interests of a growing number of States. Regional conflicts have a very bad effect on the general state of international relations. People are being killed on the battlefields of declared and undeclared wars, at the front and in the rear. Countries suffering from extreme poverty and widespread hunger are being sucked into the maelstrom of the wasteful arms race.

The settlement of regional conflicts is an imperative of our time. Our initiatives in the Middle East may serve as an example of our approach to this question. The Middle East is a sensitive nerve centre of our planet. The interests of many States, and not only of the Arabs and Israel, intersect there at the crossroads of histories, religions and cultures. We therefore advocate an extremely responsible, cautious and even delicate approach, rather than power politics, piracy and constant threats of armed force.

We say: let us search and act together. This applies to the Iran-Iraq war, to the Central American crisis, to the Afghan problem, to southern Africa, to the situation in Indo-China. The main point is strictly to respect the rights of peoples to choose their future course themselves and not interfere in the internal affairs of other States.

We are against attempts artificially to destroy historical ties. Yet justice requires the regulation of international economic activity, so that the rich cannot rob the poor. Can one really live content in a world where three quarters of the countries are deep in debt, while a handful of States play the role of omnipotent usurers? This situation carries the seeds of a social explosion that could destroy modern civilization.

A fair political settlement of regional conflicts is dictated by the same logic of an interdependent and integral world which also requires the solution of other global problems - food, ecology, energy, world-wide literacy, education and medical care.

Another calamity of the modern world is terrorism. It is a great evil. Yet, as I have stated recently, attempts to eradicate it by means of State terrorism are an even greater crime against humanity. This "method" leads to more deaths, involving the sacrifice of international law and State sovereignty, not to mention morality and justice. It creates a vicious circle of violence and bloodshed and aggravates the overall situation.

We have already stated in the United Nations and in other international gatherings - and today I should like to reiterate - our willingness to join with others in combating all forms of terrorism.

All the problems that I have mentioned are important and their solution will open up new horizons for human civilization. Yet they depend on each other in different ways: without halting the arms race, we shall not be able correctly to solve any other problems.

The Soviet Union and the Soviet people consider themselves part of the world community. The concerns of mankind are our concerns, its pain is our pain and its hopes are our hopes.

Despite all the differences between us, we must all learn together to preserve the great family of mankind.

At the meeting in Geneva, the United States President said that, if the earth was threatened with an invasion by extraterrestrials, the United States and the Soviet Union would unite to repel such an attack. I shall not dispute this hypothesis, although it may be premature to worry about such an invasion. It is more important to concern ourselves with the troubles that have already entered our common home. It is more important to realize the need to remove the nuclear threat and to accept that there is no roof on earth or in space to protect us if a nuclear storm breaks out.

Our idea of establishing a system of all-embracing international security and our other initiatives all reflect the Soviet Union's clear desire and willingness to renounce its nuclear-Power status and to reduce all other weapons to a minimum reasonable sufficiency.

The USSR is not demanding for itself anything that it would deny to others and is not even seeking an ounce more security than, for example, the United States has. However, the Soviet Union will not agree to an abridged status, to discrimination.

Consider all our proposals. No attempt is made in them to leave any of our weapons outside the negotiations. Our principle is simple: all weapons must be limited and reduced and weapons of mass destruction must eventually be eliminated. This is our firm position. Where there is an imbalance in any elements, the situation must be corrected - not by a build-up on the part of the one who has less but by a reduction on the part of the one who is ahead. On the road to the historic goal of the demilitarization of the world, there will naturally be stages. At each stage, there must be respect for mutual interests and a balance at a level of reasonable sufficiency in a state of constant decline. All must realize and agree: parity with a potential to destroy each other several times over is madness and absurdity.

In our view, it is important, while reducing the level of military confrontation, to adopt measures that would make it possible to lessen or, better still, to preclude the possibility of surprise attack. The most dangerous offensive weapons must be removed from the zone of contact. At the same time, military doctrines must of course be strictly defensive in nature.

I have already had occasion to say that, now that we have on the agenda major measures for real disarmament affecting the most sensitive area of national security, the Soviet Union will be pressing for the strictest system of supervision and verification, including international verification. There must be complete certainty that the commitments are being honoured by everyone. Could the Soviet-American experiment at Semipalatinsk not be considered as the prototype of such supervision?

There is yet another aspect to be considered in the matter of verification. It is common knowledge that the United States has numerous military bases in the territories of other countries. We should like to have access to inspect them, in order to be sure that no activity prohibited under any eventual agreement is being conducted on those bases. In this matter, the co-operation of the States where such bases are located will obviously also be required.

It would be even better to revert to the old idea of dismantling foreign bases and bringing the troops back home. We apply this to ourselves too. We have already taken the first practical steps. As you know, in agreement with our Mongolian friends, we are withdrawing part of our troops from the Mongolian People's Republic. We have brought six regiments back from Afghanistan and we shall recall the whole of our military contingent from there within the shortest possible time. However, the solution of this problem requires reciprocity on the part of the United States and of Afghanistan's neighbours, as well as international efforts.

We do not claim to possess the ultimate truth. We readily respond to proposals made by other countries, political parties, public movements and even individuals. The Soviet Union supported the idea of the creation of a nuclear-free corridor in Central Europe, of nuclear-free zones in Northern Europe, in the Balkans, in the South Pacific and in other regions. We are ready to hold consultations on each proposal in search of the best version, acceptable to all.

Dear guests! Comrades! A promising and noble idea has been put forward at your Forum - that of establishing a "human survival fund". This could be used for open discussion of ways to avert nuclear war. The fund could encourage research on the burning issues of international life and promote the drafting of projects on the global problems facing mankind, including measures to combat the latest pernicious diseases.

For our part, we would welcome active participation by the Soviet public - both material and intellectual - in the activities of such a fund.

I do not doubt that the good seeds planted by your Forum will produce a good crop. The forces of militarism - and they are nearly always synonymous with the forces of ignorance and intellectual blindness - are not all-powerful.

The emergence of a movement of scientists for the elimination of the nuclear danger, the passionate and extremely competent speeches by physicians, environmentalists, cultural and artistic personalities, and the birth of various

anti-nuclear groups and associations, are unmistakable evidence of the determination of thinking people to save the precious gift of life on earth, perhaps the only one of its kind in the universe.

Politics and political sciences are represented in this auditorium. I wonder whether today, with the knowledge and experience that we now possess, we can move step by step towards more equitable and harmonious international relations and an all-embracing system of international security, dependable and equal for all. In my view, we can and must do so.

I think that it was the hope and desire of finding a positive answer to this question that brought you to this broad Forum.

Our great scientist, Vladimir Ivanovich Vernadsky warned in 1922 (just imagine, 65 years ago): "It will not be long before man gets his hands on atomic energy, such a source of power as will give him the possibility of building a new life as he wants ... Will man be able to use that power for his own good, and not for self-destruction? Has he acquired the skill to use the power that science will certainly give him? Scientists must not close their eyes to the possible consequences of their scientific work and of scientific progress. They must feel responsible for the consequences of their discoveries. They must link their work to the better organization of all mankind".

Think about these words. Previously, mankind was striving single-mindedly to subdue the forces of nature. Now to invade nature without first considering all the consequences might turn it into a deadly enemy of man. The Chernobyl accident reminded us of that, in a tragedy of relatively local proportions. But the nuclear-arms race is inexorably pushing us towards a universal tragedy.

For centuries, men have been seeking to attain immortality. It is difficult to accept that each of us is mortal. But to accept the finite nature of all humanity and of human reason is impossible.

Unfortunately, many of our generation have become accustomed to nuclear weapons. Many have come to regard such weapons as a kind of idol, demanding more and more sacrifices. Some even declare that the nuclear-arms race is a guarantee that peace will be preserved.

Alas, nuclear weapons have done much to mould the image of the times in which we live. Naturally, destroying them does not mean returning to what was before. The renunciation of nuclear deterrence must not give a free hand to trigger-happy individuals.

This is by no means an idle issue. Some would say that the answer is to upgrade the other components of military might - conventional weapons. This is a useless and wrong course to follow.

Mankind must enter the post-nuclear age stronger, having overcome the nuclear disease. We shall become immune to violence and to attempts to dictate to others.

Today international relations are made heartless by the cult of force and the militarization of minds. Hence the goal of humanizing international relations.

Is this possible or not? Some believe it is; others think not. This is not the time to argue the point. I think that life will have its way. By and large, the peoples are already increasingly aware of this. An understanding has emerged that a nuclear war must not be waged. So let us start by taking the first big step: let us reduce nuclear arsenals and let us keep weapons out of space. Let us start from the point reached at Reykjavik and then move on. And let us see how this will affect the international climate. My own feeling is that each step of this kind will enhance confidence and open up new prospects for co-operation. This should also be helped by the democratization of international thinking and by equality and independent and active participation in the affairs of the world community by all States - large, medium and small.

The "humanization" of international relations also requires appropriate action in the humanitarian field, particularly as regards information, human contacts, creative exchanges and so on. This will help to create moral guarantees for peace and thus promote formulation of the material guarantees. The information aggression practised by some countries not only leads to spiritual impoverishment but obstructs normal communication between people of different countries and mutual cultural enrichment. It breeds hostility and alienation between peoples. On the other hand, as you will agree, a people that knows and values the culture and art of other peoples can have no ill feeling towards them.

Dear guests! Comrades! Time is running out as the danger grows of a new spiral in the arms race and as regional and so-called "global" problems are seriously aggravated. We must waste no more time in attempts to outplay each other and to gain unilateral advantages. The stake in such a game is too high - the survival of mankind. It is therefore vitally necessary to take the critical time factor into account.

May the ideas of the Forum reach all corners of the earth, hasten enlightenment and broaden mutual understanding. May your efforts help us to advance towards a non-violent world free from nuclear weapons - for the sake of the immortality of human civilization!
