



General Assembly Security Council

Distr.
GENERALA/42/621 ✓
S/19180
6 October 1987
ENGLISH
ORIGINAL: RUSSIAN

GENERAL ASSEMBLY
Forty-second session
Agenda items 49, 50, 55, 57, 62, 66 and 73
CESSATION OF ALL NUCLEAR-TEST EXPLOSIONS
URGENT NEED FOR A COMPREHENSIVE
NUCLEAR-TEST-BAN TREATY
CONCLUSION OF EFFECTIVE INTERNATIONAL
ARRANGEMENTS TO ASSURE
NON-NUCLEAR-WEAPON STATES AGAINST THE
USE OR THREAT OF USE OF NUCLEAR WEAPONS
IMPLEMENTATION OF GENERAL ASSEMBLY
RESOLUTION 41/54 ON THE IMMEDIATE
CESSATION AND PROHIBITION OF
NUCLEAR-WEAPON TESTS
GENERAL AND COMPLETE DISARMAMENT
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 5 October 1987 from the Head of the Delegation of the
Union of Soviet Socialist Republics to the forty-second session
of the General Assembly addressed to the Secretary-General

I have the honour to transmit the text of the section of a speech by the General Secretary of the Central Committee of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union, M. S. Gorbachev, at a meeting with workers in Murmansk on 2 October 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 at its forty-second session, under agenda items 49, 50, 55, 57, 62, 66 and 73, and of the Security Council.

(Signed) V. PETROVSKY
Deputy Head of the Delegation of the USSR

ANNEX

Section of the speech delivered by M. S. Gorbachev
in Murmansk dealing with foreign policy

Millions of people throughout the world are following with interest the process of restructuring taking place in our country. Our bold exercise in large-scale constructive work and revolutionary transformation, which calls for the consolidated efforts of all forces in the country, is convincing evidence of our confidence that peace can be preserved, that mankind does have a future.

True, the international situation remains complicated. The dangers to which we have no right to turn a blind eye are still there. All the same, something has changed, or is beginning to change. Of course, to judge the situation only from the speeches of certain top Western leaders, including their "programme" statements, everything would seem to remain as before - the same anti-Soviet attacks, the same demands that we should prove our commitment to peace by giving up our customs and our principles, the same confrontational language of "totalitarianism", "communist expansion", and so on.

Often, however, after a few days have passed no one remembers these speeches anymore, and in any case the business-like political negotiations and contacts deal with ideas other than those they contain. This is a very interesting point, an interesting phenomenon. It confirms that we are dealing with yesterday's rhetoric, at a time when real-life processes have been set in motion. It means that something is indeed changing. And one of the elements of these changes is the fact that it has now become hard to convince people that our foreign policy, our initiatives and our programme for a nuclear-free world are all just "propaganda".

A new democratic philosophy of international relations, of world politics, is coming to the fore. The new thinking, with its humanitarian, universal criteria and values, is penetrating the most diverse strata. Its strength lies in the fact that it is in line with people's common sense. And if we bear in mind that world public opinion and the world's peoples are extremely concerned about the world situation, then our policy is an invitation to dialogue, to a quest, to a better world, to the normalization of international relations. This is why, despite all attempts to malign and belittle our foreign policy initiatives, they are gaining ground, because they are in line with the mood of the broad masses of working people, and of realistic political circles in the West.

The favourable trends in inter-State relations are gaining strength. The substantive, frank and far from unproductive - for both sides - dialogue between East and West has become a characteristic feature of today's world political situation. Just a few days ago, the entire world welcomed the agreement reached in the Washington talks that the drafting of an agreement on medium-range and theatre and tactical missiles will be completed in the very near future, and that it will then be signed at the highest level. We are thus on the eve of a major step forward towards real nuclear disarmament. If it is made, it will be the first such step in the entire post-War period. Up until now, either the arms race has

continued or it has at best been limited to some extent, but no concrete step yet been taken towards disarmament and the elimination of nuclear weapons.

The road towards this mutual Soviet-American decision was a hard one. The crucial event along that road was Reyjkavik. Life has confirmed the accuracy of our assessment of the meeting in the Icelandic capital. Despite all the lashing out in panic, the sceptical statements and the propaganda about "failure", events have moved in the direction charted at Reyjkavik. They confirm the accuracy of the assessment we made literally 40 minutes after the dramatic ending to that meeting which I am sure you remember.

Reyjkavik has indeed become a turning point in world history and shown the possibility of improving the international situation. A different situation has emerged, and no one can act after Reyjkavik as if nothing had happened. And for us it was an event which confirmed the correctness of the course we had chosen and the need for and constructive nature of the new political thinking.

So far we have tapped nothing like the full potential of Reyjkavik, but already there have been glimmers of light on subjects other than medium- and shorter-range missiles. There have been signs of movement with respect to the banning of nuclear tests, and full-scale talks on this problem are to begin shortly. And, obviously, our moratorium was not in vain. This was not an easy step for us either. Throughout the world, it engendered and lent force to demands for an end to the tests.

I will not take it upon myself to predict the course of events. Not everything depends on us. There can be no doubt that the first results achieved recently in Washington and the forthcoming meeting with the United States President may give rise to a kind of peaceful "chain reaction" in the field of strategic offensive weapons and the non-emergence of arms into outer space, as well as in relation to many other issues which today are clamouring for international attention.

So there are signs of an improvement in the international situation, but there are too, I repeat, disquieting aspects which could lead to a sharp aggravation in the world situation.

It would be irresponsible on our part to underestimate the forces of resistance to change - forces which are influential, blinded by hatred of everything progressive, and extremely aggressive. They exist in various quarters of the Western world, but the greatest concentration of them is among those who are in the direct ideological and political service of the military-industrial complex and, as the saying goes, make their living off it.

Here is a striking recent example. On 10 September a series of hearings on the subject of "Gorbachev's economic reforms" began in the Joint Economic Committee of the United States Congress. Senators and Congressmen are taking part, and there are both open and closed hearings. Witnesses include Administration representatives and sovietologists from the CIA, the Department of Defense and various scientific centres. On the whole, this is perfectly normal. It is even

good that people at such a level in America want to gain a thorough understanding of what is happening in the Soviet Union and what our restructuring means for the rest of the world, including the United States.

Various views are being expressed, some of them flatly contradictory. They contain a good deal that is sensible and objective, some of them are open to serious discussion, and in one or two cases I dare say, it wouldn't hurt to listen very carefully. The committee members have even heard the opinion that the United States "should welcome restructuring" because it will lead to a reduced risk of nuclear confrontation.

But other kinds of recommendations are also being made to the Administration and to Congress at these hearings. Here is one of them, nearly word for word: if the Soviet Union attains the targets set by the twenty-seventh Congress of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union, this will first of all enhance its prestige in the international arena, heighten the CPSU's authority within the country and abroad and ... thereby increase the threat to the national security of the United States. This, it turns out, is the kind of conclusion they are capable of reaching. Another example: success in restructuring may weaken the political and economic authority of Western Europe, since the USSR would emerge into the Western European market. The political influence of the USSR in the developing countries will be increased, since it will be possible to increase its military and other assistance to them, and some of them will want to adopt the Soviet economic model if it proves competitive with the United States economy.

Or again, restructuring is dangerous because it will strengthen the Soviet Union's position in international financial and economic organizations. These analysts perceive a particular threat in the Soviet Union's increased influence in the world as a result of its arms control initiatives and the prospect of a treaty on medium-range missiles being signed.

Just listen to the conclusion that they draw as a result: failure of the socio-economic policy being pursued by the Soviet Union under the leadership of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union and the Soviet Government would be in the national interests of the United States.

To "facilitate" this failure, the following recommendations are made: speed up the programmes for costly anti-ballistic missile systems under the Strategic Defense Initiative and draw the USSR into an arms race so as to hinder its restructuring; allocate even more funds for the development of expensive, highly accurate weapons and space-based military systems; to the same end, increase the amount of military and other aid given to groups and régimes actively fighting against the Governments of countries supported by the Soviet Union; oppose the establishment of economic and trade contacts by the USSR with other countries and international organizations; exclude altogether any possibility of the transfer of advanced technology to the USSR and other socialist countries; and tighten control over the activities of COCOM and its member States.

There you have it - frank and cynical. And we in our turn cannot but take account of such an attitude, the more so because United States officials are

often heard to profess their love of peace while in the same breath praising the "policy of strength" and by arguments very similar to those used by the authors of the recommendations that I have just quoted.

Militarist and anti-Soviet forces are clearly concerned that the interest of Western people and political circles in what is now happening in the Soviet Union and the growing understanding of its foreign policy should not erase the artificially created "enemy image", an image that they have been unscrupulously exploiting for decades. Well, that's their affair. We shall continue firmly along the path of restructuring and of the new thinking.

Comrades! Speaking in Murmansk, capital of the Soviet Arctic region, it is appropriate to take a look at the idea of world-wide co-operation from the point of view of the situation in the northern part of our planet. There are, it seems to me, several weighty reasons for doing this.

The Arctic includes not only the Arctic Ocean, but also the northern fringes of three continents: Europe, Asia and America. It is the place where the Eurasian, North American and Asian-Pacific regions come together, where the frontiers and interests of States both belonging to and outside the opposing military alliances meet and intersect.

The North is also a problem for security of the Soviet Union and of its northern frontiers. We have some historical experience in this respect that cost us dearly. The residents of Murmansk well remember 1918, 1919 and 1941-1945.

The wars fought this century were also a painful experience for North European countries proper. And it seems to us that they have drawn serious conclusions for themselves. That is obviously why the social climate in those countries is more receptive to the new political thinking.

It is significant that the historic Conference on Security and Co-operation in Europe took place in one of the northern capitals, Helsinki. It is significant that the next major step in the development of that process - the first fundamental understanding on confidence-building measures - was taken in another northern capital, Stockholm. Reykjavik has become a symbol of hope that nuclear weapons are not eternal and that mankind is not condemned to live under that sword of Damocles.

Major initiatives on aspects of international security and disarmament are linked with the names of famous North European political figures. These include Urho Kekkonen, Olof Palme, whose death at the hands of a vile assassin profoundly shocked the Soviet people, and Kalevi Sorsa, who has headed the Consultative Council of the Socialist International for many years. We welcome the activities of the authoritative World Commission on Environment and Development headed by Norway's Prime Minister Gro Harlem Brundtland.

The Soviet Union duly appreciates the fact that Denmark and Norway, while members of NATO, have unilaterally refused to accept foreign military bases and nuclear weapons on their territory in peacetime. This stand, if consistently implemented, is important for overcoming tension in Europe.

However, this is only part of the picture.

The community and interdependence of the interests of our whole world can be felt in the North, in the Arctic, perhaps better than anywhere else. For the Arctic and the North Atlantic are not only the "weather kitchen" where the cyclones and anti-cyclones are conceived that influence the climate not only in Europe, the United States and Canada, but also in South Asia and Africa. Here, at the same time, is clearly felt the icy breath of the Pentagon's "polar strategy". Here is concentrated, on board submarines and surface ships, an immense potential for nuclear destruction that influences the political climate of the whole world, and might, in its turn, explode if anything should happen to go wrong militarily or politically in any other part of the world.

The militarization of this part of the world is becoming menacing. Reports that NATO is preparing to train to use sea and air-launched cruise missiles from the North Atlantic in the event that the agreement eliminating medium- and shorter-range missiles is concluded are bound to cause alarm. This would mean an additional threat both to us and to all the countries of northern Europe.

A new radar system, one of the components of the "Star Wars" programme, has been brought into service in Greenland in violation of the ABM Treaty. United States cruise missiles are being tested in northern Canada. Not so long ago, Canada's own Government drew up an extensive programme to strengthen military forces in the Arctic. The military activities of the United States and NATO in regions directly adjoining the Soviet Arctic region are intensifying. NATO's military presence in Norway and Denmark is increasing.

Being in Murmansk, on the threshold of the Arctic and the North Atlantic, I should therefore like to invite the States of this region, in the first instance, to take up problems of its security that have long since been ripe for discussion.

How do we envisage this? We can follow the paths of bilateral and multilateral co-operation simultaneously. I have had occasion more than once to talk about our "common European home". Modern civilization has the potential to make the Arctic habitable for the good of the economic and other human interests of the Arctic and sub-Arctic States, of Europe and of the whole international community. But for this to be possible, the first requirement is to solve the security problems that have accumulated here.

The Soviet Union advocates a radical reduction in the level of military confrontation in the region. Let the North of our planet, the Arctic, become a zone of peace. Let the North Pole become a pole of peace. We propose that all interested States should initiate talks on restricting and reducing the scale of military activities in the North as a whole, in both the eastern and western hemispheres.

What specifically do we have in mind?

First, on the subject of a nuclear-free zone in northern Europe. If a decision was taken to establish such a zone, the Soviet Union is prepared, as has

already been stated, to act as a guarantor. It will depend on participating States how best to formulate this guarantee: whether by multilateral or bilateral agreements, government declarations or other means.

At the same time, the Soviet Union affirms its readiness to discuss with each of the States concerned, or with a group of States, all problems connected with the creation of a nuclear-free zone, including possible measures applicable to Soviet territory. We could go quite a long way, in particular by removing submarines equipped with ballistic missiles from the Soviet Baltic fleet.

As is well known, the Soviet Union has already unilaterally dismantled medium-range missile launchers on the Kola Peninsula and the greater part of such launchers in the remaining territory of the Leningrad and Baltic military districts. Many short-range tactical missiles have been redeployed away from those districts. The holding of military exercises has been restricted in areas close to the frontiers of the Scandinavian countries. Additional opportunities for military détente in this region will open up after the conclusion of the "global double-zero" agreement.

Second, we welcome the initiative of the President of Finland, Mr. Koivisto, on the limitation of naval activities in the seas off northern Europe. The Soviet Union, for its part, proposes the opening of consultations between the Warsaw Treaty Organization and NATO on the reduction of military activities and the scaling down of naval and air force operations in the waters of the Baltic, the North Sea and the Norwegian and Greenland Seas and the extension of confidence-building measures to those areas.

Such measures might include agreements providing for the limitation of competition in anti-submarine weapons, the notification of major naval and air force exercises and the invitation of observers from all States parties to the Helsinki process to attend major naval and air force exercises. This could be a first step towards extending confidence-building measures to the entire Arctic, to northern areas in both hemispheres.

At the same time we are proposing that consideration should be given to the question of prohibiting naval activity in mutually agreed parts of international straits and in busy shipping lanes generally. A meeting of representatives of interested countries could be held for this purpose, say in Leningrad.

Another thought that arises in connection with the idea of a nuclear-free zone is this. At present, the Nordic countries, i.e. Iceland, Denmark, Norway, Sweden and Finland, have no nuclear weapons. We are aware of their concern over the fact that we have a testing range on Novaya Zemlya for carrying out nuclear explosions.

We are thinking of how to solve this problem, which is a difficult one for us because such large funds have been invested. However, frankly speaking, it could be resolved once and for all if the United States agreed to stop nuclear tests or, for a start, just to reduce them to the barest minimum in terms of number and yield.

Third, the Soviet Union attaches great significance to peaceful co-operation in developing the resources of the North, the Arctic. Here the exchange of experience, of knowledge, is extremely important; a general outline of rational development of northern regions could be worked out by joint efforts. We are proposing, for example, that agreement should be reached on the elaboration of a unified energy programme for Northern Europe. According to available data, the reserves of such energy sources as oil and gas here are truly immense. But getting them out of the ground entails extreme difficulties, because of the need to develop unique technical installations capable of standing up to polar conditions. So it would be more sensible to pool forces in this matter as a way of cutting both material and other costs. To give an example, we are interested in involving Canada and Norway in the establishment of joint firms and enterprises for oil and gas production on our northern shelf. We are ready for corresponding negotiations with other States as well.

We are also prepared for joint work on the utilization of the resources of the Kola Peninsula and on other major business projects in all kinds of forms, including joint enterprises.

Fourth, the scientific study of the Arctic is of enormous importance to mankind as a whole. We have a great wealth of experience and we are willing to share it. In turn, we are interested in studies under way in other sub-Arctic and Nordic States. We already have a scientific exchange programme with Canada.

We are proposing that a conference of sub-Arctic States on the co-ordination of scientific research in the Arctic should be held in 1988. The question of setting up a joint scientific council for the Arctic might be considered on that occasion. The venue for the conference could, if the partners agree, be Murmansk.

Issues relating to the interests of the indigenous population of the North, the study of its ethnic particularities and the development of cultural links between northern nationalities call for special attention.

Fifth, we attach special importance to co-operation among northern countries in the matter of environmental protection. The vital necessity for this is obvious. The experience gained from the joint measures for the protection of the marine environment in the Baltic now being conducted by a commission of seven coastal States might well be extended to all oceans and seas in the northern part of our planet.

The Soviet Union is proposing the joint elaboration of a unified integrated plan for the protection of the North's environment. The countries of northern Europe could set an example by agreeing on the establishment of a system to monitor the state of the environment and radiation safety in the region. We must make haste to protect nature in the tundra and forest tundra, and in the northern taiga areas.

Sixth, the shortest sea route from Europe to the Far East and the Pacific Ocean passes through the Arctic. I think that, depending on how things go with the

normalization of international relations, we could open up the northern sea route to foreign ships, with us supplying ice-breaker services.

Such are our proposals. Such is the specific content of Soviet foreign policy for the North. Such are our intentions and plans for the future. Of course, ensuring security and developing co-operation in the North is an international matter and by no means depends on us alone. We are prepared to discuss any counter-proposals or ideas. What matters is to conduct affairs in such a way that the climate here is determined by the warm Gulf stream of the Helsinki process, not by the polar chill of accumulated suspicion and prejudice.

One thing that everyone may be absolutely certain of is the Soviet Union's profound and unconditional interest in making sure that the North of our planet, its polar and sub-polar areas, all northern countries, never again become a theatre of war, that a genuine zone of peace and fruitful interaction is formed in this part of the world.

* * *

Such, comrades, is our approach to domestic and international affairs, our understanding of the interrelation between them. In both spheres, our policy has proved its viability and its constructive nature. We are convinced that there is no road to security and social progress other than constructive work for human happiness and freedom at home and the development of co-operation among States on a footing of equality in the international arena.

We take legitimate pride in the fact that our country has stood and today stands at the well-head both of socialist practice and of the new thinking. In the past 70 years the world has changed beyond recognition, materially, spiritually and politically. The contribution made by the Great October Revolution to the social and ideological advancement of mankind is the most valuable heritage of civilization, present and future. To multiply this contribution through perestroika, through the practical results of perestroika, is within our possibilities and in our interest.

Allow me to wish you and your families, all the workers of the territory, success in all endeavours to achieve the transformation of our country, in your studies and personal lives and to congratulate you once again upon the fact that you are approaching the commemoration of the 70th anniversary of the Great October Revolution as a Hero City.
