



ПОСОЛЬСТВО  
 СОЮЗА СОВЕТСКИХ  
 СОЦИАЛИСТИЧЕСКИХ РЕСПУБЛИК  
 13, Kensington Palace Gardens,  
 London W8

Mr. C. Powell,  
 Personal Assistant to the  
 Prime-Minister,  
 10 Downing Street, SW1

Dear Mr Powell,

I think You might be interested to have a copy of the  
 text of the article by M. Gorbachev "The Reality and the Guarantees of a Secure World" of 17 September, 1987.

I hope you will bring it to the attention of the Prime-Minister.

*Yours sincerely*  
*G. Gventsadze*

G. Gventsadze  
 Charge d'Affaires a.i.  
 of the USSR

cepc (E)

Rise Austin

You will want to  
 be aware of this.  
 But I do not think  
 you will find it  
 very edifying.

17 September 1987

COO  
 - 1079

# THE USSR EMBASSY

## PRESS RELEASE

13 KENSINGTON PALACE GARDENS LONDON W8 4QX

---

September 17, 1987

PR62287

### Gorbachev--Article

Moscow September 16 TASS - Follows the full text of the article "The Reality and Guarantees of a secure World" by Mikhail Gorbachev, General Secretary of the CPSU Central Committee. It will be published by the newspapers Pravda and Izvestia on September 17:

"The 42nd session of the United Nations General Assembly opened a few days ago. It is this fact that suggested the idea of this article. Objective processes are making our complex and diverse world increasingly interrelated and interdependent. And it increasingly needs a mechanism which is capable of discussing its common problems in a responsible fashion and at a representative level and of being a place for the mutual search for a balance of differing, contradictory, yet real, interests of the contemporary community of states and nations. The United Nations Organization is called upon to be such a mechanism by its underlying idea and its origin. We are confident that it is capable of fulfilling that role. This is why in the first

autumn days, when the period of holidays is over and the international political life is rapidly gathering momentum, when an opportunity for important decisions in the disarmament field can be discerned, we in the Soviet leadership deemed it useful to share our ideas on the basic issues of world politics at the end of the 20th century. It seems all the more appropriate since the current session of the United Nations General Assembly is devoted to major aspects of such politics.

It is natural that what we would like to do first of all in this connection is to try and see for ourselves what the idea of the establishment of a comprehensive system of international security -- the idea advanced at the 27th CPSU Congress -- looks like now that 1.5 years have passed since the Congress. This idea has won backing from many states. Our friends -- the socialist countries and members of the nonaligned movement -- are our active co-authors.

The article presented to you deals primarily with our approach to the formation of such a system. At the same time it is an invitation for the United Nations member-countries and the world public to exchange views.

1.

The last quarter of the 20th century has been marked by changes in the material aspect of being -- changes revolutionary in their content and significance. For the first time in its history mankind became capable of resolving

many problems that were hindering its progress over centuries. From the standpoint of the existing and newly-created resources and technologies there are no impediments to feeding the population of many billion, from giving it education, providing it with housing and keeping it healthy. Given obvious differences and potentialities of some or other peoples and countries, there has taken shape a prospect of ensuring befitting conditions of life for the inhabitants of the earth.

At the same time dangers have emerged which put into question the very immortality of the human race. This is why new rules of coexistence on our unique planet are badly needed and they should conform to the new requirements and the changed conditions.

Alas, many influential forces continue adhering to outdated conceptions concerning ways for ensuring national security. As a result the world is in an absurd situation whereby persistent efforts are being made to convince it that the road to an abyss is the most correct one. ?

It would be difficult to appraise in any other way the point of view that nuclear weapons make it possible to avert a world war. It is not simple to refute it precisely because it is totally unfounded. For one has to dispute something which is being passed off as an axiom -- since no world war has broken out after the emergence of nuclear weapons, hence, it is these weapons which have averted it. It

seems that it is more correct to say that a world war has been averted despite the existence of nuclear weapons.

Some time back the sides had several scores of atomic bombs apiece, then each came to possess a hundred nuclear missiles, and finally, the arsenals grew to include several thousands of nuclear warheads. Not so long ago Soviet and American scientists specially studied the issue of the relationship between the strategic stability and the size of the nuclear arsenals. They arrived at the unanimous conclusion that 95 per cent of all nuclear arms of the USA and the USSR can be eliminated without stability being disrupted. This is a devastating argument against the 'nuclear deterrence' strategy that gives birth to a mad logic. We believe that the 5 per cent should not be retained either. And then the stability will be qualitatively different.

Not laying claims to instructing anyone and having come to realize that mere statements about the dangerous situation in the world are unproductive, we began seeking an answer to the question whether it was possible to have a model for ensuring national security which would not be fraught with the threat of a world-wide catastrophe.

Such an approach was in the mainstream of the conceptions emerging during the evolution of the new political thinking involving a realistic view of what surrounds us, what is happening around us and, of ourselves -

a view characterised by an unbiassed attitude to others and the awareness of our own responsibility and security.

The new thinking is a bridging of the gap between the word and the deed. And we embarked on practical deeds. Being confident that nuclear weapons are the greatest evil and the most horrible threat we announced a unilateral moratorium on nuclear tests which we observed, let me put it plainly, longer than we could have done, ... Then came the January 15, 1986 statement putting forth a concrete programme for a stage-by-stage elimination of nuclear weapons. At the meeting with President Reagan in Reykjavik we came close to the realization of the desirability and possibility of complete nuclear disarmament. And then we took steps which made it easier to approach an agreement on the elimination of two classes of nuclear arms -- medium-and shorter-range missiles.

We believe that it is possible and realistic. In this connection I would like to note that the government of the FRG assumed the stand which is conducive to this to a certain extent. The Soviet Union is proceeding from the premise that a relevant treaty could be worked out before the end of the current year. Much has been said about its potential advantages. I will not repeat them. I would only like to note that it would deal a tangible blow at concepts of limited use of nuclear weapons and the so-called 'controllable escalation' of a nuclear conflict. There are no illusory intermediate options. The situation is becoming more stable.

This treaty on medium-and shorter-range missiles would be a fine prelude to a breakthrough at the talks on large-scale -50 per cent -reductions in strategic offensive arms in conditions of the strict observance of the ABM Treaty. I believe that, given the mutual striving, an accord on that matter could become a reality as early as in the first half of the next year.

While thinking of advancing toward a nuclear weapon-free world it is essential to see to it even now that security be ensured in the process of disarmament, at each of its stages, and to think not only about that, but also to agree on mechanisms for maintaining peace at drastically reduced levels of non-nuclear armaments.

All these questions were included into proposals set forth jointly by the USSR and other socialist countries at the United Nations -the proposals for the establishment of a comprehensive system of international peace and security.

What should it be like, as we see it?

The security plan proposed by us provides, above all, for continuity and concord with the existing institutions for the maintenance of peace. The system could function on the basis of the U.N. Charter and within the framework of the United Nations. In our view, its ability to function will be ensured by the strict observance of the charter's demands, additional unilateral obligations of states as well as confidence measures and international cooperation in all

Afghanistan?  
Cambodia?

spheres -- politico-military, economic, ecological, humanitarian and others.

I do not venture to foretell how the system of all-embracing security would appear in its final form. It is only clear that it could become a reality only if all means of mass annihilation were destroyed. We propose that all this be pondered by an independent commission of experts and specialists which would submit its conclusions to the United Nations Organisation.

Personally, I have no doubt about the capability of sovereign states to assume obligations in the field of international security already now. Many states are already doing this. As is known, the Soviet Union and the People's Republic of China have stated that they will not be the first to use nuclear arms. The Soviet-American agreements on nuclear armaments are another example. They contain a conscious choice of restraint and self-limitation in the most sensitive sphere of relations between the USSR and the United States. Or take the nuclear non-proliferation treaty. What is it? It is a unique example of a high sense of responsibility of states.

In the present-day reality there already exist "bricks" from which one can start building the future system of security.

The sphere of the reasonable, responsible and rational organisation of international affairs is expanding before our



very eyes, though admittedly timidly. Previously unknown standards of openness, of the scope and depth of mutual monitoring and verification of compliance with adopted obligations are being established. An American inspection team visits an area where exercises of Soviet troops are held, a group of United States Congressmen inspects the Krasnoyarsk Radar Station, American scientists install and adjust their instruments in the area of the Soviet nuclear testing range. Soviet and American observers are present at each other's military exercises. Annual plans of military activity are published in accordance with accords within the framework of the Helsinki process.

I do not know a weightier and more impressive argument in support of the fact that the situation is changing than the stated readiness of a nuclear power voluntarily to renounce nuclear weapons. References to a striving to replace them with conventional armaments in which there supposedly exists a disbalance between NATO and the Warsaw Treaty in the latter's favour are unjustified. If a disbalance, ← ||| disproportions exist, let us remove them. We do not tire saying this all the time and we have proposed concrete ways of solving this problem.

In all these issues the Soviet Union is a pioneer and shows that its words are matched by its deeds.

The question of the comparability of defence spending? Here we will have to put in more work. I think that given

proper effort already within the next two or three years we will be able to compare the figures that are of interest to us and our partners and which would symmetrically reflect the expenditures of the sides.

The Soviet-American talks on nuclear and space arms, the convention on the prohibition of chemical weapons which is close to being concluded will intensify, I am sure, the advance to detente and disarmament.

An accord on "defence strategy" and "military sufficiency" could impart a powerful impulse in this direction. These notions presuppose such a structure of the armed forces of a state that they would be sufficient to repulse a possible aggression but would not be sufficient for the conduct of offensive actions. The first step to this could be a controlled withdrawal of nuclear and other offensive weapons from the borders with a subsequent creation along borders of strips of rarefied armaments and demilitarised zones between potential, let us put it this way, adversaries. While in principle we should work for the dissolution of military blocs and the liquidation of bases on foreign territories and the return home of all troops stationed abroad.

The question of a possible mechanism to prevent the outbreak of a nuclear conflict is more complex. Here I approach the most sensitive point of the idea of all-embracing security: much will have to be additionally thought

out, rethought and worked out. In any case, the international community should work out agreed upon measures to be taken in the event of a violation of the all-embracing agreement on the non-use and elimination of nuclear arms or an attempt to violate this agreement. As to potential nuclear piracy, it appears possible and necessary to consider in advance and prepare collective measures to prevent it.

If the system is sufficiently effective then the more so it will provide effective guarantees of averting and curbing a non-nuclear aggression.

The system proposed by us precisely presupposes a definiteness of measures which would enable the United Nations Organisation, the main universal security body, to ensure its maintenance at a level of reliability.

Ii

The division of the world's countries into those possessing nuclear weapons and those not possessing them has split also the very concept of security. But for human life security is indivisible. In this sense it is not only a political, military, juridical but also a moral category. And contentions that there has been no war for already half a century do not withstand any test on the touchstone of ethics. How come there is no war? There are dozens of regional wars flaring in the world.

It is immoral to treat this as something second rate. The matter, however, is not only in the impermissible nuclear high-handed. The elimination of nuclear weapons would also be a major step towards a genuine democratisation of relations between states, their equality and equal responsibility.

Unconditional observance of the United Nations Charter and the right of peoples sovereignly to choose the roads and forms of their development, revolutionary or evolutionary, is an imperative condition of universal security. This applies also to the right to the status quo of a society. This, too, is exclusively an internal matter. Any attempts, direct or indirect, to influence the development of "not one of our own" countries, to interfere in this development should be ruled out. Just as impermissible are attempts to destabilise existing governments from outside.

At the same time the world community cannot stay away from inter-state conflicts. Here it could be possible to begin by fulfilling the proposal made by the United Nations Secretary General to set up under the United Nations organisation a multilateral centre for lessening the danger of war. Evidently, it would be feasible to consider the expediency of setting up a direct communication line between the United Nations headquarters and the capitals of the countries that are permanent members of the security council and the location of the chairman of the nonaligned movement.

It appears to us that with the aim of strengthening trust and mutual understanding it could be possible to set up under the aegis of the United Nations Organisation a mechanism for extensive international verification of compliance with agreements to lessen international tension and limit armaments and for monitoring the military situation in conflict areas. The mechanism would function using various forms and methods of monitoring to collect information and promptly submit it to the United Nations. This would make it possible to have an objective picture of the events taking place, to timely detect preparations for hostilities, impede a sneak attack, take measures to avert an armed conflict, prevent it from expanding and becoming worse.

We are arriving at the conclusion that wider use should be made of the Institute of United Nations Military Observers and United Nations peace-keeping forces in disengaging the troops of warring sides, observing ceasefire and armistice agreements.

And of course at all stages of a conflict extensive use should be made of all means of a peaceful settlement of disputes and differences between states and one should offer one's good offices, one's mediation with the aim of achieving an armistice. The ideas and initiatives concerning non-governmental commissions and groups which would analyse the causes, circumstances and methods of resolving various concrete conflict situations appear to be fruitful.

The Security Council permanent members could become guarantors of regional security. They could, on their part, assume the obligation not to use force or the threat of force, to renounce demonstrative military presence. This is so because such a practice is one of the factors of fanning up regional conflicts.

A drastic intensification and expansion of the cooperation of states in uprooting international terrorism is extremely important. It would be expedient to concentrate this cooperation within the framework of the United Nations organisation. In our opinion, it would be useful to create under its aegis a tribunal to investigate acts of international terrorism.

More coordination in the struggle against apartheid as a destabilising factor of international magnitude would also be justified.

As we see it, all the above-stated measures could be organically built into an all-embracing system of peace and security.

### Iii

The events and tendencies of the past decades have expanded this concept, imparting new features and specific qualities to it. One of them is the problem of economic security. A world in which a whole continent can find itself on the brink of death from starvation and in which huge

masses of people are suffering from almost permanent malnutrition is not a safe world. Neither is a world safe in which a multitude of countries and peoples are being strangled in a noose of debt.

The economic interests of individual countries or groups of countries are indeed so different and contradictory that consensus with regard to the concept of the new world economic order seems to be hard to achieve. We do hope, however, that the instinct of self-preservation should snap into action here as well. It is sure to manifest itself if it becomes possible to look into the chain of priorities and see that there are circumstances menacing in their inevitability, and that it is high time that the inert political mentality inherited from past views of the outside world be abandoned. This world has ceased to be a sphere which the big and strong divided into domains and zones of "vital interests".

The imperatives of the times compel us to institutionalise many commonsense notions. It is not philanthropy which prompted our proposal to agree on the reduction of interest payments on bank credits and the elaboration of extra benefits for the least developed nations. This holds benefit for all, namely a secure future. If the debt burden of the developing world is alleviated, the chances for such a future will grow. It is also possible to limit debt payments by each developing country to the share of its annual export earnings without detriment to

development, accept export commodities in payment for the debt, remove protectionist barriers on the borders of creditor-nations and stop adding extra interest when deferring payments under debts.

There may be different attitudes to these proposals. There is no doubt, however, that the majority of international community members realize the need for immediate actions to alleviate the developing world's debt burden. If that is so, it is possible to start working out the programme through concerted effort.

These words "through concerted effort" are very important for today's world. The relationship between disarmament and development, confirmed at the recent international conference in New York, can be implemented if none of the strong and rich keep themselves aloof. I already expressed the view that security council member states, represented by their top officials, could jointly discuss this problem and work out a coordinated approach. I confirm this proposal.

Ecological security. It is not secure in the direct meaning of the word when currents of poison flow along river channels, when poisonous rain pours down from the sky, when the atmosphere polluted with industrial and transport waste chokes cities and whole regions, when the development of atomic engineering is justified by unacceptable risks.

the thing jump up nuclear power plants?



Human rights. One can name all top statesmen of our times who threatened to use nuclear weapons. Some may object: it is one thing to threaten and another to use. Indeed, they haven't used them. But campaigning for human rights is in no way compatible with the threat to use weapons of mass destruction. We hold it is unacceptable to talk about human rights and liberties while intending to hang in outer space "chandeliers" of exotic weapons. The only down-to-earth element in that "exoticism" is the potentiality of mankind's annihilation. The rest is in dazzling wrapping.

I agree: the world cannot be considered secure if human rights are violated in it. I will only add: if a large part of this world has not the elementary conditions for a life worthy of man, if millions of people have the full "right" to go hungry, to have no roof over their head and to be jobless and sick indefinitely when treatment is something they cannot afford, if, finally, the basic human right, the right to life, is disregarded.

First of all, it is necessary that national legislation and administrative rules in the humanitarian sphere everywhere be brought into accord with international obligations and standards.

Simultaneously it would be possible to turn to coordinating a broad selection of practical steps, for instance, to working out a world information programme under the U.N. auspices to familiarize peoples with one another's

Many have suddenly begun to perceive all that not as something abstract, but as quite a real part of their own experience. The confidence that "this won't affect us", characteristic of the past outlook, has disappeared. They say that one thorn of experience is worth more than a whole wood of instructions. For us, Chernobyl became such a thorn...

The relationship between man and the environment has become menacing. Problems of ecological security affect all - the rich and the poor. What is required is the global strategy of environmental protection and the rational use of resources. We suggest starting its elaboration within the framework of the U.N. special programme.

States already exchange appropriate information and notify international organizations of developments. We believe that this order should be legitimized by introducing the principle of annual reports by governments' about their conservationist activity and about ecological accidents, both those that occurred and those that were prevented on the territory of their countries.

Realizing the need for opening a common front of economic and ecological security and starting its formation mean defusing a time bomb planted deep inside mankind's existence by history, by people themselves.

life, the life as it is, not as someone would like to present it. That is precisely why such a project should envisage ridding the flow of information of the "enemy image" stereotypes, of bias, prejudices and absurd concoctions, of the deliberate distortion and unscrupulous violation of the truth.

There is much promise in the task of coordinating unified international legal criteria for handling in the humanitarian spirit issues of family reunification, marriages, contacts between people and organizations, visa regulations and so on. What has been achieved on this account within the framework of the all-European process should be accepted as a starting point.

We favour the establishment of a special fund of humanitarian cooperation of the United Nations formed from voluntary state and private contributions on the basis of the reduction of military spending.

It is advisable that all states join the UNESCO conventions in the sphere of culture, including the conventions on protection of the world cultural heritage, on the means of prohibition and preventing the illicit import, export and transfer of ownership of cultural property.

The alarming signals of the recent times have pushed to the top of the agenda the idea of creating a world-wide network of medical cooperation in treating most dangerous diseases, including aids, and combating drug addiction and

alcoholism. The existing structures of the world health organization make it possible to establish such a network at relatively short notice. The leaders of the world movement of physicians have big ideas on this account.

Dialogue on humanitarian problems could be conducted on a bilateral basis, within the forms of negotiation that have already been established. Besides, we propose holding it also within the framework of an international conference in Moscow: we made the proposal at the Vienna meeting in November last year.

Pooling efforts in the sphere of culture, medicine and humanitarian rights is yet another integral part of the system of comprehensive security.

V

The suggested system of comprehensive security will be effective to the extent in which the United Nations, its Security Council and other international institutes and mechanisms will effectively function. It will be required to enhance resolutely the authority and role of the U.N., the International Atomic Energy Agency. The need for establishing a world space organization is clearly felt. It could work in the future in close contact with the U.N. as an autonomous part of its system. U.N. Specialized agencies should also become regulators of international processes. The Geneva conference on disarmament should become a forum that would

internationalize the efforts on transition to a nuclear-free, non-violent world.

One should not forget the capacities of the International Court either. The General Assembly and the Security Council could approach it more often for consultative conclusions on international disputes. Its mandatory jurisdiction should be recognized by all on mutually agreed upon conditions. The permanent members of the Security Council, taking into account special responsibility, are to make the first step in that direction.

We are convinced that a comprehensive system of security is at the same time a system of universal law and order ensuring the primacy of international law in politics.

The U.N. Charter gives extensive powers to the Security Council. Joint efforts are required to ensure that it could use them effectively. For this purpose, there would be sense in holding meetings of the Security Council at Foreign Ministers' level when opening a regular session of the General Assembly to review the international situation and jointly look for effective ways for its improvement.

It would be useful to hold meetings of the Security Council not only at the headquarters of the U.N. in New York, but also in regions of friction and tension and alternate them among the capitals of the permanent member states.

Special missions of the council to regions of actual and potential conflicts would also help consolidate its authority and enhance the effectiveness of decisions adopted.

We are convinced that cooperation between the U.N. and regional organizations could be considerably expanded. Its aim is the search for a political settlement of crisis situations.

In our view, it is important to hold special sessions of the General Assembly on the more urgent political problems and individual disarmament issues more often if the efficiency of latter's work is to be improved.

We emphatically stress the need for making the status of important political documents passed at the United Nations by consensus more binding morally and politically. Let me recall that they include, among others, the final document of the 1st Special Session of the United Nations General Assembly devoted to disarmament, the charter of economic rights and obligations of states, and others.

In our opinion, we should have set up long ago a world consultative council under the U.N. auspices uniting the world's intellectual elite. Prominent scientists, political and public figures, representatives of international public organizations, cultural workers, people in literature and the arts, including Nobel Prize winners and other international prizes of world-wide significance, eminent representatives of the churches could seriously enrich the

spiritual and ethical potential of contemporary world politics.

To ensure that the United Nations and its specialized agencies operate at full capacity one should come to realize that it is impermissible to use financial levers for bringing pressure to bear on it. The Soviet Union will continue to cooperate actively in overcoming budget difficulties arising at the United Nations.

And finally, about the United Nations Secretary-General. The international community elects an authoritative figure enjoying everybody's trust to that high post. Since the Secretary-General is functioning as a representative of every member-country of the organization all states should give him the maximum of support and help him in fulfilling his responsible mission. The international community should encourage the United Nations Secretary-General in his missions of good offices, mediation and reconciliation.

X

x

x

Why are we so persistent in raising the question of a comprehensive system of international peace and security?

Simply because it is impossible to put up with the situation in which the world has found itself on the threshold of the third millenium -- in the face of a threat of annihilation, in a state of constant tension, in an atmosphere of suspicion and strife, spending huge funds and

quantities of work and talent of millions of people only to increase mutual mistrust and fears.

One can speak as much as he pleases about the need for terminating the arms race, uprooting militarism, or about cooperation. Nothing will change unless we start acting.

The political and moral core of the problem is the trust of the states and peoples in one another, respect for international agreements and institutions. And we are prepared to switch from confidence measures in individual spheres to a large-scale policy of trust which would gradually shape a system of comprehensive security. But such a policy should be based on the community of political statements and real positions.

The idea of a comprehensive system of security is the first plan for a possible new organization of life in our common planetary home. In other words, it is a pass into the future where security of all is a token of the security for everyone. We hope that the current session of the United Nations General Assembly will jointly develop and concretize this idea.

Item ends



