



UNITED NATIONS  
GENERAL  
ASSEMBLY



Distr.  
GENERAL

A/35/382  
11 August 1980

ORIGINAL: ENGLISH/FRENCH/  
RUSSIAN/SPANISH

Thirty-fifth session  
Item 50 of the provisional agenda\*

REVIEW OF THE IMPLEMENTATION OF THE DECLARATION ON  
THE STRENGTHENING OF INTERNATIONAL SECURITY

Note verbale dated 5 August 1980 from the Permanent Mission of Bulgaria  
to the United Nations addressed to the Secretary-General

The Permanent Mission of the People's Republic of Bulgaria to the United Nations presents its compliments to the Secretary-General of the United Nations and upon instructions from its Government has the honour to request the circulation, as an official document of the General Assembly under item 50 of the provisional agenda, of the speech by Mr. Todor Zhivkov, President of the State Council of the People's Republic of Bulgaria, delivered on 8 July 1980 at the International Meeting and Dialogue on Détente, organized on the occasion of the eightieth anniversary of the Bulgarian Agrarian Party.

\* A/35/150.

ANNEX

TODAY HUMANITY HAS NO TASK MORE IMPORTANT AND MORE  
URGENT THAN TO SAFEGUARD AND STRENGTHEN PEACE

Speech delivered by Mr. Todor Zhivkov, First Secretary of the  
Central Committee of the Bulgarian Communist Party and  
President of the State Council of the People's Republic of  
Bulgaria, at the International Meeting and Dialogue on  
Détente, organized on the occasion of the eightieth  
anniversary of the Bulgarian Agrarian Party at Sofia  
on 8 July 1980

CONTENTS

	<u>Page</u>
Introduction . . . . .	2
Peaceful coexistence - an imperative of our time, an imperative of life . . . . .	3
On peace and war . . . . .	6
Harmonious interrelations of society and nature - the task of all mankind . . . . .	9

Dear Guests,  
Dear Comrades,

First of all I should like to express my heartfelt gratitude for the great honour you have done me by giving me the opportunity of addressing this prestigious international forum.

It is with great pleasure that I am now fulfilling the mission of greeting you most cordially on behalf of the State Council of the People's Republic of Bulgaria, of the Government and of our entire people and of wishing you fruitful work and a pleasant stay in our country. We have always opened our doors hospitably to friends, to all who come to us as the champions of love for peace and of cooperation between the peoples.

The occasion of your visit to our country is the celebration of the 80th anniversary of the Bulgarian Agrarian Party. Yesterday you heard the message of greetings of the Central Committee of the Bulgarian Communist Party to our fraternal party. In this message we once again render what is rightfully due to the Bulgarian Agrarian Party (BAP), to its leadership and to Comrade Peter Tanchev personally for their enormous work for the benefit of the people. *We cannot imagine present-day socialist Bulgaria or the solution of the tasks of our social, political, economic and cultural life, indeed, of our all-round development, without the joint work of communists and agrarians, without cooperation and unity of action between the Bulgarian Communist Party and the Bulgarian Agrarian Party.*

I wish to emphasise that our joint work and unity of action do not date from the victory of the socialist revolution. They were born and cemented already under the difficult conditions of the struggle against the fascist dictatorship, for the victory of the socialist revolution and the establishment of people's rule. We, communists and allied agrarians, suffered the disasters of the wars and the blows of fascism together, we faced the firing squads and the gallows together, and together we formed the salutary Fatherland Front which united all

progressive, democratic and patriotic forces and under whose banner the victory of the Ninth of September, 1944, was achieved.

Today the friendship and joint action of our two fraternal parties have been raised to a new stage. We discuss and solve the principal questions of the development of this country jointly, especially questions concerning agriculture and the strengthening of the people's social, political and ideological unity. This political reality has been promoted to a constitutional principle. Our cooperation can be taken as a model of the unity and joint action of the progressive forces in a country which is being built up and developed under the motto 'Everything for Man, Everything in the Name of Man'.

We also value the international activity of the Bulgarian Agrarian Party very highly. In our age, the contacts, friendly relations and cooperation between the BAP and many agrarian parties, movements and kindred democratic organisations, as we all know, play a great role in promoting cooperation and understanding between the peoples and states, in forming our planet's social and political physiognomy.

That is why we are very pleased that the celebration of the 80th anniversary of our fraternal organisation is being turned today into such a prestigious forum, one which will discuss the most fateful problem of our time — the problem of detente and peace. This fact in itself shows our common concern for the process of detente, for the cause of peace, it shows — and I am convinced you will agree with me — our common interest in overcoming the present complications in the international arena.

*We all know that the problems which face mankind and which determine the aspect of and have an influence on the social-political, economic and all other processes in the contemporary world, are many. There are, however, three exceptionally important, cardinal problems. We can safely call them problems above all other problems, decisive ones, vital and fateful for the development of present-day civilisation, of the world of today, problems concerning hundreds of millions of people on our planet.*

*The first problem* — this is the problem of peaceful coexistence of states with different social systems.

*The second problem* — is the problem of war and peace.

*The third problem* — is the problem of the relationship between man and nature. Allow me to dwell briefly on these three problems.

**Peaceful coexistence — an imperative of our time, an imperative of life**

Esteemed friends and comrades,  
We live — and all of us in this hall are very well aware of this — in an exceptionally dynamic time, a time of stormy and profound social change, of unprecedented activity of the social forces of the whole planet.

What is the world today? As you know, as a result of successful social revolutions, a large group of countries have embarked on the road to the build up of a socialist society or have orientated themselves towards it. The colonial system has collapsed, it is practically nonexistent. Dozens of young independent states have emerged. They are now faced with the problems of how to overcome their centuries-old backwardness, inherited from colonialism and imperialist dictates, how to emerge from their very difficult economic situation, to build up their national economies, to feed, shoe and clothe their populations, how to organise their health services, how to do away with illiteracy, etc.

The activity of all organized public forces, parties and movements has increased tremendously. They are ever more insistently demanding to take a direct part in shaping the policies of their states, in solving social problems, in charting the ways to economic development, in regulating international relations, particularly in the struggle for peace and detente.

That, in a nutshell, is what the world is now: dynamic and fraught with great social conflicts, with unusual activity and striving on the part of the peoples to live in a new way, to transform the world, to build up their prosperity, their happiness.

*All this gives rise to, and cannot but give rise to, many important problems, and it cannot but give rise to contradictions. And this is natural.*

The axis of the most essential and deepest social and political processes of our time are the *relations between the socialist and the capitalist states*. There are differences in principle and contradictions between the two world systems. These systems exist, they are a reality. The contradiction between the socialist countries and the capi-

talist countries is the *fundamental contradiction* at the present stage of social development.

Naturally, besides this fundamental contradiction, there are also other contradictions: ones between the developing countries and the advanced capitalist countries, others between the capitalist states competing with each other for markets and sources of raw materials, etc.

Such are now the stark realities of the world which no sober-minded politicians can afford to disregard.

If we discuss all these contradictions from the point of view of international security and the interests of the whole of mankind, from the point of view of the people's happiness and prosperity, we cannot help realising that *the problem of peaceful coexistence between states with different social systems is acquiring exceptionally great and decisive significance*.

There are ideologists, politicians and statesmen who consider that a situation of constant tension and confrontation between the socialist and capitalist countries should exist in the world, that in the final count, the decisive means of settling the contradictions between these two systems must be arms, must be war.

This is a misanthropic, barbarous theory which defies all comparison. Unfortunately these are not merely ideas, or merely intentions. Such are also the actions of some Western circles. In practice these circles play into the hands of the Maoists. Quite overtly the Maoists have set themselves the task of provoking a military conflict in which the Soviet Union and the USA would destroy each other, so that they, the present-day leaders of China, could realise their goals of hegemony.

In no circumstance can we agree with the adventurous course of confrontation and war. The question of peaceful coexistence concerns not only separate countries, not only separate peoples. It is of cardinal significance to the world of today, to our civilisation, to the present and future of the peoples inhabiting our planet. The question, as it stands today, is: either we shall coexist peacefully, or we shall exterminate each other.

*Consequently the principal conclusion which we must draw, can be none other than the following: step by step, but steadfastly and decisively, to build up new international relations, relations of peaceful coexistence between states with different*

*social systems.* This is the only true conclusion. Because, esteemed guests, esteemed comrades, if we draw any other conclusion, if we take steps in any other direction, that could lead to catastrophic consequences for our planet, for the peoples.

The experience of history, particularly the experience of the last decade, abounds in examples of mutually advantageous and fruitful cooperation between the socialist and the capitalist countries which prove the correctness of the thesis of the need for peaceful coexistence.

What are the facts?

Let us take the Second World War. In the crushing of nazism — that barbarous and inhuman regime which kindled the war — an enormous role was played by the coalition between the Soviet Union and a number of capitalist countries. That was a convincing example of states becoming aware of the necessity of struggling jointly for survival, and for coexistence in conditions of peace and independence.

Or another example. After the victory in the Second World War, the *United Nations Organisation* was set up. This, too, is a triumph for the principles of peaceful coexistence, for the understanding that such an international organ should be set up to discuss and settle controversial questions and to help in averting the danger of fresh war. This organisation has been functioning for 35 years now. We know how important a role it has played and is playing in the discussion of a number of big international problems, in reducing world tension.

If we go further, we must point to the success of the *European Security and Cooperation Conference* and to the signing of the Final Act in Helsinki which established the principles of peaceful coexistence as the basis of relations between states with different social systems.

The signing of SALT-1 and SALT-2 is yet another victory for peaceful coexistence.

*If we examine only the last decade, from 1970 on, we can see that during that period great, I should say historic, changes took place in the development of the world, on the basis of peaceful coexistence.*

We know very well what the 'cold war' was like, what a threat it posed to peace and what tension it caused in the world. The 'cold war' was overcome. A climate of trust began to be created. Detente was gra-

dually gaining ground as the principal and leading tendency in international relations. The territorial, political and social realities in Europe after the Second World War were confirmed. Many international agreements were signed between socialist and capitalist countries; this created conditions for the development of equal and mutually advantageous cooperation in various spheres.

We achieved big successes in the economic field. East-West trade attained a wide scope. If we make a comparison we shall see that the growth rate of trade between the socialist and the capitalist countries over the last decade was twice as high as the growth rate of world trade as a whole. This is a major gain. Industrial cooperation and specialisation was initiated between Western firms and economic organisations of the socialist countries and new forms were sought in which to develop economic relations, techno-scientific cooperation, etc.

In the sphere of culture there was a tangible increase in this decade in the exchange of cultural values between countries with different social systems. These relations have been increasingly expanding.

We must assess all this on its merits, and assess it as a tremendous achievement in our efforts to implement the principle of peaceful coexistence between countries with different social systems.

*We declare, for all to hear, that we stand for peaceful coexistence, that it is of advantage to our people who are building a developed socialist society and who need peace and international cooperation for the successful fulfilment of their daring plans.*

But is there in fact any nation that is not interested in the preservation of peace?

All peoples stand to lose from the disruption of normal relations and cooperation. No one should entertain any illusions about it. To restrict political, economic and cultural contacts between the East and West, to cancel business agreements already concluded means to pursue a short-sighted and unrealistic policy.

Of course, we realize that there are difficulties in pursuing the course of detente and in applying the principle of peaceful coexistence and there cannot but be difficulties. First, because it is a matter of relations between countries with two different social systems, capitalist and socialist. Secondly, because the considerable differences and contradictions between the developed capitalist nations and the develop-

ing countries give rise to severe conflicts between them which complicate the general situation. Thirdly, because there can be no stopping the historical process, the peoples are waging their struggle for national independence, against oppression and exploitation, for the right to utilize their own resources for social progress. Fourthly, because there are influential circles in the capitalist countries whose interests are bound up with the policy of tension and with the arms race, not with détente; and so on.

There are, therefore, objective conditions in the present-day world to give rise to complications of various character, and even of crisis situations. *We should, however, never lose sight of the main, the decisive thing, the one thing without which there can exist neither socialist nor capitalist countries, nor the rest of the world, namely that there is not and cannot be a reasonable alternative to peaceful coexistence.*

Whatever the methods and approaches, whatever the theories used to analyse modern society, there is no denying the fact that the socialist countries exist. They may be abused, and abused they are. What fabrications do they not write about them. But the socialist countries do really exist. The Soviet Union exists and so does the entire socialist community. The capitalist countries, too, do really exist. Such is the present-day world, and it is all the same whether anyone likes it, or not.

We Marxists, we communists, think that the future of the world is socialism and communism. Capitalist ideologists think otherwise. All right, let us argue about it. But let us not reach out and take up arms to prove that we are right. *Let history decide the question in whose favour, in what direction the world will develop. And let this dispute be settled peacefully, not under conditions of tension, not under conditions of continual confrontation between the two systems.*

Some people will say: 'You, Comrade Zhivkov, or Mr. Zhivkov, disregard the fact that besides the socialist and capitalist countries there are also other countries, there are developing countries. Yes, there are, Comrades. And I do not in the least underrate their role in international life, in the struggle for peace. This is natural, for if we take up arms, if a new world war breaks out, it will give no heed to which country is socialist, which is capitalist, and

which is a developing one. *But the focus at which world problems now converge and in which the question of peace and war is settled, is the relationship between the socialist and the capitalist countries. Whatever we may do, we cannot circumvent this historical fact.*

Some people suggest to us: good, since we are to follow a line of peaceful coexistence, of peace and understanding, then let us agree not to let any revolutions happen in one region or another, in one country or another of the world.

But how is such a thing possible? It is absolutely impossible. This question has been historically decided by the development of human society. We may take as many decisions as we like, but where there is no freedom, where there is oppression, exploitation and slavery, the peoples will rise in struggle. And they have the right to do that. There can be absolutely no doubt about that. Revolutions will be carried out, and cannot but be carried out there where the conditions are ripe for them. Nothing can stop the revolutionary process.

Peaceful coexistence is coexistence and cooperation between countries with two different systems. It, does not, however, settle nor can it ever settle either the question of the people's struggle for liberation from foreign oppression, or the problems of inter-class relations in the different countries.

*We are resolutely opposed to the export of revolutions, and we do not engage in such activity.* We know very well that revolutions are the result of social developments in a given country, the result of a series of concrete conditions — social, economic, political, historical, etc. They are an expression of the need for radical changes in the interest of the broad masses of people. It is only when the conditions for deep social transformations are ripe, that the social revolution wins. But that is above all a question for the peoples to decide, one which reflects the concrete correlations of the forces in the countries concerned. This is absolutely clear to us. This is our position. We are no adventurers. We are realists.

*At the same time, however, we are also resolutely opposed to the export of counterrevolution to countries and regions which have embarked upon the road to social transformation, along the road to radical renewal of their economy and their entire social system. Under no circumstan-*

ces will we be the accomplices of the stranglers of the peoples. On this question we must be clear. As long as counterrevolution is exported and any country threatened by it asks for our help, we shall help it with all the possibilities and means at our disposal. In this there is nothing strange, nothing unnatural. On the contrary, the opposite would be unnatural.

This is how the problems of revolutions and counterrevolutions stand.

We all, dear guests, work in our countries, bear a responsibility to our parties and organisations, and are inspired by the humane goals of working for the well-being of our peoples. But we know very well that in our epoch there can be no closed communities, no closed countries, there can be no happiness and no prosperity for the peoples, that even the ordinary citizen cannot arrange his own home and build up a happy life, unless peace is safeguarded and strengthened, unless the peaceful coexistence of countries with different social systems triumphs in international relations. The existence and happiness of mankind, the existence and happiness of the peoples and of the man in the street are indivisibly linked.

*We, statesmen and politicians, regardless of the rank we hold and the responsibility we bear, are faced with the great historic task, the imperative of the time, the imperative of life: to work out a system of undertakings, agreements and treaties with a view to ensuring — in spite of the occasional ebbs and flows in international life, and in spite of the crisis phenomena that may arise in given regions — the peaceful coexistence of countries with different social systems on our planet, and the peace, freedom and progress of the peoples.*

I should like once again to stress the fact that we, the socialist countries, the People's Republic of Bulgaria, are working and consider it our extremely important duty, to carry out such foreign political activity, to pursue such a policy as will further consolidate and promote peaceful coexistence.

#### On Peace and War

Esteemed guests and comrades,

Allow me to pass on to the following question — *the question of war and peace.*

This question is neither of today nor of yesterday. It is a question which has

aroused the concern of mankind, of the peoples, ever since there were wars. And wars were waged, as the historians say, even in the remotest Antiquity. The most lucid minds of mankind have resolutely declared themselves against plunderous, unjust wars. We are all perfectly aware that in the last few decades, the question of war and peace has become a cardinal one. *And I would say what I think coincides with your convictions as well — that there is no question more important, more fateful for the very existence of mankind than the question of peace and war.*

Shall we succeed in ensuring lasting peace in the world or shall we allow, irrespective of our wishes, a war to flare up? If a third world war broke out, it would be radically different from all the wars waged so far, including the Second World War. I am not saying anything new. You are prominent public figures and statesmen, and know this very well. Through the present-day techno-scientific revolution in the sphere of warfare there have been developed arms of a colossal power of destruction, such a power of destruction as the human imagination cannot picture.

What would happen if such a war broke out?

*First, there would be no battle-front and no rear.* War would be total, involving whole countries, whole states, the entire planet, no matter where it happened to be waged. I beg you very much to take note of this — no matter where it happened to be waged and *no matter whether it was waged with nuclear arms between the Soviet Union and the USA or between China and I don't know which other state.* Why? Because even if most of the countries in the world were spared direct thermo-nuclear hits, they could not be spared radioactive fallout. Radioactive fallout would spread over all countries, over the greater part of our planet, and there would be no means or possibilities of overcoming this, of avoiding it, of preserving a normal living environment for the people's life. So there would be no front, no rear, no frontiers, no neutral or belligerent, friendly or hostile states.

*Secondly, a future war would make no difference between classes.* It would be impossible, let us say, to destroy the capitalist class and leave the working class, or the other way round. All would go. No

differentiation could be made between the good and the evil, the innocent and those guilty for the calamity. And so on and so forth.

This is, therefore what a future war would be like. There would be no state unaffected in a future war.

A symposium of US scientists, representatives of the medical sciences, took place last February in the USA. They came up with a letter to US President Carter and to Leonid Ilyich Brezhnev, President of the Presidium of the Supreme Soviet of the USSR, in which they drew their attention to several very important facts. The letter points out (I quote from memory), that should a thermonuclear war, even a limited one break out, it would have irreparable consequences. The American medical experts write that to the US a nuclear war would mean the destruction of the entire population, of the towns, of the industry. To the Soviet Union it would mean the destruction of the greater part of the towns and the majority of the population, because the Soviet Union has bigger territory and a smaller concentration of the population. In the end, the conclusion is drawn that there is no alternative to an atomic war but peace, that in such a war there would be neither vanquished nor victors, that measures should be immediately taken to guarantee world peace, to prevent a third world war, a thermonuclear war.

As you know, Leonid Ilyich Brezhnev answered the authors of the letter declaring that the Soviet Union would continue to do its best to safeguard peace.

This is, Comrades, how things stand.

Lenin — that genius of mankind — said that if a weapon capable of destroying entire armies, entire peoples was invented, then war would become an absurdity. Now a weapon has already been developed capable of destroying not only entire armies and entire states, but of destroying the whole of our planet. Such a weapon has been created. Moreover the arms race continues, at a tremendous pace, too.

According to official data, to UN statistics, mankind now have at their disposal such a quantity of thermonuclear arms that in their destructive power they equal 1.5 million bombs of the type which destroyed Hiroshima. These bombs can destroy 15 times over everything living on

our planet. Fifteen times! This is the stark truth: as a result of the contemporary techno-scientific revolution a weapon of mass destruction, new in principle, has been developed, which is, indeed, turning war into an absurdity.

Dear Guests, Comrades,

I should like to say here quite frankly that *we have been gravely worried by the latest theories, particularly by the corresponding action already taken by the US strategists, on the issues of disarmament and a future war.*

Through the whole period following the "cold war" we were negotiating an agreement — there exist written documents to this effect, there are statements made by Comrade L. Brezhnev on the Soviet side and by the US President J. Carter, by military experts, theorists and others — to the effect that approximate parity had been reached in the military forces of the East and the West. This has been accepted as a reality. And on this basis we went to Helsinki. The Salt-1 and Salt-2 negotiations were based on this premise and on this conclusion. Everything was based on this. And it was right that it was so, because what kind of detente can there be if a relative balance of armaments has not been achieved?

Now, however, they openly declare — both in the USA and at the NATO sessions — that the USA must achieve superiority in the military sphere. What does that mean? It means the undermining of the foundations of everything that has been achieved and the torpedoing of our future negotiations and talks aimed at resolving conflict situations and at continuing the process of detente.

In what variants and what aspects is the new concept being discussed and formulated now?

*First of all certain ideologists in the West, claim that thermonuclear war is not so terrible. They underrate the casualties they would suffer and present matters almost as though it would be something like a sporting event if a third world war broke out. The conclusion they draw is that they must prepare to wage a thermonuclear war; and to be able to wage it, they must have superiority.*

*The second thesis, now being formulated by certain ideologists and strategists in the West, is on the so-called second-eche-*



*lon wars, local wars.* You see, in their view conditions had to be created at all costs for inciting and fanning local wars! And they go on shamelessly writing and propagating this. Local wars are also being waged at present, but in the conceptions of these people, this has already become a strategy, a policy, a line of development. That is what worries us.

According to these strategists an eventual war in Europe would also be a local war. Everyone of us, every man of common sense, can understand what this formula means and what it aims at.

What would it mean if a local war broke out in Europe? It would mean that Europe would be reduced to ashes. The stationing of new US medium range thermonuclear missiles on the territory of Western Europe aims precisely at this: to leave the US outside the European theatre of military operations.

Of course, this theory amounts, as we say, to reckoning without one's host. Those overseas strategists who preach it should know that if a war breaks out in Europe, it cannot and will not be a local war. Because the new US missiles which are being prepared for stationing in Western Europe will cover the whole of the European part of the Soviet Union and a considerable part of its other territory. To the Soviet Union it would make no difference whether it was attacked with thermonuclear arms from US territory or from bases in some European country. So whether a world war were kindled directly or someone considered Europe as a region of local war, would amount to one and the same thing; both in theory and in practice this would be catastrophic. Obviously we cannot agree to changing the balance of forces in Europe to any degree.

What should be done?

We should by all means prevent a third world war!

Preparations for war are now going on at unheard-of and unprecedented rates. Last year the NATO countries set aside about 220,000 million dollars for military preparations, and in several years' time it is planned for this sum to reach 400,000 million dollars — as much as all the states in the world now spend on armaments. 400,000 million dollars! Moreover, Comrades, I doubt whether this is the true figure. Part of the funds for military preparations are transferred to other paragraphs

in the budget. Probably no less than 500,000 million dollars now go for military preparations every year.

It is well known that we, the socialist countries, are taking very serious measures and showing exceptionally vigorous activity to safeguard peace. To us the principal, cardinal question is the question of ensuring lasting world peace, of preventing a third thermonuclear war. There is no task more important than this one at present, there is not, nor can there be! All other tasks, goals, etc. should be relegated to second or third place.

It was not by chance that this was the central question at the jubilee session of the Warsaw Treaty Organization in the capital of Poland, and in the documents adopted there. A number of new and important proposals were put forward in Warsaw with the aim of curbing the arms race and ensuring world peace.

Naturally when we speak of peace, we have in mind a democratic and just peace. Only a democratic and just peace can have prospects, only under such conditions can the questions of halting the arms race and starting gradual disarmament be resolved.

In short, *our position, the position of the socialist countries, including the People's Republic of Bulgaria, is that there is no weapon, either thermonuclear or conventional, whose production cannot be stopped if we sit down and agree under mutually beneficial conditions to preserve parity.* There should be no double-talk, but a dialogue under equal conditions. We are ready to sit down and settle these problems, settle them honestly, settle them in observance of the rules of the interrelations of states, while taking into account the rights and interests of the security of all countries.

In regard to us in particular, the People's Republic of Bulgaria, as you know, we are, luckily or unluckily, situated in the heart of the Balkan Peninsula. In the past the Balkans were a powder keg. History has bequeathed to us many controversial problems. But if we, the peoples of our peninsula, were to start delving into everything, we should always have to be ready to fly at each other's throats.

We consider that the realities in the Balkans are realities elucidated by everything which came as a result of the Second World War, as a result of Helsinki, and we endeavour to take these realities

strictly into consideration. We have absolutely no claims — either territorial or whatsoever — on our neighbours. We have no claims whatsoever on any state in the world, on any people. Our only desire is to live in peace, to live in understanding. The People's Republic of Bulgaria pursues a consistent, principled and honest policy of peace, good neighbourliness and mutually beneficial cooperation with all the other Balkan countries. And we shall also go on unswervingly pursuing this policy in the future.

We must say that through the efforts of all the Balkan countries — and of course, also as a result of international developments — good relations have been established in the Balkans notwithstanding the complicated situations which arise and will, maybe, arise in the future too. *We have succeeded in establishing a climate of trust and goodneighbourly cooperation. This policy and these achievements attained through the common effort of all the Balkan countries are a great achievement. They are in the interest of the Balkans, in the interest of detente and understanding in Europe and in the world.*

As one of the 160 world states, socialist Bulgaria sincerely wishes the world to advance along the path of detente, along the path of peace and understanding.

Bulgaria is a construction site. Wherever you go you will see that something is being constructed, something is being made, transformed. These are not only tasks set forth in our plan, these are not items in the budgets of the respective organizations entrusted with ensuring funds according to the plan. This construction work is a nationwide undertaking. Our people have rolled up their sleeves and are building. They have already come out of their age-old backwardness and are now struggling to take a place among the most advanced peoples of the world. What we are building is not being built, of course, to be destroyed. We are building it to bring happiness and prosperity to our people. The people are building it themselves and they understand this. Our people are politically mature, they know very well that peace is the first and most important condition for building at the present stage of the developed socialist society in the People's Republic of Bulgaria.

*So, dear guests, dear friends, you can rely on the People's Republic of Bulgaria, on her efforts to contribute, within the range of her possibilities, to understanding between peoples, to overcoming the present international tension and continuing along the path of the 70s to detente and understanding between different countries and different peoples.*

### **Harmonious Interrelations of Society and Nature — the Task of All Mankind**

Dear Guests and Friends,

Allow me to pass on now to the third problem — *the relationship between man and nature.*

Man and nature are indissolubly linked. Nature is not only the natural environment in which the human race came into being and was formed but also the source of the means of existence. Mankind did not come out of the blue, they are part of nature. As Engels put it, we belong to nature and exist in nature with our flesh, our blood and our reason.

History teaches us that any 'spoliation' of nature, any recklessness and consumer attitude towards it has always had, has still and will have dangerous consequences for mankind. In recent times great and serious problems have arisen in the interrelations of man and nature, problems which are engaging the attention of all mankind and cannot but agitate and worry them.

Some bourgeois ideologists hold that the upsetting of the *ecological balance*, which was formed naturally in the historical development, is the result of the present-day techno-scientific revolution. It is true that this revolution has brought about tremendous qualitative changes in the evolution of human life.

*First*, the contemporary techno-scientific revolution has radically transformed the *production base* and continues to change it both quantitatively and qualitatively. This revolution actually created and is continuing to create a production base, new in principle.

*Second*, the techno-scientific revolution has radically changed *the material surroundings and the conditions for the life of the people*, it has become the foremost factor in the considerable rise in the efficiency of human activity, in making it more intensive.

*Third* the techno-scientific revolution has created conditions for the rapid development of *social consciousness*, for raising the intellectual capacities of man.

All this is true.

Another thing, however, is also true that *in the conditions of the presentday techno-scientific revolution, on the basis of which industrialization is taking place today, considerable damage has been done and is still being done to nature*. You are familiar with the data being published on the use of natural resources. They are rather alarming. I should like to remind you of some of them only.

It is said and is probably true that in the last 500 years man has destroyed two-thirds of the forests on this planet. Hundreds of plant species have become extinct. They were destroyed.

The air, our atmospheric ocean, is being polluted more and more. Gradually and uncontrollably the content of carbon dioxide is increasing. Specialists have calculated by millions and millions of tons annually. And the possibilities of the atmosphere are not unlimited. It cannot take in everything which is released in it.

It has been proved that about ten million tons of oil and all sorts of other refuse are dumped in the world ocean annually. Its capacities, too, are limited.

The signals of the pollution of soil, rivers and lakes are also alarming.

But, dear Guests, Friends and Comrades, it would be unfair to throw the blame for all this on our contemporary techno-scientific revolution. That would be incorrect, for it is just the opposite. *In its nature the techno-scientific revolution is and can be our great 'ally' in harmonizing the relationship between society and nature*. If this has not yet been done it is not the techno-scientific revolution which is to blame but the people. Therefore the questions of creating harmonious relations between man and nature are above all social questions.

The techno-scientific revolution is not a curse but a blessing if a given society, country and people have succeeded in harnessing its truly cosmic powers for the well-being of mankind.

We believe that one should not take up the same position as some bourgeois ideologists who dramatize the problem of the disturbed ecological balance on the

earth and one should not be pessimistic about it. *The awareness of danger is the signal for action, not for pessimism*. I agree that we should not underestimate and neglect the warning of scientists and other specialists. But mankind must have the power to deal with this disaster now, because tomorrow or the day after tomorrow, it may prove catastrophic for the whole planet. And in connection with this I repeat again that the techno-scientific revolution is and can be our powerful 'ally' in harmonizing the interrelations of society and nature.

*Here is a field for fruitful and noble cooperation among all of us, small and big states, advanced and developing countries*. These problems, like the problems of coexistence and the problems of war and peace cannot be settled by individual states no matter how big they are. They can be settled only through the efforts of all states, of all peoples. This is so because these are cardinal problems, concerning all mankind, the people, including the ordinary working people, their respective organizations and so on and so forth.

*The ecological problem is a vital problem for all people. And to solve it successfully the energy and talent of all peoples must be mobilized*. What is now being done in this sphere is insufficient.

It should not be forgotten that whatever we do we come to social problems. How will man influence nature, will he approach it barbarously or with attentive care — all this is determined, in the final count, by the nature of the social system, by the correlation of the social forces, by the ultimate goals and tasks of production, by whether they are orientated to society or to directing the lion's share of the riches to a limited part of it. All this is highly important.

Irrespective of this, I repeat again, we can and must pool our efforts now in order to harmonize the interrelations of society and nature. *This, however, can be achieved only in conditions of coexistence, of peace and detente. This is the preliminary and the most important condition for uniting our efforts to solve the ecological problem*.

Recently the tackling of the ecological problem has been closely associated with the raw materials problem, the energy problem, and the food-supply problem. These problems, too, call for sober analysis and re-assessment.

It is true that in connection with the rapid development of the productive forces of modern civilization some of the so far traditionally used *raw material resources* are being increasingly exhausted, the 'share of income' they bring in is, so to say, decreasing. Apart from this something else should be taken into consideration — the lack of all 'divine justice' in the distribution of the raw materials and energy resources on the earth. Take us, for instance: the dear Lord treated us unjustly, nature treated us unjustly, in not giving us sufficient raw materials and energy. We import oil, gas, coal, metals and so on and so forth. Nature has simply treated us unjustly and it is apparent that not only Bulgaria has been treated unjustly, many other states have been treated unjustly, too. But for all that, there are raw materials in the world and there will be.

The question is whether we should settle the raw material problem with military force and confrontation or not?

Some circles in the West see no other way of settling the raw material crisis than by resorting to military confrontation. They imagine that they could take the raw materials and energy by force from the countries where they are available without taking into account the fact that these are the national wealth and property of the respective countries and these circles scheme to plunder them for ever and ever. They do not realize that such a policy can lead at any moment to local confrontations, and cause a third thermodynamic world war. That is not and cannot be the way. And here peaceful coexistence is necessary and here we need a dialogue and here joint efforts are necessary to settle the raw material and energy problem.

The techno-scientific revolution reveals sufficient new possibilities of settling this problem. Incidentally, efforts are already being directed towards seeking substitutes for raw materials, towards prospecting for new energy resources, etc. At this stage we are using chiefly our primary resources, i.e. what nature has given us, but there are other enormous potential possibilities. Science has still to start tapping them and putting them at the disposal of mankind. That is how the question of raw materials and energy stands. It should not lead to a conflict, to tension, to interference in the affairs of other states,

but should be settled on the basis of peaceful coexistence, friendship, dialogue and ever more efforts should be put into seeking other potential possibilities. If we continue to drift along, this problem may lead to extremely grave consequences for mankind, from local conflicts and tension it could grow into worldwide tension, into a world conflict.

On the so-called *food-supply problem*.

We all know that this problem is particularly acute in such regions as Africa and Asia and even in some strata of the population of the advanced Western states. But it is mainly a problem of the countries which were formerly under colonial slavery and have only recently cast off colonial dependence.

We have more than once set forth *our positions on this problem*. It is also a social problem and cannot but be such.

In their theories various bourgeois ideologists maintain that undernourishment and hunger on our planet are due to demographic factors, to natural, so to say, factors such as high birth rates, lower soil fertility, etc. There is not a grain of truth in this. These pseudo-theories should be smashed to smithereens. The truth, as you know, is quite different. The year before last I visited Nigeria, Angola, Mozambique, Ethiopia and the People's Democratic Republic of Yemen. According to the present standard of living in Africa, Nigeria alone could feed the entire population of that continent. The same is true of Angola and Mozambique. Ethiopia has exceptionally good soil conditions and could settle the problem of feeding her own population altogether and even the problem of feeding some neighbouring state. And so on.

That means the problem does not lie in the shortage of resources for feeding the population. According to the data of the respective international organizations dealing with problems of food supplies, it is necessary to treble the present-day production of consumer goods to be able to meet the needs of the entire population in the next 20 to 25 years. And this is completely feasible. If for instance Nigeria, Angola, Mozambique, Ethiopia and other countries introduce the organization and the technology we have in Bulgaria's agriculture today, the picture will be drastically changed. These countries will not

only meet their own needs, they will have surplus output. This means that these countries are not to be blamed, their peoples are not to be blamed, for having remained backward for centuries.

Are mankind in a position to help these countries? I am absolutely confident that they are. But the question here is also one of peaceful coexistence. Now imperialist propaganda has been trying to scare some peoples and ruling quarters with the bogey of the Soviet Union — that the Soviet Union was going to occupy them, to rob them of their wealth etc. Fabrications! This propaganda may mislead some people for a while, may have a temporary effect. But life is life and asserts itself. Is there a way out? Yes, there is! The way out is for these peoples to solve their problems themselves. But to do so they ought to be given a helping hand in terms of funds, the training of their own experts, etc. Where are the funds to be raised for this. If 8–10 per cent of the 400 or 500 billion dollars now being spent on armaments were set aside, the problems of food supplies, poverty, illiteracy and stamping out most diseases would be settled. Eight to ten per cent would settle the problems. Consequently the problems are social and not demographic of course, they will not be solved all at once, there will be difficulties, but the perspective will be clear.

In solving the food and other cardinal problems we derive confidence and optimism from our own experience and the experience of a number of other countries.

What was Bulgaria until the victory of the socialist revolution?

Bulgaria was the last but one of the most backward countries in Europe. Only Albania was more backward and this was certainly not the fault of the Albanian people. And now Bulgaria is an advanced industrial-agrarian country. Our agriculture can now feed a Bulgaria and a half, in about 1985 it will be able to feed two Bulgarias and after that — three. In its arable land our country holds one of the last places in Europe. How could Bulgaria solve these problems, and countries with such vast and fertile lands such as the African countries — I take Africa as an example but this could apply to other regions as well — could not settle their problems? What are the reasons?

These are the wonders which took place and are still taking place in Bulgaria. They have been and are being worked by our people under the leadership of our Communist Party, in joint efforts with the Bulgarian Agrarian Party, to which great credit must go for solving the problems in our agriculture. We have relied on the assistance (reciprocally given and taken) and all-round cooperation with the socialist countries, above all with the Soviet Union. At present we have a large army of well-trained specialists and thousands of our specialists are also working in other countries, but formerly the situation was altogether different. Within the range of her powers and possibilities, how is the People's Republic of Bulgaria tackling the cardinal problem — the relationship between man and nature — in our own country, and what contribution is she making and preparing to make in the future to its solution on a world scale?

*The question of environmental conservation and of improving our people's living milieu is a state policy laid down in the Constitution.* It is explicitly and unequivocally set forth in the Constitution that this is one of the cardinal problems — a problem which must be resolved by our Party and State leadership, by the public organizations, etc. The Constitution of the People's Republic of Bulgaria has decreed that the struggle for the conservation of the natural environment should increasingly assume the character of a nationwide cause.

We have set up at all levels of state government appropriate organs in charge of the conservation and reproduction of the environment. There are such organs in the State Council — the highest instance in the People's Republic of Bulgaria, in the Council of Ministers, in the counties, in all the conurbations.

The Fatherland Front organization, the Trade Unions, the Hikers' Union are all committed to this cause. Our comrades in the Bulgarian Agrarian Party are taking an active part in it. The study and elucidation of ecological problems are compulsory in all the higher institutes of learning, in the whole system of education, as well as among the population. With full justification we can declare that we have given nationwide significance to this problem.

In our five-year and yearly plans there is a special section on environmental con-

servation. In the current five-year plan period, which ends this year, 900 million leva have been allotted to the conservation and restoration of the natural environment. In the next five-year plan, which is being drawn up now, over 1,000 million leva are envisaged for this purpose.

Besides this I must note that in afforestation we rank among the first countries in the world. It is true that we continue to fell trees in our forests, but we shall leave to coming generations enough forests and timber, because we afforest from 40,000 to 50,000 hectares of land every year. Over 1.6 million hectares have been afforested in the years of people's rule. This is 49 per cent of the country's woodlands and 14.6 per cent of its territory. You can imagine what it means: 49 per cent of our forests, which you can now see, are new, planted in the years of people's rule.

Special organizations have been formed to restore the natural environment, to combat erosion, to reclaim land — organizations covering nearly all the regions. Vast territories denuded of forests in the past — wastelands and land severely affected by erosion — have been turned into forests fertile land, orchards and market gardens, which have been of help in curbing erosion processes, and in increasing timber supplies and which have radically improved the natural scenery of the country.

Of course, we do not delude ourselves that the problems bound up with environmental conservation in our country have been fully solved. But what is the most important in this? The important thing is that it is a state policy, that it has been endorsed in the constitution; that a system and organization has been evolved and the ecological problem has now become a nationwide concern.

You are now in Bulgaria. I should be very pleased, if it is possible for you, to go round and see something of our country. If you look through data on what Bulgaria was like up to the 1944 revolution, and on what it is now, you will see a radical change. At that time bare hills could be seen, screes, a barbarous attitude toward's forests, and so on.

Wherever you go today, you will see scores of beautiful places in our homeland — a fully renewed country — the vast new and virginal forests of the Rila, Pirin

and Rhodope Mountains; the Black Sea tourist resorts stretching along the coast like gems; well-built towns, villages and residential areas; the green belts in the Dobroudja plain and many other things — you will see a country which is a veritable garden created by our people's labours.

*Our approach is to show understanding and respect for nature, to tend it wisely and judiciously, to ensure a harmonious relationship between society and nature.*

That is why the People's Republic of Bulgaria takes an active part in all international undertakings and initiatives dedicated to this problem. Recognition for the active role played by our country in solving ecological problems is the dissemination of "The Basic Guidelines for the Conservation and Reproduction of the Natural Environment in the People's Republic of Bulgaria" as an official document in the UN. The results of the efforts of many countries, including our country, was the signing of a convention in 1978 which bans military and all other hostile use of means of affecting the natural environment, and which was ratified and is strictly observed by Bulgaria. Several years ago, a symposium was held in Bulgaria along UNESCO lines to study the experience we have gained in restoring the natural environment and in combatting erosion. Our country took a number of initiatives in drafting the respective conventions and agreements between the coastal countries concerned in protecting the River Danube and the Black Sea from pollution.

*We hold out our hands to all big and small nations, to all countries, to all parties for joint action not only in political, economic and cultural cooperation but also in ecological cooperation so that our Mother Earth should bear ample fruit, both for us and for coming generations.*

\*  
\* \*

Dear Guests,  
Dear Comrades,

In conclusion, I should like to stress most emphatically that the problems of peaceful co-existence, of war and peace and the relationship between man and nature are bound up together and cannot be discussed apart from each other.

*But, of course, the main leading one at this stage, especially at the present moment when the international situation is aggravated and attempts are being made to go back to the 'cold war', is the problem of war and peace. It is acquiring exclusive importance.*

We put forward this question honestly, frankly and clearly. This, however, does not mean that we are in panic, without perspectives. By no means! We know that there are forces which will not allow adventurism to prevail, neither in the present set-up nor in the future. Adventurism cannot be a determinant, constant trend in world development. Mankind have vital forces, not only in the socialist countries, but in all countries of the world. These forces are the ordinary people and a great part of the present leaders of states, politicians and public workers, who are fully aware of what the confrontation some are seeking to impose on us today, would in fact imply. Mankind cannot be steered to a 'cold war'! That is an impossible variant.

Well, it is true we have reached extremes, we could not go any further. And I should like to ask some strategists of the West: all well and good you have brought about an incredible rise in NATO's arms expenditure. You have come to a decision on this. It's a fact. You have gone further and restricted economic, scientific and technical contacts with the Soviet Union. Well, you can consider you have decided that issue too. But see, with the Olympics you are out of luck: you tried to spoil the Games but they sprang a boomerang on you. The Olympics will be held. And some will have to find an answer to give their people why their sportsmen are not going to Moscow.

And now, when all is said and done, what next. I should like to ask those who steered this course what they will undertake next — further on? Further on only arms remain. Yes, arms, but arms are already something different.

We have respect for the USA — it is a big state. We have respect for its technical genius, for its people — we have respect for every country and all the peoples. We want to live in peace and cooperate with each other. We resolutely reject the course which leads to armament.

*We hail the talks between Leonid Brezhnev and Valéry Giscard d'Estaing, between Comrade Brezhnev and Chancel-*

*lor Schmidt. They bid fair. That is the way — the way to dialogues, discussions and exploration of possibilities of finding a way out of this situation.*

I am deeply convinced and I believe that this highly responsible forum will not fail to contribute to the relaxation of tension in international relations. All the more so as you, the representatives of agrarian and other democratic parties, organizations and movements, are involved both in the formulation and the solution of present-day world problems.

And in this hope, in this belief and in this aspiration, I wish your meeting great success.

Thank you for your attention.

(Comrade Todor Zhivkov's speech was interrupted and hailed with prolonged and rousing applause).

-----