UNITED
NATIONS

A S

General Assembly Security Council

Distr.
GENERAL

A/42/231
S/18816
20 April 1987
ENGLISH
ORIGINAL: RUSSIAN

GENERAL ASSEMBLY
Forty-second session
Items 57, 62, 63, 64, 67, 72 and 74 of the preliminary list*
PREVENTION OF AN ARMS RACE IN OUTER SPACE
CHEMICAL AND BACTERIOLOGICAL (BIOLOGICAL) WEAPONS
GENERAL AND COMPLETE DISARMAMENT
REVIEW AND IMPLEMENTATION OF THE CONCLUDING DOCUMENT OF THE TWELFTH SPECIAL SESSION OF THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY
REVIEW OF THE IMPLEMENTATION OF THE RECOMMENDATIONS AND DECISIONS ADOPTED BY THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY AT ITS TENTH SPECIAL SESSION
STRENGTHENING OF SECURITY AND CO-OPERATION IN THE MEDITERRANEAN REGION
COMPREHENSIVE SYSTEM OF INTERNATIONAL PEACE AND SECURITY

SECURITY COUNCIL
Forty-second year

Letter dated 15 April 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 part of the speech delivered by the General Secretary of the Central Committee of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union, M. S. Gorbachev, at the Czechoslovak-Soviet Friendship Meeting held in Prague, Czechoslovak Socialist Republic, on 10 April 1987, which deals with foreign policy. I should be grateful if you would have the text circulated as an official document of the General Assembly under items 57, 62, 63, 64, 67, 72 and 74 of the preliminary list and of the Security Council.

(Signed) A. BELONOGOV

* A/42/50.

ANNEX

Extract from the speech by the General Secretary of the Central Committee of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union, M. S. Gorbachev, at the Czechoslovak-Soviet Friendship Meeting on 10 April 1987

Interdependence in the contemporary world is such that all peoples are like a team of climbers roped together on a mountain slope. They can either press onwards together, to the summit, or fall together into the abyss. And to prevent this happening, politicians need to rise above narrowly-conceived interests and recognize the full drama of the current situation. That is why the need for new political thinking in the nuclear age is such an urgent topic, for this is the only way of inducing all participants in international relations to adopt immediate measures to prevent the nuclear catastrophe which threatens to destroy the human race.

It would not be true to say that the idea of the new thinking has not met with any response. Indeed, the number of people in the world who espouse it is increasing - among them scientists, doctors, and representatives of many other professions and of the creative intelligentsia, as was convincingly demonstrated yet again during the International Forum for a Nuclear-Free World and the Survival of Mankind held recently in Moscow.

Where some issues are concerned, manifestations of the new approach to international affairs are also to be seen on the part of a number of prominent Western politicians and statesmen. But these are only the first signs. The old stereotypes are still strong in the West, and still leave their mark on foreign policy. To speak of the new political thinking as having truly become a real force will be possible only when the stalemate in respect of disarmament has finally been broken.

Is there any hope of this? What prospects for it exist today?

Let me say right away that there is hope, that the danger of war can be reduced. Our conviction that this is so is based both on the growing understanding in the world of the disastrous consequences for mankind of a nuclear confrontation, and on the possibilities which emerged at Reykjavik of reaching agreement on the radical reduction and elimination of the most destructive types of nuclear weapons.

The Soviet Union responsibly proclaims its desire to find mutually acceptable solutions to the whole range of nuclear disarmament issues. The root of the problem remains a radical reduction in strategic offensive weapons. As you know, we are prepared in this respect to take the most decisive steps - both for a 50 per cent reduction in such weapons within 5 years, and for their complete elimination within 10 years - on the essential condition, of course, that there is strict compliance with the ABM Treaty and that an arms race does not begin in space.

In our effort to take at last the first, and hence extremely important, step towards disarmament, we have proposed that agreement should be reached on medium-range missiles. In so doing, we have taken into account both the voice of the world community, and the attachment proclaimed by our Western partners to the complete elimination of these missiles from Europe. But a paradoxical situation has emerged: some politicians, and even Governments, are now shunning their own "zero option" like the plague and trying to hedge the solution of the medium-range missile question about with all kinds of reservations and qualifications.

A great deal is now being written and said in the West about the problem of tactical missiles. We are ready to find a constructive solution to this problem as well, but in such a way as to avoid complicating the reaching of agreement on the central question of today, that of medium-range missiles. To facilitate the early reaching of agreement on medium-range missiles in Europe, we propose to begin discussing the reduction and subsequent elimination of missiles with a range of between 500 and 1,000 kilometres deployed on the European continent, without relating this to the progress and outcome of the solution to the medium-range missile problem. For the period of the talks, the parties would undertake not to increase the number of tactical missiles. I wish to emphasize that we are in favour of bringing about a radical reduction, and ultimately the complete elimination, of tactical missiles in Europe, and we see no need to build into the future agreement any kind of "loophole" for their accumulation and further improvement.

Following the signature of an agreement on medium-range missiles, and regardless of progress in the discussion of the tactical missile question, the Soviet Union will, in agreement with the Governments of the Czechoslovak Socialist Republic and the German Democratic Republic, withdraw from these countries the missiles which were deployed there in response to the deployment of Pershing-2 and cruise missiles in Western Europe.

The implementation of the agreement on tactical missiles would of course be subject to stringent monitoring, just as in the case of medium-range missiles and strategic nuclear weapons.

As soon as the discussion focuses on the reduction, and still more the elimination, of whole classes of nuclear weapons from Europe, the issues relating to verification of compliance with existing agreements will take on new significance. Under these circumstances, verification will become one of the most important ways of ensuring security. This is why we shall call for the development of the most stringent measures in this sphere; what we have in mind is, of course, not inspection for inspection's sake, but verification of performance of the obligations entered into at all stages of nuclear disarmament.

Appropriate verification, including on-site inspections, should extend to the missiles and launch facilities which remain after the reductions, both those which form part of the combat strength and all other facilities - testing sites, missile-producing factories, training centres, etc. Admission of inspectors to the military bases of the other side in the territory of third countries must also be ensured; this is required in order to obtain complete assurance that the agreement is being strictly complied with.

Another urgent issue which relates directly to European security is the concentration of a vast potential of armed forces and conventional weapons in the region.

Of course, for Europe as for the world as a whole, the elimination of nuclear weapons - strategic, medium-range and tactical - is the priority task. Scarcely anyone would argue with that. However, let us put it this way: is the vast concentration of tactical nuclear and non-nuclear weapons in Europe, and the confrontation of armed forces there consistent with the concept of a secure world? I think the answer to that question is clear.

Unfortunately, absolutely nothing has yet been done to rectify the extremely unsatisfactory state of affairs that has arisen there. The situation needs to be radically changed by taking steps to reduce and ultimately eliminate tactical nuclear weapons, radically reduce armed forces and conventional weapons, and prevent the possibility of a surprise attack.

A major step in this direction would be the implementation of the Budapest Programme of the Warsaw Treaty countries, in which it was proposed that the problem of reducing armed forces and conventional weapons should be solved together with tactical missiles, strike aviation, nuclear artillery and other tactical nuclear weapons. The need for such a joint approach is dictated by the fact that tactical nuclear weapons are for the most part "dual-purpose" weapons, in other words they can carry either conventional or nuclear payloads.

In order to reduce armed forces and weapons in Europe, efforts are required on the part of all the European States, the United States of America and Canada. Consultations are now going on in Vienna between the Warsaw Treaty and the NATO countries. However, the question arises whether the time has not come to bring together there all the Ministers for Foreign Affairs of the States participating in the Conference on Security and Co-operation in Europe, and to take a decision on the initiation of large-scale talks with a view to the radical reduction of tactical nuclear weapons, armed forces and conventional weapons.

At these talks, a number of top priority measures related to reducing military confrontation and preventing the threat of a surprise attack, as well as to the mutual withdrawal from the zone of direct contact between the two military alliances of the most dangerous forms of offensive weapons, could also be discussed.

The final aim of these talks would be major reductions in armed forces and weapons along with the establishment of international verification and the use of on-site inspections. The Conference in Stockholm last year afforded experience in the development of possible measures.

Of course, exchange of relevant data on the armed forces and armaments of the Soviet Union, the United States and the other States of the region would also be required.

In the West, there is talk of inequality and imbalance. Admittedly there is an asymmetry, caused by historical, geographic and other factors, in the armed

forces of the two sides in Europe. We are in favour of removing inequalities that have arisen in any components, but through a reduction by those who are ahead, not a build-up by those who are behind.

We see the reduction in military confrontation in Europe as a stage-by-stage process, with the balance at each stage being maintained at the level of reasonable sufficiency. Measures of this kind would make it possible to shift the whole mass of problems of armed forces and armaments that has accumulated in Europe. A truly unique opportunity now exists, and to let it slip would be unforgiveable.

The objectives of strengthening European security would also be facilitated by such measures as the creation of nuclear-free zones and chemical weapon-free zones. I wish to state that we support the proposal made by the Governments of the German Democratic Republic and the Czechoslovak Socialist Republic to the Government of the Federal Republic of Germany for the establishment of a nuclear-free corridor in central Europe. As you know, the Social Democratic Party of Germany also made a contribution to the development of the idea of such a corridor.

Excluded from this zone would be all nuclear munitions, including nuclear mines, tactical and theatre missiles, nuclear artillery, launch aircraft of the tactical strike forces and surface-to-air missile units capable of using nuclear weapons. A considerable proportion of these weapons consists of what are known as "dual-purpose" weapons.

For our part, we are prepared to withdraw from this corridor all Soviet nuclear weapons, and to guarantee and respect the nuclear-free status of this zone. Of course, the agreement on this corridor must provide that on the NATO side there will be no nuclear weapons in the corridor proposed by the Governments of the German Democratic Republic and the Czechoslovak Socialist Republic.

In our view, implementation of the proposals by Bulgaria, Romania and Greece for a nuclear and chemical weapon-free zone in the Balkans would be of great importance. The active position taken by Poland in relation to confidence-building in Europe, as well as the proposals by Finland and other Western European countries for a nuclear-free zone in this region, also deserve attention and support.

And now let me turn to another question which is far from unimportant - the prohibition of chemical weapons. We have consistently called for an international Convention on this subject to be drawn up as soon as possible - even this year - and are engaging in active talks on this subject. I am able to inform you that the Soviet Union has ceased the production of chemical weapons. The other Warsaw Treaty countries, as you know, have never produced them, and have had none in their territory. The USSR has no chemical weapons beyond its frontiers, and where the stockpiles of such weapons are concerned I should like to inform you that we have begun constructing a special facility for destroying them. The entry into operation of this facility will enable the process of chemical disarmament to go ahead rapidly once the international Convention has been concluded.

Returning to the problems of nuclear disarmament, I wish to state that among these problems, the one now closest to a possible solution is that of intermediate-range missiles in Europe. The United States of America is increasingly being called upon to take this first, really major step in the disarmament field and thus to facilitate the creation of a fundamentally new climate of mutual understanding between East and West.

We see it as a fact of great political importance that Greece, the Netherlands, Spain, Italy, Finland and many other European countries have raised their voices in favour of solving the Euromissile problem.

We invite Paris, London and Bonn, for their part, to contribute to freeing Europe from medium-range nuclear missiles and to move forward at last to nuclear disarmament.

For where, if not in Europe, is the time ripe for a breakthrough to the new political thinking!

Allow me in this connection to say a few words about the role of Europe in the modern world. It is indeed more than appropriate that our thoughts should turn to this subject here, in Czechoslovakia, where the geographical centre of Europe is located and where there is even a stone to mark the spot.

We attach primary importance to the European aspect of our foreign policy. Why? Above all because our people live on this continent, they are, together with others, the legitimate heirs of the civilization that arose here, and they are making their integral contribution to its development.

Socialism has marked a major turning point in the centuries-long history of this part of the world. From time immemorial, wars constituted the turning-points here. The overthrow of fascism and the victory of socialist revolutions in the Eastern European countries created a new situation on the continent - a mighty force arose here which set itself the objective of breaking the interminable chain of armed conflicts. It is socialism which Europe has to thank for the fact that this is now the fifth decade in which its peoples have not known war.

Now, too, we strongly oppose the division of the continent into opposing military blocs, the accumulation here of weapons stockpiles, everything which gives rise to the threat of war.

In the light of the new thinking, we have put forward the idea of Europe as being "under one roof". This is not a pipe dream, but the outcome of a serious analysis of the situation on the continent. The concept of "Europe under one roof" means above all acknowledging a certain unity, even though we are speaking of States belonging to different social systems and grouped into opposed military and political blocs. It combines within itself problems that are ripe for solution with the existence of real possibilities of solving them.

Given its high population density and high degree of urbanization, Europe is over-saturated with armaments, with two armies of 3 million facing each other.

Even "conventional" war here would be ruinous, not only because "conventional" weapons are now many orders of magnitude more destructive than those which were used during the Second World War, but because there are in its territory about 200 nuclear power station sites and an extensive network of major chemical plants, an attack on which would render the continent uninhabitable.

Or take pollution of the environment in which we live. Industrialization and transport in our continent are developed to such a scale that the ecological danger has already approached the critical point. This problem has gone far beyond national borders to become a Europe-wide problem.

It is time to think, too, about how integration processes in the two parts of Europe will proceed in future. The laws of the world economy are objective, and scientific and technical progress, as well, prompts the search for some form of mutually advantageous co-operation.

The Council for Mutual Economic Assistance has given the signal for the building of bridges in the interests of all European peoples. It may be assumed that the new processes in the economies of the countries of the socialist community will make it possible to activate and enrich with new content the economic co-operation between the two halves of Europe.

Europe "from the Atlantic to the Urals" is also a historical and cultural concept in the highest spiritual sense. Here world civilization has been enriched by the ideas of the Renaissance and the Enlightenment, the humanist tradition and the study of socialism have flourished, and a priceless heritage has been built up, through the efforts of men of genius of all the European nations, in all fields of scientific knowledge and artistic achievement.

Thus we are proposing, instead of a nuclear crematorium for Europe, the peaceful development of the multi-faceted and at the same time unified European culture.

Our idea of Europe as "under one roof" in no way means that we intend to shut the door in anyone's face. On the contrary, the progress of Europe would enable it to make a still greater contribution to progress throughout the rest of the world. Europe must not shun participation in solving the problems of hunger, indebtedness and underdevelopment, or in promoting the elimination of armed conflicts.

There need be no doubt that the Europeans are, without exception, in favour of a strengthening of the atmosphere of good-neighbourliness and trust, coexistence and co-operation on the continent. This would be in the fullest sense a triumph of the new political thinking.

The movement towards this objective is in no way dictated solely by moralistic considerations. It is in the underlying interests of all European nations, for in our age of interdependence more and more problems are arising which can be solved only through the joint efforts of the European and indeed the entire world community. Is not a united front essential against such threats to civilization as terrorism, crime and drug addiction? Surely it is clear that unless we turn our

efforts today in combating the new scourge of AIDS that is afflicting mankind, then tomorrow it may already be too late.

This list could be continued. Literally dozens of extremely complex problems are today becoming global in status, in other words they can be solved only through the efforts of the united world community. Europe can set a worthy example, and our countries are fully resolved to make their worthy contribution to doing so.

It is in this context that we view Czechoslovakia's initiative for the convening of an economic forum. We are convinced that this can play a major role in strengthening the economic security of States and the development of mutually advantageous co-operation.

The same motive underlies our proposal to hold in Moscow a conference of the States participating in the Conference on Security and Co-operation in Europe to discuss the development of humanitarian co-operation.

We feel that any idea which would really lessen the strains of confrontation, to however small an extent, is worth putting forward and discussing. A great deal has already been done, on a joint basis, to promote universal recognition of the concept of Europe as under one roof. The post-war structure of Europe is generally accepted. The Helsinki process is alive, and is gradually making it possible to strengthen trust between all European countries.

To act in this way, to make mutual interests apparent, to reduce the level of military confrontation and to strive for a nuclear-free world - this is how we should like to conduct affairs in Europe.
